

**RAMSEY TOWN COMMISSIONERS**

**[ PUBLIC ]**

A Special Board Meeting of the Ramsey Town Commissioners was held in Town Hall, Parliament Square, Ramsey, on Monday, 9<sup>th</sup> September, 2019, at 7.30 p.m.

**Present:** Mr. A. G. Cowie, Mesdames M. Quayle and J. Wedgwood, and Mr. L. Parker.

**Apologies:** Messrs. Rev. Canon N. D. Greenwood, J. McGuinness and F. B. R. Williams. *MR HANKIN*

Mr. Oldham has been granted Leave of Absence.

The Town Clerk, Deputy Town Clerk and Technical Services Manager were in attendance.

**(2019/20:129) Consultation Changes to the Planning System:**

It was noted that the attendance did not constitute a quorum.

The Chairman suggested, and Members agreed, that the meeting might discuss the consultation document and that he would submit a response in his personal capacity reflecting the views established.

The meeting discussed the Town Clerk's Report dated 6<sup>th</sup> September, 2019, and the recommendations therein, and agreed that the Chairman submit views along the following lines in response to the questions contained with the Consultation, copies of which had been circulated previously to members:-

**Question NPD1.**


**Do you think the above approach is broadly appropriate? Yes/No**

Other Comments:

*The Commission recognises the process is finalised by the obtaining of Tynwald approval, and that it is assumed this is by specific resolution and not merely by the Directive having been lid before.*

**Question NPD2. Would you suggest any changes? Yes/No**

**Question DPO1. Do you think there are any amendments to applications which should be allowed and would not be allowed for under the proposed order? Yes/No**



**Question DPO2. Do you think there are any amendments to applications which should not be allowed and would be allowed for under the proposed order? Yes/No**

Members noted that there is potential that the introduction of a more available mechanism to amend approvals without making a separate application might result in persons being disenfranchised where the amendment was considered to their detriment when they had no objection to the original application.

*Amendments should be to the physical appearance or layout only, and that alterations to conditions should not be permitted under this process and should continue to be processed as distinct applications.*

*Amendment should be brought to the attention of any designated interested party to the original application that would be entitled to submit comments prior to consideration. This provision would require any party to register their interest in an application whether the objected or supported it to ensure that they were then entitled to comment on amendments.*

**Question DPO3. Do you think an additional charge of £100 for hearings is fair and would encourage more appeals to be by written representations? Yes/No**

**Question DPO4. Do you think the proposed target timescales for large/complex applications are reasonable? Yes/No**

**Question DPO5. Do you agree that applicants should have the right to appeal against non-determination of applications? Yes/No**

**Question DPO6. Do you think the changes identified would allow for electronic submissions and processing and that this is desirable? Yes/No**

**Please provide reasons and any suggested changes:**

*The proposal will cease the provision of paper copies to local authorities. From a practical point of view this will mean that persons wishing to view application will have to do so online, or by visiting the office of the planning authority in Douglas.*

*It is evident from the online planning portal that large applications can involve a considerable number of plans and documents, often these can include numerous versions of the same plan. Removing the physical files may result in confusion and make reviewing plans more difficult.*

*If this proposal is proceeded with it is suggested that the planning authority introduce a clear naming convention for all documents available online so that enquirers may easily and confidently obtain relevant application information.*



*Whilst the inclusion of metric scale data is noted not all enquirers will have access to large format printing. It is suggested that a measured linear scale be included on all plans (as with maps) and that layout and elevation plans include external measurements.*

**Question DPO7. Do you think planning application validation requirements, as set out above are sufficient? Yes/No**

**Please provide reasons and suggested changes:**

*It is suggested that the requirements as set out be increase to include that elevation drawings must show the height relationship of the development with adjacent properties. This is suggested as it will then be easier for persons viewing applications electronically to establish/view the proposals in the context of the existing streetscape.*

**Question DPO8. Do you think the proposed requirements for site notices will make them sufficiently clear? Yes/No**

**Question DPO9. Do you have any other comments on the proposed order? Yes/No. Please provide details:**

*The Commission has previously raised with the Department the question of local authority interested party status for applications abutting on the authority boundary where they have a visual or environmental impact on the area within the authorities jurisdiction. The Commission should request that provision be made to extend interested party status to adjacent local authorities where an application in an adjacent areas outside the authority boundary can be seen to have a visual, environmental or other impact on that authority.*

It was noted that the Commission had previously resolved to raise the question of adjacent applications and that therefore the Town Clerk could raise this matter within formal response on behalf of the Commission to the consultation.

The meeting closed at 8:10 p.m. - giving a time of 1 hour for the payment of attendance allowances.



Chairman.