

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
27	<u>Introduction and Apologies</u>			<p>Apologies received from: Cllr Dee Laws, Emma Nasta, Alex Patrick, Kirsty Paul, David Wyatt.</p> <p>Present: Lee Bevens (LB), Dino Biagioni (DB), James Burton (JB), Marcel Cooper (MC), Alan Davis (AD), Gareth Edwards (GE), Sarah Greenall (SG), Peter Harley (PH), Mark Jones (MJ), David Rowen (DR), Matt Leigh (ML), Rachel Mottram (RM), Nick Seaton (NS), Tim Slater (TS), George Stone (GS), Michael Temple (MT), Shubhankar Umran (SU), George Wilkinson (GW),</p>
28	<u>Review of Action Schedule</u>			The Action Schedule was confirmed.
29	<u>Local Plan Update</u>			Rachel Mottram (RM), the Planning Policy Officer provided the Forum with an update concerning the Local Plan.
30	<u>Performance</u>			<p>David Rowen presented the performance data.</p> <p>Planning Applications Year-end 2024/25 (2023/24)</p> <p>Major – 91% (92%) Minor – 85% (67%)</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>Other - 91% (86%)</p> <p>Against the Govt 24 Month Rolling performance Requirement</p> <p>Majors 92% (designation threshold 60%) Non-Major 81% (designation threshold 70%)</p>
31	<u>Staffing</u>			<p>Matt Leigh presented an updated with regards to staffing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principal DM Planning officer Alan Davies has started. • Gavin Taylor has moved into a Major applications role • New Senior DM officer to start Mid-May • Permanent Enforcement team Leader successfully recruited. • Tim Williams Contract has finished • Katie Smart (Ecology) has left • Landscape Support
32	<u>Negotiations during the lifetime of a planning applications</u>			<p>ML explained the principle of the document has been signed of by CMT and the Portfolio holder, this will have a document that comes with it and this document will be provided to everyone via an email before the 1 May 2025 as the document will come into place from the 1 May 2025.</p> <p>Category A – Scheme approved without</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>negotiation as it was acceptable as submitted.</p> <p>Category B - Scheme unacceptable as submitted. However, needs only minor amendments to make it acceptable. These changes are so minor that they would not require re-consultation and would not affect the Council's ability to determine the application within the statutory timeframe.</p> <p>Category C - Scheme unacceptable as submitted. However, needs only minor amendments or further information to meet the objections or concerns of a consultee. These changes would relate solely to the consultee objection and would not require re-consultation to any other party. An Extension of Time must be agreed with the Applicant and the Council to cover the relevant process must be agreed otherwise, the application will be determined as submitted.</p> <p>Category D - Scheme refused without negotiation as it was fundamentally unacceptable as submitted.</p>
33	<u>National Update on Planning</u>			<p>ML gave an update on the Planning and Infrastructure Bill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spatial Development Strategies • Streamlined Approvals for major Infrastructure Projects • Changes to Local Planning Committees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National scheme of delegation Mandatory training for all committee members • Reforming Environmental Regulations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature Restoration Fund

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>Environmental Outcome Reports</p> <p>MC asked if there is any information on what the parameters will be for deciding when something should not be delegated? ML responded predominantly outline majors, if the applicant and employee work for a designated member, this should be determined at officer level.</p> <p>GS asked, has there been any feedback from members on this and what is their general thoughts on delegated decision-making ML replied, a detailed report will be going out to members, he stated that he is conscious of the potential cost if it has to be bench marked against the current service if FDC carry on with the 80% delegation, this could translates into a cost for the residents for the future, Members are reluctant to give officers anymore delegation.</p>
34	<u>Developers Forum Going Forward</u>			<p>ML outlined the developer Forum going forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequency of meetings. • Format. • Content/Topics • Membership. <p>MC stated the format of the meeting and it being remote suited them as they are based 3 hours away, but with the content would like updates and thinks a newsletter would work. ML stated he was thinking about creating an email account for everyone to use to capture ideas and thoughts.</p>

No	Action Point	Allocation	Timeframe	Update
				<p>MC did comment he felt that as developers their thought were not always heard.</p> <p>SG stated that it would be good to meet in person at least once a year as it is good to put a face to a name and helps with the working relationship.</p>
35	<u>Any Other Business</u>			<p>CC asked what the technical position is on various apps as formally he had an understanding that there was not any point in submitting a viability assessment because it would have to be accessed by an appointed FDC expert which the applicant would pay for. ML the document that was used is out of date now. If a viability statement is submitted now this will be independently reviewed at the cost of the applicant. CC asked what the resources are like regarding BNG and Ecologist? ML responded the planning department have recently employed inhouse to make the process a bit quicker. CC asked what is the current situation on flood situations? ML responded the Council stance is that if you were in a flood zone they would need an FRA.</p> <p>GS asked in terms of the viability assessment, would the applicant hear anything back? ML confirmed they would receive feedback.</p> <p>SG asked to confirm what the cost was for the viability assessment ML responded this is an area which is still being developed</p>

Finish: 3.53 pm