

## Appendix 2 – Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comment	Response
Environment Agency	No comments	NA
Planning Agent – Ben Edmondson	<p>I have read the attached and understand its content. I would question one item</p> <p>Those exempt:  <i>For example, those wishing to undertake development to adapt their existing residential property to meet the needs of disability or those needing to extend their existing residential property to meet their family needs particularly those from ethnic minorities as has been identified in the latest Rossendale Housing strategy will not be affected.</i></p> <p>Why is it that persons with disabilities or ethnic minorities are singled out rather than <b><u>ANY</u></b> families wanting to extend their homes to meet their family needs?</p> <p>I agree that to extend a property to adapt for a disability should be set apart however why should those of an ethnic minority be noted over families of none ethnic backgrounds?</p> <p>There are many families in Rossendale who are living in homes that require extending due to extended families whose dwellings are not large enough for their needs, and extending is their only option, many of these are not from ethnic backgrounds.</p> <p>I assume that there will be no charge for these type of people, as noted in the document? Why put this statement in?</p>	<p>Officers have sought clarification on the agent's comments which relate to section 5.5 of the report. His concern was that by identifying specific groups by example, other groups wishing to extend their existing property might infer they were not exempt.</p> <p>The expression "For example" was meant to be illustrative rather than providing an exhaustive list. However, the policy will make clear that all those looking to extend their residential properties are exempt from pre-application submission charging.</p>

## Appendix 2 – Consultation Responses

Organisation	Comment	Response
GBS Design Services	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>Thank you for your email with the information on the proposed scale of charges for pre-application advice.</p> <p>I feel that the proposed scale seems to be fair for householder extensions, as householder application for extensions will not be charged for pre-app advice, so that this will not prevent householders or their agents from seeking advice from Planning before applications are submitted.</p> <p>I would also like to see a similar exemption for single new dwellings, as these are often built by self-builders and it would be very beneficial if self-builders and their agents could consult with the planning team before an application is submitted. In these circumstances I suggest that the first consultation meeting should be free and any follow up meetings should have a modest charge applied such as £50.00 per hour.</p>	<p>The comments on householder extensions are noted.</p> <p>In relation to the suggestion the threshold for pre-app charging is increased from 1 dwelling to 2, officers and Policy, Overview and Scrutiny committee have given this comment due consideration. However, it is considered on balance that it is those who are proposing new individual properties who potentially would benefit most from detailed pre-app advice. The cost of £150 is also not considered significant as a proportion of the final overall cost of a scheme. Finally, it remains the case that most proposals for new individual properties relate to commercial ventures and it would prove extremely difficult to distinguish between a self-build venture and a commercial venture.</p>

NB – 123 consultees were consulted including developers, planning agents and other organisations