

<p>What are your views on the proposed changes to the validation checklist?</p> <p>Do you have any other comments on the validation checklist such as things that should be added or changed?</p>	<p>Council's Response</p>
<p>Views:</p> <p>I haven't compared the proposed validation checklist to the previous one. However, I having read through the proposed document I thought it was very clear.</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <p>Perhaps there should be a note somewhere that explains that the bracketed instructions on the 'Required Item' list clarify the circumstances under which the item may or may not be required for that specific application type.</p> <p>What is the policy for sites which are along a single road without any nearby additional roads? Would these circumstances remove the requirement for at least two named roads? In my experience, those validating planning applications tend to take a fairly sensible approach in such circumstances, but the uninitiated may believe they need to purchase a very large Ordnance Survey extract at substantial cost - yes, via the planning portal the site and its location can be clearly located and red lined, but someone submitting their first planning application wouldn't necessarily know that.</p>	<p>We agree that clarity is important, and we will consider adding a note or making it clearer that the bracketed text sets out the circumstances in which each requirement is or is not required.</p> <p>With regard to location plans, the requirement for two named roads reflects national standards and is intended to ensure that sites can be clearly identified. However, where a site is located on a single road with no nearby intersecting streets, the Council already takes a proportionate and practical approach. In such cases, a standard-sized location plan showing the site in context with significant area names or landmarks may be sufficient.</p> <p>We recognise that some applicants will be residents submitting a planning application for the first time. While planning applications inevitably involve a degree of technical detail, we will review the wording to ensure it is as clear and accessible as possible. The checklist will continue to provide straightforward guidance for residents, while also containing the level of detail needed for those preparing larger or more complex applications.</p>
<p>Views:</p> <p>Says a lot but unfortunately leads to interpretation of what is, or is not, necessary as logic, common sense, and the ability to read a drawing seems to have been lost. Instead, a catch all scenario of more and more avenues of request seems to appear.</p>	<p>The checklist has been updated to ensure clarity, consistency, and compliance with both national requirements and the Council's adopted local planning policies. Accurate and complete information at validation is essential to allow officers to assess proposals against these policies from the outset and to avoid delays later in the process.</p> <p>Many of the items referenced in your response—such as the need for CIL forms or accurate existing plans—are statutory or widely used</p>

EXAMPLE what is the point of demanding CIL forms for small domestic extensions where the area of extension is blatantly less than 100 sq.m merely to sign off exempt.

EXAMPLE likewise having to go back to site to fully survey the FF to create a drawing for validation where the existing garden is already 170 sq.m for the obscure reason that it is to check the amenity area is satisfactory for a 30 sq.m single storey rear extension, clearly a pointless exercise wasting time in every respect, fuel, etc.

EXAMPLE having to spend time editing drawings to remove Building Regulation specification from drawings which are normally submitted at the same time, will try to remember to do separate Planning only drawings for Castlepoint the only Council I know who have such a request.

Whilst some might think more and more intricacies, are a good idea it is a dangerous path which eventually grinds everything to a halt. As proven some authorities have ramped up statistics of 95% invalid applications such as Waltham Forest, where there is a chronic state of affairs creating back logs of emails let alone nearly 2 months for registration due to the ability not to understand their own forms, let alone the capability of reading a drawing by new staff who are absolutely clueless, non-contactable, and don't respond to emails, utterly crashed and broken.

I did have words at Chelmsford outlining the monster being created, they did listen but still hitting upto 33% invalid applications, there always seems to be something that can be conjured up when a list of validation requirements now 33 pages long applies.

Gone are the days of 99% validated, enter a new age of 95% invalid applications, creating truly broken Planning Services.

requirements and are not unique to this authority. Similarly, with regard to application descriptions, the Council already follows the standard practice of making minor amendments where necessary to ensure accuracy and notify applicants accordingly.

We recognise the importance of proportionate and transparent validation requirements. The intention of the revised checklist is to reduce repeated requests for information, support timely decision-making, and ensure that applications can be assessed in accordance with local and national policy.

<p>EXAMPLE rewording titles of application, unless factually wrong, no one is going to fuss over the wording, different authorities have worked out how to be pro-active :-</p> <p>Such as Southend Council quote on their acknowledgement letter :- “Please note that there may have been some minor changes to the description of development to more accurately reflect the nature of the proposal. If you have any concerns regarding this, please contact us immediately otherwise the application will be publicised with the above description.”</p> <p>Or Chelmsford City Council an even simpler quote on their acknowledgement letter :- “Please check the description and let us know immediately if you feel it does not accurately describe your proposal”.</p> <p>A new attitude of getting things done rather than a negative attitude of halting progress might help. Be careful of what you wish for as a monster could be created as per Waltham Forest which would be miserable for all.</p> <p>Simplification should be the aim as per the original Planning Portal preaching consistency across the England, clearly that vision has truly been put out by continuous straying of most Local Authorities back to local idiosyncrasies.</p> <p>Hope this helps, thank you.</p> <p>Other comments:</p> <p>As above</p>	
<p>Views:</p> <p>Request for additional documentation and reports to be submitted for minor and major applications, as well as suggestion to provide further</p>	<p>While we recognise that some submissions will require specialist input, the checklist is not intended to provide detailed technical guidance on those documents. Instead, it focuses on identifying <i>when</i> certain information is required, rather than prescribing the level of professional detail that may be needed in individual cases.</p>

details of what the documents are, why they are required, links to find additional information, and when they are required.

Where the Council does not currently have supporting local policy or adopted standards, we do not consider it appropriate to include some of the suggested documents as validation requirements. Where such information becomes necessary, it can be sought during the assessment stage or secured by condition where appropriate.

We will continue to ensure that the checklist remains proportionate, policy-based and aligned with national requirements, while still enabling applicants/agents to understand clearly what is required at the point of validation.