



Report of: Corporate Director of Housing, Transformation and Resources

Contact for further information: Steve Faulkner (Extn. 5165)
(E-mail: steven.faulkner@westlancs.gov.uk)

SUBJECT: Increasing planning fees and performance: technical consultation

Wards affected: Borough wide

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1.1 To seek members agreement to proposed responses on the above consultations.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS TO PLANNING COMMITTEE

2.1 That Planning Committee endorse the attached report and comments as the Council's observations on the above consultation in advance of their sending to the Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) on or before 25 April 2023.

3.0 BACKGROUND

3.1 This consultation seeks views on proposals to increase planning fees and to improve the performance of local planning authorities. A full link to the consultation document is attached below.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/increasing-planning-fees-and-performance-technical-consultation/technical-consultation-stronger-performance-of-local-planning-authorities-supported-through-an-increase-in-planning-fees>

3.2 The consultation proposes a number of changes, as follows:

- increase planning fees by 35% for major applications and 25% for all other applications
- additional fees for bespoke or 'fast track' services
- make an annual inflation-related adjustment to planning fees
- ring-fence additional fees income

- double fees for retrospective applications
 - remove the 'free-go' for repeat applications
 - introduce a prior approval fee for the permitted development right allowing the Crown to develop sites within the perimeter of a closed defence site
 - build planning capacity and capability within local authorities, including challenges in recruitment and retention, and how these can be addressed
 - reduce the Planning Guarantee from 26 weeks to 16 weeks for non-major applications
 - improve the quality of the local authority planning service by monitoring more performance measures.
- 3.3 The consultation would include an annual adjustment of planning application fees in line with inflation, with an initial increase of between 25% and 35% being earmarked as early as this Summer in England. Extra funds raised by the fee would be ring-fenced for local planning authorities to provide a more effective service through additional financing and resources.
- 3.4 By way of example, with a proposed 25% increase, householder planning application fees would rise by £52, from £206 to £258 while prior approval applications would rise from £96 to £120. Non-major applications, which are charged per dwelling or per 75 square metres of non-residential floorspace, would rise from £462 to £578.
- 3.5 As a result of the 35% increase in major planning application fees, major applications for between ten and 50 dwellings or between 1,000 and 3,750 square metres of commercial non-residential floorspace will rise from £462 to £624 per dwelling or per 75 square metres.
- 3.6 Major applications for over 50 dwellings or more than 3,750 square metres of floorspace would be charged at a rate of £30,860 plus £186 for each additional dwelling in excess of 50 dwellings or additional 75 square metres in excess of 3,750 square metres up to a maximum of £405,000. Applicants are currently charged £22,859 plus £138 for each additional dwelling in excess of 50 dwellings or additional 75 square metres in excess of 3,750 square metres up to a maximum of £300,000. The current proposals offer a considerable uplift in the maximum fees for major applications.
- 3.7 There has been no increase in planning fees since January 2018, and the Government has announced that to keep up with inflation, planning application fees will be adjusted annually moving forward. The proposed changes would apply to all applicants, notwithstanding those able to claim fee exemptions. The Government estimate that the proposed increase will represent on average, less than 1% of overall development costs incurred by applicants.

Capacity and Capability

- 3.8 The current funding shortfall for the planning application service nationwide is estimated to be in the region of £225 million annually (approximately 33%). The changes are expected to help with this funding shortfall and create greater financial sustainability for all local planning authorities, whilst also looking to local

planning authorities to become more efficient, while lower the costs of delivering the planning application service.

- 3.9 In relation to the performance of the planning applications service, the consultation stresses a need to ensure that all applicants experience a high-quality and timely service. The consultation proposes a new approach to how the performance of local planning authorities is measured across a broader set of quantitative and qualitative measures. This includes the measurement of performance in respect of the validation of planning applications, and enforcement performance. It also introduces a measure of performance based on those applications which are allowed on appeal following an overturn of the planning officer recommendation.
- 3.10 The consultation highlights that whilst extension of time agreements are useful, they should be used in exceptional circumstances to allow additional time for unforeseen issues to be resolved to the benefit of all parties. Currently, extension of time agreements do not count against a local planning authority's performance figure for speed of decision-making and therefore can mask instances where local planning authorities are not determining applications within the required statutory periods.
- 3.11 Although not specifically mentioned in relation to extension of time agreements, the Government also proposes the introduction of a wider range of metrics to encourage improvements in service quality, which in doing so, will allow the Government to identify authorities that are most in need of additional targeted support.
- 3.12 The specific metrics have not yet been outlined within the consultation, however it is proposed that a broadened planning performance framework would continue to focus on development management activity only and would exist alongside other performance monitoring regimes, for example in relation to local plan progress.

Potential Introduction of 'Fast Track' Applications

- 3.13 In addition to statutory planning application fees, local planning authorities can charge for bespoke or additional services above the level or standard that the local planning authority has a duty to provide, provided that these charges do not exceed the cost of providing the service. These services can include pre-application advice, Planning Performance Agreements (as currently exist), and the consultation identifies the prospect of premium or 'fast track' planning application services. More broadly, the consultation looks to expand options available to local planning authorities including allowing extra flexibility to bespoke services where these services would provide a more expedited service.
- 3.14 No specific changes are proposed within the consultation however the Government are seeking to understand what experiences stakeholders have had regarding bespoke or 'fast track' services for which an additional fee is or could be charged and how this has assisted in supporting faster decision-making. They also welcome any other suggestions on how local planning authorities could deliver a more efficient planning application service for an additional fee.

Tightening the Planning Guarantee

- 3.15 The Planning Guarantee allows for an applicant to secure a refund of the planning fee where a planning decision has not been made within 26 weeks of submitting a valid application if an extension of time has not been agreed with an applicant. The consultation proposes that where the statutory determination period is 8 weeks the Planning Guarantee should be set at 16 weeks and where the statutory determination period is 13 weeks (or 16 weeks for Environmental Impact Assessment developments) the Planning Guarantee should be retained at 26 weeks.

Prior Approval Fee for Permitted Development Rights Afforded to the Crown by a Closed Defence Site

- 3.16 A further proposal seeks to introduce a prior approval fee for the permitted development right allowing development by the Crown on a closed defence site. For context, in December 2021 the Government introduced a new permitted development right allowing development by the Crown on a closed defence site under Class TA of Part 19 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended. The right allows the Ministry of Defence to both extend and alter existing buildings and erect new buildings within the perimeter of a site, subject to certain limitations and conditions. Though noted, it is not considered that this brings any substantive implications for the borough.

4. CONSULTATION QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

- 4.1 Taking the above into account, the proposed response of the Corporate Director of Housing and Transformation is set out in the answers to targeted questions below.

Question 1. Do you agree that fees for planning applications should be increased by 35% for major applications?

The principle of increasing planning fees for major planning applications is agreed and the ability to ringfence those increases is welcomed. This is an overdue measure and is likely to assist local planning authorities in resourcing their overall service.

However, it is important to note that this increase will not overcome the difficulties experienced by local planning authorities in securing timely consultee responses, which are critical to the quality of decision making, and the increase cannot therefore be guaranteed to speed up decision making as an isolated measure.

It is also felt that the increase for major applications will not manifestly affect those engaged in large scale applications, as even based on a 35% increase, the planning application fee is a fractional percentage of the development's overall Gross Development Value (GDV). It is therefore suggested that for large-scale major development of, say, 10,000 square metres, or on developments of 150 dwellings or more, that a 50% increase would be appropriate. The Council's views

on this increase should be considered in conjunction with the response to Question 2 below.

Question 2. Do you agree that the fee for householder planning applications should be increased by 25%?

The principle of increasing planning fees for householder planning applications is agreed and is an appropriate measure geared towards ensuring that the users of a planning service are bearing the costs as opposed to the general taxpayer and as per Q1 above, reflects a very small percentage of the resulting increased value to extended properties. However, the work can vary on a 'per application' basis to the point where the fee received for a planning application does not go anywhere near to covering the costs of administration, publicity, assessment, post-submission requests for amendment and the possible need to re-notify neighbouring properties.

The 25% increase proposed is likely to offer some assistance in covering existing gaps in the speed and quality of service but there should be a specific measure allowing local planning authorities to request further fees in the event that further requests are made following the original submission, as a positive step toward ensuring that all costs are covered. This would encourage applicants to use pre-application services to get their formal submission right at the first time of asking and allow local planning authorities to determine applications on the basis of what has been submitted.

Question 3. Do you agree that fees for all other planning applications should be increased by 25%?

Yes, but with the same caveats expressed in the answer to Question 2 above.

Question 4. Are there any other application types or planning services which are not currently charged for but should require a fee or for which the current fee level or structure is inadequate?

At present, listed building consent applications and works to trees covered by tree preservation orders do not attract a fee. Both are specialist areas of planning and take up a considerable amount of specialist officer time.

The fee level and structure for discharge of condition applications is wholly inadequate and requires significant review. Developers will often ask for multiple conditions to be addressed via 1 fee, and it is considered that the fee should be based around a "per condition" charge, with the local planning authority afforded an express legislative ability to issue a split decision on such applications. Additionally, an increased base fee for such applications may dissuade requests for such conditions during the planning process and incentivise the required information being provided either at validation stage or prior to the planning application being determined.

Question 5. Please can you provide examples of bespoke or 'fast track' services which have worked well or you think could be introduced for an additional fee? Are there any schemes that have been particularly effective?

West Lancashire Borough Council has not introduced 'fast track' services to date as this potentially introduces a two-tier system where customers receive differing levels of service and has not at the time of writing sought views from service users as to the possible benefits. It is questionable as to whether there would be a wider take up of 'fast track' services when they cannot offer the end user meaningful guarantees over the actual outcome.

Question 6. Do you agree with the proposal for all planning fees to be adjusted annually in line with inflation?

West Lancashire Borough Council supports proposals to adjust planning fees in line with inflation. Linking fees to inflation will assist in setting the Development Management Service budget on an annual basis and reduce the gap between income received and the cost of delivering the service. Consideration could also be given to increasing fees based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) to reflect the realities of current household budgets.

Question 7. Do you consider that the additional income arising from the proposed fee increase should be ringfenced for spending within the local authority planning department?

As set out in Question 1, the Council considers it would be appropriate to ringfence the additional income arising from the proposed fee increase for spending within the Authority's planning department to support the capacity and capability of the Service.

Question 8. Do you agree that the fee for retrospective applications should be doubled, i.e., increased by 100%, for all applications except for householder applications?

West Lancashire Borough Council supports the proposal in principle, but there are various issues over whether an increased application fee will serve as a deterrent to stop people from undertaking development without first obtaining planning permission.

It can take considerable time and resource for to obtain retrospective applications with the current fee levels so increasing the fee could make obtaining retrospective applications more difficult. It is not always clear as to whether a development is 'retrospective' – often the issue of whether development has commenced can be disputed, and works could potentially commence following receipt of an application but prior to the decision itself being made. The measure also potentially penalises those who inadvertently and innocently proceed with development whilst placing them on the same footing as those who wilfully and recklessly seek to abuse the process.

It would be preferable for any such doubling of the fee to be accompanied by consideration of a more wide-ranging review of planning enforcement processes to enable local planning authorities to act swiftly and raise the profile of the planning process to encourage people to understand the possible repercussions of undertaking development without the necessary permissions being in place.

Question 9. Do you consider that the ability for a ‘free-go’ for repeat applications should be either: (a) removed (b) reduced for re-applications within 12 months (c) retained (d) none of the above (e) don’t know

A free re-submission can give rise to extensive amounts of work, notably when considering major applications. This impacts significantly on time and resource and to that end, the principle of removing a free go is supported.

Notwithstanding this, it is considered unreasonable that an applicant who is genuinely trying to resolve an issue with their original scheme is dissuaded from doing so by being asked to pay the whole fee in its entirety. As such it is considered that the Government should take the opportunity to simplify the process by saying that any application of the same character and description on the same site by the same applicant should attract a fee in the region of 80% of that otherwise applicable for major developments and 60% of that otherwise applicable for householder developments.

The possible issue with removing the free go altogether is that it may inadvertently result in an increased number of appeals, for which there is no fee and additional resource spent by the local planning authority. It is therefore considered that this issue could be moderated by requiring those wishing to appeal to pay that same reduced fee to the local planning authority, which would then contribute to the costs of the resulting appeal. In the event that the Council has behaved unreasonably in its decision making process, it would then be open to the Inspector to direct the authority to refund that fee.

In the event of a re-submission being accepted, the applicant would forfeit their right to appeal the first refusal and would not be charged a further fee should they appeal the second one (with no fee applicable in the event of non-determination). Such steps will encourage negotiation and promote a problem-solving approach between all parties and ensure the appeals process is seen as a last resort.

Question 10. Do you agree that a fee of £96 (or £120 if the proposed fee increase comes forward) should be charged for any prior approval application for development by the Crown on a closed defence site?

Yes.

Question 11. What do you consider to be the greatest skills and expertise gaps within local planning authorities?

In recent years, local planning authorities have either foregone landscape and urban design officers, and some have reduced their investment in heritage/conservation advice to a minimum. There is also a heavy reliance on external advice in matters of viability and retail assessment. Some of this is reflective of the need arising 'as and when'.

Question 12. In addition to increasing planning fees, in what other ways could the Government support greater capacity and capability within local planning departments and pathways into the profession?

The planning process is seen as unattractive to many and the activities of the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI), whilst worthy, have not appeared to make a wider impact on this perception. Possible candidates for the planning profession are put off by the idea of making more money in other seemingly less demanding professions, and more could be done to shift wider media perceptions that the planning system appears slow, bureaucratic and ineffective. It is important that the skills and knowledge of those passionate about planning are afforded a system that allows them to act as quick and decisively as those who are demanding prompt outcomes.

It would also be of benefit to open up funding opportunities for local planning authorities to forge linkages with colleges and universities to unearth graduate planner positions and career grade opportunities that would allow them to develop and grow younger professionals through their organisation affording continuity and a retention of local knowledge that serves as a bedrock for sound decision making.

Question 13. How do you suggest we encourage people from under-represented groups, including women and ethnic minority groups, to become planning professionals?

West Lancashire Borough Council has been very successful recently in securing employees from these groups in its planning service. The most recent recruitment process proved attractive to candidates as it offered genuine opportunities for flexible working. The best way of encouraging those who are under-represented is to encourage a wider advertising of planning roles, across those areas beyond the traditional 'planning' pages, which not only raises the profile's profession but enables a wider range of candidates to consider planning as a viable, rewarding career choice.

Question 14. Do you agree that the Planning Guarantee should better mirror the statutory determination period for a planning application and be set at 16 weeks for non-major applications and retained at 26 weeks for major applications?

West Lancashire Borough Council is supportive of this proposal on the proviso that it may still request extensions of time in the event of the statutory determination period not being met.

Question 15. Do you agree that the performance of local planning authorities for speed of decision-making should be assessed on the percentage of applications that are determined within the statutory determination period i.e. excluding extension of times and Planning Performance Agreements?

West Lancashire Borough Council is concerned that this could reduce collective incentives to negotiate positive solutions rather than issuing an instant refusal. The number of issues which Local Planning Authorities must consider when deciding planning applications has increased substantially over the years.

The determination of planning applications requires specialist input and on major applications it is necessary to seek the views of statutory consultees. There can be delays in receiving comments from statutory consultees and a need to engage

with them more than once throughout the determination of an application. The speed at which responses are provided by statutory consultees is not within the control of local authorities.

Notwithstanding all the changes that have occurred, the statutory determination periods allowed for deciding many planning applications have remained unchanged for decades. Though some applicants do seek pre-application advice in advance of submitting planning applications, there is often dissatisfaction with the advice but equally as many cases where applicants are not willing to address pre-application comments and this often undermines the collective aim to reduce the time taken to decide the planning application when it is submitted.

Often, no pre-application advice is sought, and this can result in it proving almost impossible to secure a determination within statutory periods. This becomes even more so in circumstances where legal agreements need to be entered into.

Rather than working with applicants to make schemes acceptable (extending determination periods by agreement when necessary) local authorities may be forced to refuse planning applications to meet performance targets. This in turn will result in more planning appeals, further delays to development and increased costs to both Councils and developers.

The current planning system allows applicants to lodge a non-determination appeal if a decision is not made within the statutory determination period. This is the appropriate means of addressing slow performance if they consider a local authority is not dealing with their application quickly enough and in the event of such an appeal being allowed, it should then be open to the applicant to have their original planning fee refunded at that point.

Further consideration should be given to whether 8 weeks remains a realistic timeframe for local planning authorities to determine planning applications based on current resources. The timeframe was in place long before more recent additional responsibilities were introduced and was arbitrary even at that stage. More recent pressures include the need to ensure planning websites are maintained, the need to manage significantly greater public scrutiny of the planning process, and increased responsibilities on local planning authorities to have due regard to the impact upon habitat sites from amongst other things recreational disturbance and nitrates. The forthcoming introduction of mandatory Bio-Diversity Net Gain (BNG) is not going to speed up decision making as determining authorities and developers come to terms with the impending requirements.

The current the definition of "major" and "non-major" applications is too binary and does not reflect the fact that some non-major applications can give rise to considerably further work than other major cases. Equally, the time required to deal with, say, large industrial buildings on defined sites in designated areas is inevitably likely to differ from what is required to deal with larger and more complex housing sites and as such consideration should be given to extending timescales for each.

Question 16. Do you agree that performance should be assessed separately for (a) Major applications (b) non-Major applications (excluding householder applications) (c) Householder applications (d) Discharge of conditions (e) County matters applications?

West Lancashire Borough Council is supportive of the proposals for performance being measured separately for the above areas. This fairly reflects that different local planning authorities have a varied profile and range of submissions depending on their character and make up.

Question 17. Do you consider that any of the proposed quantitative metrics should not be included?

West Lancashire Borough Council is concerned over the use of average times per application as it can only take one or two applications of significant length to skew the figure unreasonably. For these reasons, it is suggested that a fairer measure would be to take the median figure, which would more accurately reflect a Council's general performance.

Equally, whilst extensions of time are routinely used to ensure that planning applications are approved and dealt with at the first time of asking, it is important that the measures are not seen as a barrier to discussions that may promote a positive solution. What may be recorded as good performance does not always reflect the realities of the customer experience, as greater all round value can be achieved through negotiation and an approval taking 9 weeks serves all parties better than a refusal taking 7 weeks. This measuring may reward a less positive and proactive approach by the local planning authority owing to their fear of sanction and possible return of fee income.

It should also be noted that whilst measures for addressing planning enforcement are noted, the measures are not especially consistent with the Framework's suggested approach, which promotes the publishing of a local enforcement plan to manage enforcement proactively. West Lancashire Borough Council will be adopting its own Local Enforcement Policy as of 1 May 2023, and the performance measures suggested risk local planning authorities reducing their emphasis on proactive enforcement at the expense of "shutting down" the case as quickly as possible.

It is also important if such enforcement measurement is brought forward that it is clear what is meant by a live case. In the strictest sense a case remains live even after the appropriate notice is served and an appeal lodged – this can disadvantage an authority that has in reality acted quickly. There are often cases where a local planning authority is being forced to manage difficult situations whilst a case awaits its appeal outcome. Effective planning enforcement is also highly dependent on other government functions and their ability to promptly respond, and complainant evidence, and there will be many situations where the ability to close a case is beyond the direct control of the local planning authority.

It would appear more sensible for the measuring of enforcement to be covered through stronger focus on local enforcement plans as set out by the Framework to

allow authorities to tailor their activities based on their local environment, and for these to be subject to appropriate consultation and periodic review.

Question 18. Are there any quantitative metrics that have not been included that should be?

The measurement of local planning authority performance has to be balanced against the often poor quality of submitted applications. Whilst many developers cite a slow and unresponsive process all too many appear not to be looking at validation checklists and properly understanding what is required on a case by case basis. Applicants will ask for significant issues of detail to be covered by condition to secure a decision notice and the latter application for planning conditions becomes prone to later complaint over the time taken to resolve, often resulting from inadequate or ill thought out submissions.

The whole review centres on measurement of planning by numbers. This does not reflect the wider aspirations of the revised Framework which are placing the greater emphasis on quality. It will be extremely difficult to reconcile both should the various changes be introduced.

Question 19. Do you support the introduction of a qualitative metric that measures customer experience?

A strong customer experience is unimportant. West Lancashire Borough Council adopts a very proactive approach to dealing with its customers and is continually developing strategies with a view to engage service users further. The approach to customer interaction would appear to be far better left to local Councils, with those not satisfied with the service they receive have existing means of redress, whether by appeal, corporate complaint procedures or the Local Government Ombudsman.

Question 20. What do you consider would be the best metric(s) for measuring customer experience?

This depends hugely on what we mean by "the customer". The experience of West Lancashire Borough Council is that applicants and agents expect positive outcomes, in no time, but with relative ease of access to officers. This can make it difficult to manage expectations. It is not impossible to undertake customer surveys to assess whether applicants and agents were satisfied with the service, but again it is unclear what the outcome and sanction will be when the aims and objectives of the planning process should be to secure the right development in the right place in a timely manner.

Regarding the wider public interest, authorities could be measured in respect of how easily its website allows access to information, including all relevant plans and documents, and the ease with which the public can interact. Authorities can also introduce customer engagement charters which set out how we will respond to the public when they engage with planning processes.

Question 21. Are there any other ways in which the performance of local planning authorities or level of community engagement could be improved?

If metrics are to be introduced it is essential that clarity is afforded to how performance is being measured, allowing for it to be reported to the relevant local authority service area, with any required actions the authority needs to take identified and published. Those who perform well should be able to positively reflect on this in their outward communications with those same customers.

Question 22. Do you have any views on the implications of the proposals in this consultation for you, or the group or business you represent, and on anyone with a relevant protected characteristic? If so, please explain who, which groups, including those with protected characteristics, or which businesses may be impacted and how. Is there anything that could be done to mitigate any impact identified?

No

6.0 SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

6.1 It is important that the local environment is protected from the harmful effects of unauthorised development, as are the interests of residents, visitors and businesses. The Policy sets out the Council's aims for the enforcement of planning control in this context.

7.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no significant financial or resource implications arising from this report. All resources required to prepare and implement the Policy are covered by the Planning Service revenue budget.

8.0 RISK ASSESSMENT

8.1 A failure to set out clearly the Council's plan for the enforcement of planning controls could result in the loss of public confidence in the planning system. By adopting and publishing an Enforcement Plan it ensures that the Council's resources are prioritised to maximum effect.

9.0 HEALTH AND WELLBEING IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are no health and wellbeing implications arising from this report.

Background Documents

There are no background documents (as defined in Section 100D(5) of the Local Government Act 1972) to this Report.

Equality Impact Assessment

There is a direct impact on members of the public, employees, elected members and / or stakeholders, therefore an Equality Impact Assessment is required. A formal equality impact assessment is attached as an Appendix to this report, the results of which have been taken into account in the Recommendations contained within this report

Appendices

1. Equality Impact Assessment
2. Planning Services Enforcement Plan

Appendix 1

Equality Impact Assessment Form



Directorate: Planning and Regulatory Services		Service: Planning Services
Completed by: Steve Faulkner		Date: 06/04/23
Subject Title: PLANNING SERVICES ENFORCEMENT PLAN		
1. DESCRIPTION		
Is a policy or strategy being produced or revised:	No	
Is a service being designed, redesigned or cutback:	No	
Is a commissioning plan or contract specification being developed:	No	
Is a budget being set or funding allocated:	No	
Is a programme or project being planned:	No	
Are recommendations being presented to senior managers and/or Councillors:	Yes	
Does the activity contribute to meeting our duties under the Equality Act 2010 and Public Sector Equality Duty (Eliminating unlawful discrimination/harassment, advancing equality of opportunity, fostering good relations):	No	
Details of the matter under consideration:		
<p><i>If you answered Yes to any of the above go straight to Section 3</i> <i>If you answered No to all the above please complete Section 2</i></p>		
2. RELEVANCE		
Does the work being carried out impact on service users, staff or Councillors (stakeholders):	No	
If Yes , provide details of how this impacts on service users, staff or Councillors (stakeholders): <i>If you answered Yes go to Section 3</i>		
If you answered No to both Sections 1 and 2 provide details of why there is no impact on these three groups: <i>You do not need to complete the rest of this form.</i>		
3. EVIDENCE COLLECTION		
Who does the work being carried out impact on, i.e. who is/are the stakeholder(s)?	All residents, businesses and visitors.	
If the work being carried out relates to a universal service, who needs or uses it most? (Is there any particular group affected more than others)?	N/A	

Which of the protected characteristics are most relevant to the work being carried out?	
Age	No
Gender	No
Disability	No
Race and Culture	No
Sexual Orientation	No
Religion or Belief	No
Gender Reassignment	No
Marriage and Civil Partnership	No
Pregnancy and Maternity	No
4. DATA ANALYSIS	
In relation to the work being carried out, and the service/function in question, who is actually or currently using the service and why?	All relevant residents, businesses and planning agents.
What will the impact of the work being carried out be on usage/the stakeholders?	None
What are people's views about the services? Are some customers more satisfied than others, and if so what are the reasons? Can these be affected by the proposals?	The Planning Service is subject to routine public consultation in relation to services and future development. tee.
What sources of data including consultation results have you used to analyse the impact of the work being carried out on users/stakeholders with protected characteristics?	The Planning Service is subject to routine public consultation in relation to services and future development.
If any further data/consultation is needed and is to be gathered, please specify:	N/A
5. IMPACT OF DECISIONS	
In what way will the changes impact on people with particular protected characteristics (either positively or negatively or in terms of disproportionate impact)?	None.
6. CONSIDERING THE IMPACT	
If there is a negative impact what action can be taken to mitigate it? (If it is not possible or desirable to take actions to reduce the impact, explain why this is the case (e.g. legislative or financial drivers etc.).	N/A
What actions do you plan to take to address any other issues above?	No actions
7. MONITORING AND REVIEWING	
When will this assessment be reviewed and who will review it?	The Planning Service is subject to routine public consultation in relation to services and future development.

