

## **REPORT OF PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**(Meetings held on 31 May and 28 June 2000)**

### **1. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (MINUTE NO. 6).**

#### **Testwood Lakes**

The Committee was advised that discussions with Southern Water on the future restoration of Testwood Lakes were progressing constructively, but were not sufficiently advanced for a report to be submitted. A report would be taken to the Development Control Sub-Committee at the earliest opportunity. Southern Water accepted that they could not leave the site in an environmentally unacceptable condition until some unspecified future date when they had the funding to complete the water storage reservoir. Plans were now being drawn up for interim restoration and the use of the land until the full scheme could be completed.

Members recalled that there was a legal agreement to secure the full restoration of this site. They were not satisfied that Southern Water was not being pursued more vigorously and noted that the parent company, Scottish Power, had considerable resources available to them.

It was agreed that a copy of the Chairman's announcement would be sent to all members of the Council; and also that a briefing meeting should be arranged with all Totton Councillors, together with Cllr Burdle, before the issue was considered by the Development Control Sub-Committee.

### **2. CAR PARKING CHARGES - PERMIT REFUNDS (REPORT A) (MINUTE NO. 8).**

The Committee considered whether to refund, in whole or in part, the cost of car park permits, following the removal of car parking charges from Town and Village centre car parks. This followed a decision in the Court that the Council had no legal obligation to do so.

The Committee considered a presentation from Cllr Locock that the Council should, on the grounds of reasonableness rather than obligation, refund the cost of car parking permits.

There are no powers under the terms of the Council's Off-Street Parking Places Order to make a refund. In addition, incurring expenditure for this purpose under the subsidiary powers of Section 111 of the Local Government Act 1972 could be considered ultra-vires. It was accordingly decided that no refund should be paid on parking permits issued as part of the Town and Village Centre Car Parking initiative.

### **3. COMMONERS DWELLINGS IN THE NEW FOREST (REPORT B) (MINUTE NO. 9).**

The New Forest Commoners Trust was established by the New Forest Committee in the early 1990's to provide a legal mechanism through which to secure the construction of houses specifically for active commoners. The policy which recognised the role and mechanism provided by the Trust that had been included in the deposited District Local Plan was however amended by the Local Plan Inspector. It is now much more general, allowing the construction of schemes which are capable of management by an appropriate body, such as a registered social landlord, the New Forest Commoning Trust or a Village Trust or similar accredited local organisation.

The Trust have indicated that they do not wish to accept any more applications under the scheme. At present four houses have been permitted. Two are occupied and another two are nearly finished.

The Committee discussed the options available to provide a mechanism through which to secure commoners' dwellings in the long term. It was suggested that this might be a role for the New Forest National Park Body, in due course. In the meantime it was agreed in principle that this Council should take over the responsibility for the management of Commoners' Dwellings under planning policy NF-H8. A report will be submitted to a future meeting of the Committee, following a consultation exercise on the proposal, prior to the new arrangements being implemented.

### **4. PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE NOTE 3: HOUSING (REPORT C) (MINUTE NO. 10).**

This PPG proposes a radical change to the way in which Local Authorities identify and deal with proposals for new Housing Development. The main thrust of the document includes the use of high housing densities; as much as possible reusing previously developed land; to provide good quality mixed developments which meet the needs of the whole community. It is also intended to reduce dependence on the motor car, and promote the use of alternative means of transport, including walking and cycling. The PPG provides a framework through which Local Planning Authorities can identify and seek to meet the needs for housing in their areas.

The Committee considered that this issue required further detailed debate to establish the practical implications for this District. Other Local Authorities are pursuing interesting options to secure a greater mix of houses in market developments, which might make it easier to integrate social housing. There are, however, serious practical problems in mixing types of tenure, not least in securing the funding for the social housing development in tandem with the market scheme.

Members expressed their concern that reducing car parking requirements in housing developments would create problems for the future. The number of cars owned by households would not be reduced by cutting the number of spaces available for them to park. To encourage the use of alternative means of transport other practical initiatives, such as the provision of secure ground floor cycle storage for flats, will have to be pursued.

In answer to questions, members were advised that a new Housing Needs Survey was being funded by the Housing Committee, but included joint working with the planning officers. This survey would be used to inform the forthcoming debate on housing provision which would take place under the review of the District Local Plan. It was agreed that the issues raised by PPG3 should be further considered and taken into account in the review of the New Forest District Local Plan. A copy of Report C, and of the minute, will be sent to members of the Housing Committee and those members invited to attend the Local Plan debate on housing issues.

In addition, the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions will be advised of this Council's concerns that the good practice notes, which support this PPG, have not yet been issued and urged to release them as a matter of urgency.

**5. DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT, TRANSPORT AND THE REGIONS PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR BUILDING CONTROL (REPORT D) (MINUTE NO. 11).**

This Council's Building Control service already operate to the quality system registered by the British Standards Institute under ISO 9002. The DETR are now encouraging all Local Authorities to adopt their recently published Building Control Performance Standards. The publication of this document has been promoted by the introduction of "Approved Inspectors" through private companies, and the consequent need to ensure a satisfactory standard of service across both the private and public sectors. The performance standards have also been backed by the Local Government Association (LGA), Construction Industry Council and Association of Corporate Approval Inspectors. The LGA have recommended that local authorities should formally adopt them. The key differences between the existing and the proposed performance standards are:

- One Stop Shop – the DETR would like all permissions to be dealt with at one location – as set out in their report "The One Stop Shop approach to Development Consents"
- Assessment of Plans – the DETR recommends more documentation and record keeping on the assessment of plans. The assessment stage is designed to advise the designer of contraventions of Building Regulations.
- Site Inspections – the DETR recommend the introduction of formal written inspection plans for each site, to include a written "inspection notification framework". The number and intensity of inspections, and the record keeping on site would also be increased. This has obvious resource implications.

Members are concerned that there is no requirement on private sector building control providers to adopt these quality standards. By offering a lower standard of service, private companies can be more price competitive in the market place. Such lower standards might also increase the requirement for enforcement, which remains a Local Authority function. This could further increase costs to the Council, where there has been no income from the initial inspection.

The Committee were also aware of the valuable role played by the Council's Building Control Surveyors in monitoring compliance with Development Control issues. They considered that it was therefore essential that, as far as possible, this service continued to be provided by the Local Authority.

The DETR Performance Standards for Building Control have been adopted subject to additional resources being available (see item 7 below). But at the same time, the DETR have been urged to put pressure on other organisations offering Building Control Services to adopt the same Performance Standards. They have also been reminded of the cost implications of enforcement for Local Authorities, on sites inspected by the private sector.

## **6. REVISED CHARGES FOR BUILDING REGULATION WORK (REPORT E) (MINUTE NO. 12).**

The Committee have agreed a revised scheme of charges for Building Regulation work in the light of the revised model scheme which was published recently by the Local Government Association, and also the Council's own income profile over the last year.

The new scheme will take effect from 1 October 2000. A copy of the fee schedules is attached at Appendix 1. The key new features, and differences in the local scheme, compared with the LGA model are:

- On overall increase in fees for domestic extensions of 3%
- The fee for minor works (under £1,000) to be reduced from £100 to £50
- The fees for both attached and detached garages to be harmonised. Those under 40 sq m to be charged £103. New charging category of garages 40-60 sq m, to be charged £206. Over 60 sq m to be calculated on estimated cost of work.
- New minimum fee for extensions over 60 sq m of £412
- The fee for the provision of rooms in the roof of a dwelling to continue to be calculated on the basis of estimated cost – and not introduce the recommended minimum fee of £309.
- Introducing a 30% discount on the plan checking element where proposals are substantially the same as another submission, or previous approval.

The scheme will be reviewed after 6 months of operation.

## **7. STAFFING FOR PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION FUNCTIONS (REPORT F) (MINUTE NO. 13).**

Over four years, savings of £397,000 have been made from the Committee's budgets, as required by the expenditure plan process. An additional £161,000 savings has also been made following the review of the senior management structure in the Environment Services Directorate. Since that review, the workload and income of teams within the Directorate has increased, reflecting the buoyancy of the economy. This has been exacerbated by rising standards which are being set by the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions across the Committee's functions. While the additional workload has, so far, been met by the existing establishment, the Committee accepted that additional posts were now needed in each of the Development Control, Policy, Design and Information, and Building Control teams. The Committee was advised of statistical information in support of the need for these posts. The following additional posts have been agreed:

- an additional post of Planning Officer in the Policy and Plans team for a two year temporary period;

- an additional post of Planning Officer (Enforcement and Special Projects) in the Development Control Division; and
- an additional post of Assistant Building Control Surveyor in the Building Control team

Policy and Resources Committee have been requested to agree a supplementary estimate of £11,500 to meet the part year costs of the above resolutions in 2000/01, and to make budgetary provision for future years funding of £48,000 per annum from 2001/02 onwards.

## **8. DRAFT REGIONAL PLANNING GUIDANCE FOR THE SOUTH EAST (RPG9) (REPORT H) (MINUTE NO. 15).**

Revised draft Regional Planning Guidance, to cover the period up to 2016, has been published in the light of comments received in response to the initial draft which was issued in early 1999. That draft was the subject of an Examination in Public last year.

The report set out in detail the main provisions of the revised draft RPG, and the implications for this District. In general the RPG could be welcomed. It had been considerably improved since the original draft, taking account of the comments that the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) had received. Of particular note was the inclusion in Policy E1 of specific recognition of the need to protect the New Forest, and the inclusion of the New Forest Heritage Area on the key diagram.

The comments to the GOSE include:

- (i) Support for the proposed core strategy and key development principles set out in Chapters 3 and 4 with the exception of development principle 6 (paragraph 3.5). This should have regard to the resolution agreed by the National Assembly of the Local Government Association which call on the Government “to respond to the household growth proposals, which are being proposed by the Regional Planning bodies, in a manner which recognises the need to enhance the demands of services, transport and the quality of life with economic regeneration, urban renaissance and rural needs in a sustainable way”. In addition, the assessment of housing needs should be based on quantifiable need, not on aspirations to live in fashionable areas. The region should be seen within the context of the country as a whole, and development here should not prejudice the viability of other, more northern, areas;
- (ii) Welcome for the proposals regarding environmental strategy and the countryside (Chapter 6) and in particular the specific reference in Policy E1 for the need to protect the New Forest and the inclusion of the New Forest Heritage Area on the key diagram (Map 3);
- (iii) The suggestion that:
  - The South West Hampshire Green Belt on the “Environment” diagram (Map 3) should reflect that in the adopted Hampshire County Structure Plan Review to 2011 and;
  - Map 3 should be revised to show the Avon Valley as a designated (rather than potential) Special Protection Area and should also show the River Avon SSSI as a candidate Special Area of Conservation;

- (iv) Support for the proposals for the regional economy (Chapter 7), although the way in which the policies are applied to local areas must take into account the specific local circumstances;
- (v) Objection to the proposed increased provision for housing development on the basis of the comments of SERPLAN's Members' Policy Group of 19 April 2000 (as set out in paragraph 2.25 and 2.26 of Report H);
- (vi) Endorsement of the objections set out in resolution (iv) of Hampshire County Council's Planning and Transportation Committee meeting of 15 May 2000 with regard to the housing provision proposed in Hampshire (as set out in paragraphs 2.28 and 2.29 of Report H);
- (vii) Support for the transport content (Chapter 9) of the draft RPG, subject to some detailed points which will be forwarded to GOSE;
- (viii) Support for the reduction of the area shown as included in the South Hampshire Priority Area for economic regeneration (Map 4) and the general proposals for this area (paragraphs 12.7 to 12.11). However, the statement that "some development will have to be on land outside the existing urban areas" in paragraph 12.9 should be qualified to say "in environmentally acceptable locations";
- (ix) Support for the proposal for a regional ports strategy (paragraph 9.35) and the statement that "any proposal for the expansion of the Port (of Southampton) will need to take account of the wider spatial strategy and its environmental, social and economic objectives (paragraph 12.11);
- (x) A reminder that in the case of any expansion of the Port of Southampton, the expansion would be outside the boundaries of Southampton and overspill into this District; and
- (xi) Support for the proposed arrangements for "plan, monitor and manage, and for future reviews of the Regional Planning Strategy, but also some concerns about the resources that will be required.

**9. HYTHE SALTMARSH – TRIAL USE OF DREDGED SEDIMENTS (REPORT O) (MINUTE NO. 16).**

The Committee received a detailed presentation from Andrew Kenny and Ian Townend of ABP Research and Consultancy on proposals for a trial recharge of Hythe Saltmarsh using dredged sediments. In addition, a statement from English Nature, in support of the proposals, was submitted to the meeting. The work has been required by the DETR as a condition of their consent for dredging the main channel in Southampton Water is large. It is recognised that saltmarshes in general are a threatened habitat, and are often subject to erosion. This is the case in the Solent. This experiment was designed to test whether the saltmarshes could be recharged, using the fine sediments obtained in routine maintenance dredging, without causing undesirable ecological effects. It was emphasized that this was a small scale trial, specifically to find out what the ecological effects would be. The proposal was for the natural tidal action to redistribute the sediments over the saltmarsh from the initial deposition site. The degree of spread would be monitored. Monitoring would continue over several weeks to evaluate the effects of tides at various stages in the lunar cycle.

No objection has been raised about this trial inter-tidal recharge, under the terms of sections 60-63 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc) Regulations 1994, provided that the work is carried out in accordance with the method statement produced by English Nature and ABP Research and Consultancy.

**10. SHORELINE MANAGEMENT PLANS (REPORT P) (MINUTE NO. 17).**

The Committee has adopted the West Solent and Southampton Water Shoreline Management Plan and the Poole and Christchurch Bay Shoreline Management Plan as the Council's official source of technical guidance to inform the District Local Plan.

**11. DRAFT PLANNING POLICY GUIDANCE NOTE 25 (PPG25) : DEVELOPMENT AND FLOOD RISK (REPORT I) (MINUTE NO. 19).**

This Draft Planning Policy Guidance Note has been released for public consultation. It explores the relationship between development and the risk of flooding. The Committee discussed the views which should be expressed to the DETR on the PPG.

There is now increasing emphasis on a precautionary principle "taking action now to avoid possible environmental damage when the scientific evidence for acting is inconclusive but the potential damage could be great". This is particularly relevant to flooding. The PPG also shows increasing recognition that development in flood plains should be limited and that there should be greater emphasis on sustainable, "soft" engineering techniques, such as natural flood meadows, salt marshes and mud flats to help attenuate flooding and to contribute to bio-diversity. The PPG defines the responsibilities of those involved in the development process including property and land owners, and Authorities with powers in respect of drainage. The PPG also reaffirms that flooding issues are a material planning consideration. Local Planning Authorities are therefore required to take into account information on the nature and degree of flood risks in coming to decisions about allocating land for development, and dealing with planning applications. This approach should be applied to all development, not just that in flood zones.

The PPG does not take any account of the potential effects of climate changes, and the consequent rise in sea level. The DETR's attention has also been drawn to the need to have clearly assigned responsibility for assessing the impact of development on the water table and localised flooding, and advised that such responsibility should most property lie with the Environment Agency. In addition the suggested risk-based approach to assessing development does not include any mechanism to ensure consistency of advice, nor define who may advise local planning authorities. It is suggested that this should also be a function of the Environment Agency. The PPG does not address the practical problems of implementing Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems, which it advocates should be encouraged.

**12. DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE : DEVELOPMENT IN TOWN CENTRES : DEVELOPERS' CONTRIBUTIONS IN LIEU OF ON SITE CAR PARKING (REPORT J) (MINUTE NO. 20).**

The Committee have adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance on Development in Town Centres : Developers' Contributions in Lieu of On-Site Car Parking Provision.

**13. TOTTON AND WATERSIDE TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY (REPORT K) (MINUTE NO. 21).**

The Totton and Waterside Transportation Strategy has been prepared for public consultation by the County Council to address the areas' growing transportation problems. It has been developed through the Waterside and Totton Issues Panel which includes five County and three District Councillors. The County Council were seeking initial views, prior to the public consultation exercise. This Council would have a second opportunity to comment, at that stage. They have been advised of this Council's general support for the Strategy both to form the basis for consultations and also, once the results of the public consultation exercise have been taken into account, for dealing with Totton and Waterside's growing transportation problems. They have been recommended to include the Health Authority and the New Forest Committee in the bodies to be formally consulted. They have also been urged to make the proposed bus priority measures along the A35 between Rushington roundabout and Redbridge Causeway and also along the A326 to the Dibden roundabout into a "multi occupancy vehicle" lane and not a bus only lane.

It was also agreed that this Council should seek to introduce innovative measures to improve accessibility for residents living in Calshot, in partnership with other agencies, at an estimated cost to this Council of £1,000. For 2000/01 the cost will be met from within the existing budgets. In future years the expenditure will be considered as part of the expenditure plan process.

**14. COASTAL TOWNS TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY – CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PROGRAMME (REPORT L) (MINUTE NO. 22).**

The Committee considered a proposed programme of measures for the Coastal Towns to implement that areas' part of the Local Transport Plan. The original programme of measures was drawn up in line with the Officers' expectation that there would be an annual settlement of around £220,000 per annum between 2000/01 and 2004/05. Since the initial programme was drawn up, the Government Office for the South East had indicated that additional money might be available, and consequently the work schedule had been amended. The revised programme of measures was attached as Appendices to Report L.

Members had some difficulty in assessing the programme as there was no overall strategy to help guide and prioritise individual items of work. Such strategies had been developed in the other package areas through joint working arrangements, including the Members' Panels. The County Council has therefore been asked to work with this Council to develop the overall strategy for the area.

The County Council have been urged to implement this programme within the timescales indicated. The comments on individual proposals include:

- (i) a request to evaluate the suggested proposal for the construction of a new roundabout, or other alternative measures, at the Bashley Cross Roads junction. This should include referring the matter to the New Forest Members' Panel and/or Officers Groups as appropriate. They have also, however, been advised that this improvement should not be brought forward so as to prejudice other, higher priority, schemes within the town;
- (ii) a request to assess the need for a controlled pedestrian crossing outside the Milford-on-Sea Primary School, Lymington Road, Milford as a matter of urgency;

**15. NEW FOREST INDICATORS AND MONITORING REPORT (REPORT M) (MINUTE NO. 23).**

In 1996 the New Forest Committee recognised the need for monitoring of the New Forest Heritage Area to support the implementation of "A Strategy for the New Forest". There is also a need to bring data collection for the area into line with practices followed in National Parks. In addition such monitoring data will be useful to this Council, for example in the review and defence of the Local Plan. An effective monitoring framework requires the establishment of indicators to express the overall health of the New Forest Heritage Area, together with the regular collection of data. In 1998 the GeoData Institute of Southampton University was commissioned to establish key indicators. This involved a study of baseline data to see how existing monitoring activity could be used and co-ordinated to contribute to these indicators. The study was funded by this Council, in its capacity as a member of the New Forest Committee.

The New Forest Indicators and Monitoring Report has now been completed. It provides the baseline for further investigative work which will be carried out through the auspices of the New Forest Committee. The New Forest Committee will use it to develop a monitoring strategy, as part of the reviewed "Strategy for the New Forest"

**16. LOCAL OMBUDSMAN DECISION OF NO MALADMINISTRATION (REPORT N) (MINUTE NO 24).**

The Committee was advised of the circumstances of an investigation by the Ombudsman where there had been a finding of no maladministration. The case had highlighted the constraints within which the Council and members have to work, and also the possible consequences of not maintaining the highest standards of propriety at all times. It had also illustrated that from time to time the officers would have to give professional and independent advice on sensitive and controversial issues. At times this could be difficult for both members and officers. It was however important that such independent advice was given, even when it was anticipated that it was not what members would have desired.

The manner in which individual members of the Committee, following advice, responded to the need to maintain propriety at all times was commended.

**17. MILFORD-ON-SEA CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL (REPORT Q) (MINUTE NO. 25).**

The draft conservation area appraisal for Milford-on-Sea has been approved for public consultation. The general format, which will form the model for the other appraisals, was also approved, subject to the introduction being expanded to include a brief explanation about conservation areas.

**18. CONSERVATION AREA DESIGNATION – LYMINGTON (WATERFORD) (REPORT R) (MINUTE NO. 26).**

The Committee has approved draft proposals for the designation of a conservation area at Waterford, Lyminster, to form the basis for public consultations. They were anxious that the public consultation exercise should make it explicit that the draft proposals were only the starting point, and could be amended in the light of representations received, provided the proposals met the technical requirements for inclusion in a conservation area.

**19. LIFE 3 PROJECT (REPORT S) (MINUTE NO. 27).**

The Committee has agreed to play a part in the partnership being put together to pursue a bid for European funding for works to the benefit of the Forest under the Life 3 initiative. A number of the proposed activities were relevant to this Authority. For this Committee, the financial commitment which would follow from taking part would be the reallocation of £8,000, over a four year period, from within existing budgets to commission work by the Hampshire Wildlife Trust to survey sites of potential nature conservation importance in land adjacent to the New Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Boundary.

**20. RINGWOOD FOREST DEVELOPMENT BRIEF : CONSULTATION DRAFT (REPORT T) (MINUTE NO. 28).**

The County Council has been advised that this Council welcomes the preparation of supplementary planning guidance for sand and gravel extraction at Plumley Wood and Farm and Blue Haze (North) and thanked for consulting this Council on the draft Ringwood Forest Development Brief. They have been advised of this Council's concerns about the possible use of the C102 to access the Plumley Wood and Farm area. It has also been suggested that they should consider including a requirement for the development to contribute towards the funding of the construction of a cycle lane adjacent to the existing carriageway of the B3081.

**21. MARYLAND, WEST LANE, BRANSGORE (APPLICATION 68492) (REPORT U) (MINUTE NO. 30).**

The Committee was advised of the circumstances under which retrospective planning consent had been granted, in error, under officers delegated powers, for the retention of a conservatory. Although the conservatory has no physical impact on the adjoining property, it breaches the size constraints imposed by the small dwellings policy (Policy NF-83).

In this case, the Council's policies and procedures were correct and adequate, but had not been properly applied. A number of steps have been taken to ensure that such a mistake does not happen again.

Having considered the options which were available to them, it was agreed that a press release should be issued which:

- (i) Publicly acknowledges that a mistake has been made;
- (ii) Explains how the mistake was made;
- (iii) Sets out the planning implications, as set out in the report;
- (iv) Explains the steps taken by the Council to ensure that similar mistakes do not incur in future; and
- (v) Includes a public apology to the adjoining occupiers.

The contents of the press release to be agreed by the Chairman of the Planning and Transportation Committee and local member. A letter of apology was also to be sent to the occupiers of the adjoining property.

**22. TRANSPORT AND WORKS ACT 1992, PROPOSED ASSOCIATED BRITISH PORTS (FAWLEY BRANCH LINE IMPROVEMENTS) ORDER 2000 (REPORT A – 28.6.00) (MINUTE NO. 32).**

The Committee have agreed their Statement of Views on proposed works to the railway track at Totton. This is the first stage in the process, prior to Associated British Ports submitting an Order to the Secretary of State for consent under the Transport and Works Act 1992. The Statement is reproduced at Appendix 1 to this report.

The scope of the consideration is very limited at this stage. The Local Planning Authority is required to provide its opinion on only two issues. Firstly, whether the proposed work is consistent with the provisions of the development plan; and secondly whether planning consent is required for the works or other matters for which provision was made under the draft Order. The draft Order itself will require careful consideration, once it has been submitted for determination. At that stage potential issues such as noise, vibration, and the effects on traffic movements around Totton, will be given proper consideration. These points are not relevant at this stage.

Members were advised that, in addition to the responses to public consultation set out in Section 4 of Report A, both Marchwood Parish Council and Totton and Eling Town Council had expressed views. Marchwood Parish Council supported the principle of providing a "holding pen" for freight traffic; but objected to works which would allow the length of trains to be increased to 500 metres, and the consequent effect such trains would have on traffic movements in the area. Totton and Eling Town Council objected on the grounds of increased rail usage, which would disrupt north to south traffic movements in the Town; and also because of the consequent environmental impact that this would have. Members were advised that some of these points were outside the scope of the present exercise and would be more relevant to the consideration of the actual order once it was received.

In answer to questions, members were advised that it was likely that Associated British Ports would apply to the Secretary of State for any necessary planning consents for this work, rather than to this Council. This is because the works would form part of a much larger package, including the Harbour Revision Order, which must be determined by the Secretary of State. This Council will be consulted and would have the opportunity to express its views at that stage.

Members were concerned that the Solicitors acting for Associated British Ports had sent a supporting letter which gave statistical information on the likely number of additional train movements, but without any substantiating evidence. This had created confusion and concern. It was important that any statistical information that they released was at the correct stage of the process, and was fully justified in order to avoid creating unnecessary confusion. It was agreed that a covering letter would be sent to the Solicitors on this issue.

**Cllr Mrs P A Wyeth  
CHAIRMAN**

(ctteemtg/cttee/pc310500)pcreport

## CHARGES FOR CERTAIN SMALL BUILDINGS, EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS

Type of Work  (1)	Amount of Plan Charge  (2) £	Amount of Inspection Charge  (3) £	Amount of Building Notice Charge or Reversion Charge  (4) £	Amount of Regularisation Charges  (5) £
1. Erection or extension of a detached or attached building which consists of a garage or carport or both having a floor area not exceeding 40m <sup>2</sup> in total and intended to be used in common with an existing building, and which is not an exempt building.	35	68	103	123.60
2. Erection or extension of a detached or attached building which consists of a garage or carport or both having a floor area exceeding 40m <sup>2</sup> but does not exceed 60m <sup>2</sup> in total and intended to be used in common with an existing building, and which is not an exempt building.	70	136	206	247.20
3. Any extension of a dwelling the total floor area of which does not exceed 10m <sup>2</sup> , including means of access and work in connection with that extension.	206	-	206	247.20
4. Any extension of a dwelling the total floor area of which exceeds 10m <sup>2</sup> , but does not exceed 40m <sup>2</sup> , including means of access and work in connection with that extension.	77	232	309	370.80
5. Any extension of a dwelling the total floor area of which exceeds 40m <sup>2</sup> , but does not exceed 60m <sup>2</sup> , including means of access and work in connection with that extension.	103	309	412	494.40

Charges for applications relating to - applicable cavity wall insulation, applicable unvented hot water systems, any extension or alteration of a dwelling consisting of the provision of one or more rooms in a roof space, including means of access - Refer to Table C.

TABLE 2

**CHARGES FOR SMALL DOMESTIC BUILDINGS (DWELLINGS)**

Number of Dwellings	Plan Charge		Inspection Charge	
	Basic Charge	Additional charge for each dwelling above the minimum number in the band in column (1)	Basic Charge	Additional charge for each dwelling above the minimum number in the band in column (1)
	£	£	£	£
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1	140	-	160	-
2	205	-	300	-
3	270	-	435	-
4	335	-	575	-
5	405	-	710	-
6	475	-	785	-
7	495	-	945	-
8	515	-	1105	-
9	535	-	1265	-
10	540	-	1440	-
11	545	-	1580	-
12	550	-	1720	-
13	555	-	1860	-
14	560	-	2000	-
15	565	-	2140	-
16	570	-	2280	-
17	575	-	2420	-
18	580	-	2560	-
19	585	-	2700	-
20	590	-	2840	-
21 to 30	600	10	2940	100
31 and over	700	5	3940	75

TABLE 3

**CALCULATIONS OF CHARGES FOR ALL OTHER BUILDING WORK**

Where the estimated cost is £1,000 or less the sum of .....	£50.00
Where the estimated cost exceeds £1,000 but does not exceed £2,000 the sum of .....	£100.00
Where the estimated cost exceeds £2,000, but does not exceed £5,000 the sum of .....	£165.00
(a) Where the estimated cost exceeds £5,000, but does not exceed £20,000 the sum of .....	£165.00
together with	
(b) For every £1,000 (or part thereof) by which the cost exceeds £5,000 the sum of .....	£9.00
(a) Where the estimated cost exceeds £20,000, but does not exceed £100,000 the sum of .....	£300.00
together with	
(b) For every £1,000 (or part thereof) by which the cost exceeds £20,000 the sum of .....	£8.00
(a) Where the estimated cost exceeds £100,000, but does not exceed £1,000,000 the sum of .....	£940.00
together with	
(b) For every £1,000 (or part thereof) by which the cost exceeds £100,000 the sum of .....	£3.50
(a) Where the estimated cost exceeds £1,000,000, but does not exceed £10,000,000 the sum of .....	£4,090.00
together with	
(b) For every £1,000 (or part thereof) by which the cost exceeds £1,000,000 the sum of .....	£2.75
(a) Where the estimated cost exceeds £10,000,000 the sum of .....	£28,840.00
together with	
(b) For every £1,000 (or part thereof) by which the cost exceeds £10,000,00 the sum of .....	£2.00

NOTE: The following minimum charges apply:

Where an extension to a dwelling, the total floor area of which exceeds 60m<sup>2</sup>, (3) including means of access and work in connection with that extension the sum of the plan charge and the inspection charge of the building notice charge must not be less than £412.

## Reductions

Where one application is in respect of two or more buildings or building works all of which are substantially the same as each other a 30% reduction in the plan charge will be made for all work detailed in Tables 1 and 3.

Where in accordance with Regulation 8b of the Building (Local Authority Charges) Regulations 1998 an application in respect of building work which is substantially the same as building works in respect of which plans have previously been approved by the same local authority, and where that local authority are satisfied that the owner of the plans who deposits them is the same person who originally deposited the plans, a 30% reduction in the plan charge will be made.

In relation to work which Table 1 applies the reduction shall be calculated as a percentage of the average plan charge of each individual extension and in relation to Table 3 the reduction shall be calculated as a percentage of the plan charge of those buildings or building works which are substantially the same as each other.