



Planning Peer Challenge

East Herts Council

12 – 14 November 2014

Report

1. Background and scope of the peer challenge

This report is a summary of the findings of a planning peer challenge organised by the Local Government Association (LGA) in cooperation with the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) and carried out by its trained peers. Peer challenges are managed and delivered by the sector for the sector. They are improvement oriented and are tailored to meet individual councils' needs. Indeed they are designed to complement and add value to a council's own performance and improvement focus.

The Council wanted the challenge team to focus on some detailed issues:

- Member and officer working
- Moving to a Development Management culture and being 'open for business'
- Localism and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- The Development Management Committee

These specific areas for examination are picked up under the themes and focus used for a planning peer challenge:

- Clarity and locally distinctive vision and leadership for the planning service
- Community leadership and engaging with the community
- Management and service delivery
- Partnership working both internally and externally
- Achieving outcomes.

Peers were:

- Simon Machen, Director of Growth and Regeneration, Peterborough City Council
- Alan Gomm, Local Development Framework Manager, Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council
- Councillor Neil Clarke, Leader, Rushcliffe Borough Council (Conservative member peer)
- Bob Kenyon Peer Challenge Manager, LGA Associate

The LGA and PAS make a significant investment in planning peer challenge delivery and are keen to ensure councils follow this up with an improvement programme. After the planning peer challenge report is finalised the following support is available to the council:

- A LGA and PAS Improvement Planning day structured to meet the council's requirements and involving members of the peer challenge team.
- A range of additional planning support – much of this at no cost – is available from PAS <http://www.pas.gov.uk/pas/core/page.do?pageId=1>
- Follow-up advice through Gary Hughes, Principal Adviser, LGA on further support that the planning service and the council might require.
- A range of other support from the LGA – some of this might be at no cost, some might be subsidised and some might be fully charged <http://www.local.gov.uk/>

The LGA may ask to meet with the council 6-12 months after the peer challenge to make an assessment of the peer challenge recommendations; how the council acted on these; and what beneficial impact came from this.

The team appreciated the welcome and hospitality provided by East Herts Council and the candour and openness in which discussions were held. The team would like to thank everybody that they met during the process for their time and contribution.

2. Executive summary and recommendations

The Council's Executive is clear about the vision for the District and provides strong leadership to promote this, particularly with external stakeholders. This vision recognises the need for the District to contribute to sub-regional growth whilst maintaining its own distinctive identity. However, not all councillors are on board with the vision and the lack of an adopted local plan means that Development Management Committee members and local people feel powerless to reject unwanted development.

Partners welcome the Council's clear commitment to working together to deal with the need for growth. But they are concerned that, with the upcoming political changes with elections in May and several key councillors standing down, there is a risk that the impetus will stall.

Partnership working is strong, particularly with neighbouring councils. The planning policy portfolio holder is seen as a proactive place shaper who is open to the Duty to Cooperate (Localism Act 2011) but not at the expense of the distinctiveness of the District. Neighbouring councils welcome his approach.

The Council employs some excellent staff. We found the majority of officers to be very customer focussed and with a "can do" attitude. The planning policy function is well resourced, the portfolio holder provides strong political leadership to the function and staff value this. Development management, by comparison, lacks a similar level of political or senior management commitment. Development management staff feel undervalued, have high workloads, and there is a significant risk to the service if more staff leave. Despite this, staff are delivering a good service with a good approach to customers and good speed of determining planning applications. This could be further improved by a significant overhaul of processes and procedures, many of which are outdated. Implementation of the new IT system provides the ideal opportunity to do this.

Management of the planning function is underdeveloped. We found outdated and inefficient processes and procedures that are recognised by staff but have not been challenged. We also found a lack of structured team meetings and briefings that contributed to inconsistent approaches and a lack of a corporate, joined up approach to overseeing the planning function.

The Council has a genuine desire to involve and engage its local community in important place shaping decisions, as well as individual local planning decisions. The consultation on its emerging Local Plan is comprehensive and thorough and 5 communities are working on their own neighbourhood plans. Strong local engagement will be important because difficult decisions will be needed to accommodate growth and not all communities will understand or accept the need for growth.

There is a widely held view, shared by the peer challenge team, that the Development Management Committee takes a parochial approach to decision making and has a default position of saying no to development. There are several significant opportunities to improve the effectiveness of the Committee that include: the way reports are presented; the scheme of delegation; organisational arrangements; and training.

The Council recognises the need to ensure that the local plan programme does not slip any further and is also considering how it will implement the community infrastructure levy (CIL). The Council is successful at maximising community benefits from developments, but more could be done to improve delivery of rural affordable housing.

The Council provides some useful training and information for its councillors but more is needed, particularly for members of the Development Management Committee. Town and parish councils would also welcome some training about planning matters. This could help to improve the contribution from town and parish councils to planning decisions.

To support the planning service at East Herts Council to improve further, the peer challenge team has made the following recommendations. These are:

- R1 Introduce better management and communication across the planning functions, and with other key stakeholders, such as highways, to ensure a joined up approach to planning services that reflects corporate priorities. Consider how senior managers can demonstrate more visibly their commitment to the functions.
- R2 Ensure effective engagement, with communities and key partners, on the development and spatial implementation of the Community Infrastructure Levy - to agree how infrastructure needs will be prioritised and how money will be spent.
- R3 Maximise investment in the rural housing enabler post, and work with the willingness of existing registered providers to deliver appropriate small scale affordable housing in rural areas, to deliver the housing that local communities want to meet their needs.
- R4 Carry out a review of development management processes, using LEAN or similar approach, with external facilitation from another council if appropriate, to ensure a strong focus on customers and the removal of duplication. Updated processes should be introduced alongside implementation of the new IT system.
- R5 Consider increasing pre-application charges, or redistributing existing income, to increase the capacity of partner organisations such as county highways, so they can provide dedicated, specialist advice - to input into planning policy and the determination of planning applications.
- R6 Review Development Management Committee to include:
 - Simpler, plain English written reports that include a one page summary of salient issues.
 - Case officers providing short presentations of applications to Committee.
 - Changing the layout of the Committee to provide clarity about which councillors are part of the Committee, which are ward members, and include job titles on staff name cards.
 - Review the scheme of delegation to avoid last minute call in of small scale or less complex applications.
 - Consider further mandatory training for all Development Management Committee members to include policy context and material planning considerations including the benefits of external input tailored to members specific needs
- R7 Consider providing planning training for town and parish councils - to improve their knowledge of the planning decision making process and the context that decisions have to be made in.

3. Detailed findings

3.1 Vision and Leadership

Strengths

East Herts Council has a cabinet model of governance and the Executive Committee is made up of councillors from the Conservative majority administration. The Chair of the Development Committee is a member of the Conservative group.

The Council's Executive Committee has a clear vision for East Herts. It wishes to maintain the identity and vitality of the 5 market towns in the District and conserve the heritage of the area. The vision includes developing high skill and high value small and medium enterprises.

The Executive also understands the key role that the District will need to play in the growth agenda for the wider region. The portfolio holder for planning policy provides very strong leadership. He recognises the need to maintain the integrity and identity of the District whilst accommodating some of the growth that will be necessary in the London Stansted Cambridge Corridor,. This is important because of the significant Government commitment to national growth. The Council will need to shape future development in the District to meet its own vision for the place rather than have the wishes of others imposed upon the area. Several external partners told us how highly they regard the portfolio holder because of his clear vision and the proactive role that he and the Council are taking in trying to shape the growth agenda.

The Council provides a range of training and information for councillors. We were told that this had been particularly effective in relation to some planning policy matters.

Member and officer working relationships are strong in relation to planning policy. We found excellent mutual trust and respect between the planning policy portfolio holder and planning policy officers. Officers felt that the portfolio holder understood the issues and challenges facing them. They recognised the support that he provided them including ensuring they have adequate resources to carry out their function.

Areas for consideration

Whilst the Executive has a clear vision for the District, the lack of a current adopted local plan means that this vision has not yet been formally endorsed by the Council. We asked a number of councillors from the Development Management Committee to tell us what the vision for the District is. We did not hear the same clear vision from this group of councillors. When the Local Plan is adopted, it will be vitally important that the Development Management Committee adhere to it when making planning decisions.

Partners strongly expressed their concerns about political succession planning. The Peer team agrees that this is a significant risk to the Council. The planning policy portfolio holder will not be standing at the next election in May and it is not yet clear who will take on this role following the elections. Partners are keen that the Council maintains its positive and proactive approach to the sub-regional planning agenda.

Whilst we found some good training opportunities for councillors, we were not clear whether basic planning training is mandatory for all Development Management Committee members. Many councils do not allow members to take planning decisions unless they have undergone mandatory planning training. We found that many Development

Management Committee members do not always attend training that is provided, partly because of the timing of it - directly before committee meetings. There is also a need to ensure that ward members receive training on planning policy and development management issues given the Council's position with its emerging Local Plan and lack of a 5 year housing land supply.

Working relationships between councillors on the Development Management Committee and officers are strained. The Council's lack of an adopted Local Plan means that officers are operating in a local policy vacuum to some extent. There are some saved policies but these do not make up for the lack of a comprehensive local planning framework. This means that officers (and the Council) must rely on the National Planning Policy Framework, which sets a very clear presumption in favour of sustainable development. The absence of a five year land supply and a local plan means that officers are sometimes unable to provide sound planning policy reasons for refusing what councillors see as opportunistic applications. Councillors and local people feel frustrated by this lack of power to decide locally where development will go. This results in the Committee members making unrealistic and inappropriate demands on officers to refuse applications when there are no material planning grounds to do so, and doing so in a public arena. Care will be needed to explain the 5 year land supply situation even in a post Pre-Submission Plan situation.

3.2 Community leadership and engagement

Strengths

The Council's planning policy consultation is thorough and comprehensive, for example the Preferred Options roadshows. This has led to a lengthy plan making process resulting in the position that the Council now finds itself with no adopted plan or five year land supply. In the circumstances though, the peer challenge team understands this approach. In particular that the Council will need to make some difficult decisions in relation to growth that may not be popular with parts of the local community.

A comprehensive consultation process that allows a genuine engagement with councillors and the community will help ensure that all possible options are explored, and will allow the Council to promote a plan that delivers the "least worst" option. Whilst people may not like the outcomes, it is important that they have the chance to have their say and make suggestions in relation to the location of new development.

The Council has an open and transparent approach to planning policy development. A District Planning Executive Panel meets in public and meetings are webcast. The Panel tests policy development in a public arena including looking at consultation responses and making sure these are properly considered.

The Council is keen to involve local people in the place shaping agenda. The Council sees neighbourhood planning as a good way to deliver this and supports communities in the plan making process. Five town / parish councils are progressing with neighbourhood plans with the first to be examined soon.

The Development Management Service is keen to take a proactive approach to development despite being under pressure from a high volume of planning applications. They have delivered documents to help with the place shaping agenda such as the Mead Lane Urban Design Framework - a "vision and strategy to promote a sustainable mixed-use development to enhance a much neglected area of Hertford".

Areas for consideration

The Council recognises that despite the comprehensive consultation on its emerging Local Plan, it will still be difficult to convince some parts of the local community of the need for growth. It will be important once the Council adopts its Local Plan that all councillors take every opportunity to promote it. This will make it easier for the Development Management Committee to take the difficult decisions it will need to make to secure planned growth referred to above.

We heard a perception from several partners that the Development Management Committee takes a parochial approach to decision making and has a default position of saying 'no' to development. This perception was backed up by what we saw at the Development Management Committee we attended. This means that the Council is increasingly subject to planning by appeal with councillors turning down applications without robust material planning grounds to do so. This forces developers to take applications to appeal where there is a significant risk that they will be allowed. This has resulted in significant award of costs against the Council.

The peer challenge team recognises that this is partly because the Council has to rely of the NPPF for decision making given the local planning policy vacuum, and the fact that councillors currently feel powerless to stop what they and the community consider to be unwanted development. Adoption of the new Local Plan will provide the Committee with a clear framework setting out where development should and should not go. It could also provide the Council with an opportunity to change the culture of the Development Management Committee. The Executive will need to take an active role to ensure this happens.

Some parish and town councillors feel undervalued and excluded. We heard from some that they do not feel that their views are taken into account in planning decisions. They also told us that they would welcome more feedback and training about planning decisions. The Council does not provide a programme of planning training for town and parish councils. Training could help to dispel some myths and perceptions; help the town and parish councils to better understand things like material planning considerations; and hence make more meaningful contributions to the planning process.

3.3 Partnership working

Strengths

The Council works well with neighbouring councils. We heard from neighbouring districts that East Herts is helpful and proactive in the Duty to Cooperate. We heard that the Council understands the need to accept housing growth for some neighbouring councils. The planning policy portfolio holder is seen as a proactive place shaper who is open to the duty to cooperate but not at the expense of the distinctiveness of the District. Neighbouring districts welcomed his approach. One example of this is the start of discussions on hard issues such as the expansion of Harlow into Gilston We also heard that East Herts is an equal partner in the Hertfordshire Infrastructure Planning Partnership - looking at how to achieve the benefits of development in delivering improvements to infrastructure.

We found some good working across service areas in relation to planning. For example, a representative of the housing team meets regularly with planning officers to discuss upcoming planning applications that include affordable housing legal obligations.

We found that local partners are keen to work with the Council to help deliver affordable housing needs identified by the community. We heard that the Council part funds a rural

housing enabler who has not yet secured delivery of any affordable housing in the District but is very effective in other areas. One registered provider told us that they were keen to work with the Council to improve delivery of affordable housing in rural areas of the District. The registered provider and the rural housing enabler are keen to engage with individual parishes and local communities - to deliver appropriate schemes that local people want - to meet their local identified needs. This is a good opportunity for the Council.

Areas for consideration

Capacity issues in some partner organisations impacts on the planning service. For example, the planning service struggles to get the input it requires from highways in both policy formulation and planning decision making. This can impact on the Council in a variety of ways. For example, a lack of highways input at the pre-application stage means that planning officers are unable to give comprehensive advice about highway requirements in relation to proposals. It is important that East Herts recognises the financial and capacity issues facing partner organisations. We heard that sometimes expectations are too high about what information should be provided and by when. For example, around transport modelling to support the Local Plan, and that the same information is sometimes requested in different formats or by different staff. A more structured approach to engagement, for example through service level agreements with partners, would be beneficial with East Herts recognising that it may need to fund some of this support.

Whilst we found that some partners such as neighbouring districts think that East Herts works well to deliver growth, other key partners, such as the Hertfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) think the Council could do more. For example, future expansion of Stansted Airport may increase demand for housing and location for food preparation businesses in the Bishop's Stortford area. The Council is aware of this and has communicated its vision for the type of growth it is and is not prepared to accept to key partners such as the LEP. But it needs to ensure, that despite this, it continues to have effective working relationships with key stakeholders.

We heard that some groups would like to have better engagement with the planning service. One planning agent told us that an East Herts specific forum would be welcomed, and the Council could consider hosting a wider customer forum including town and parish council, and key consultee representatives. Some interest groups also told us that they would like opportunities for improved engagement. The peer challenge team recognises that some interest groups can be hard to engage with - but a planned and systematic approach may help to reduce lengthy engagement on specific applications.

3.4 Management, service delivery and service to users

Strengths

Planning staff are hard working and enthusiastic. We heard that most planning staff are well regarded by colleagues in the Council and those stakeholders they work with. We found there were some very high calibre officers. We found that staff are well motivated and many see East Herts as a good place to work.

The Council's performance in relation to the speed of determining applications is strong and the Council has responded to past performance issues in development management. For example, performance data showed that the Council was not meeting government targets for the amount of time taken to determine major planning applications. As a result

of this, the Council made changes to the way it processes planning applications - including agreeing extensions of time where appropriate. Developers welcome this approach as it avoids the pressure for early refusal or the need to withdraw applications.

The plan making process is working well. Although the plan has taken a long time to produce, the process is thorough with strong political commitment and good community involvement. The Council has allocated resources to the process and the staff feel valued and supported.

The Council has recognised the need for better information technology to support development management and a new software system is imminent.

Areas for consideration

Whilst the peer challenge team understands the reasons why the Council is taking so long to produce its new Local Plan, it is essential that there is no further slippage to the timetable. Further slippage will result in even more pressure for unwanted and unplanned development.

Staff retention is a critical risk for the delivery of the development management service. The Council has lost some key staff and these posts remain vacant at a time when there is significant demand across the public and private sector for planning staff. We heard that pay levels at the Council are lower than neighbouring councils and that this, along with potential cuts to remuneration packages, has the potential to impact on staff morale. A number of staff told us they were actively looking for new jobs because of these factors. The Council does not have a clear staff retention strategy or workforce succession plan in place and this should be addressed as a matter of urgency.

Many of the Council's existing development management systems, procedures and processes are outdated and inefficient. Whilst the Council recognises this to some extent and has invested in a new IT system, effective, timely implementation of this will be key. The Council will need to make sure that it uses this opportunity to overhaul existing processes - rather than using a new system to replicate old, outdated processes and procedures. For example, at the moment when the Council receives electronic applications, it prints several copies of these and then scans the paper copies to get them into the electronic system. A different approach could completely eliminate this time consuming redundant process and release resource capacity. The Council will need to consider allocating additional resources to this, and could buy in expertise from a council that has implemented transformational change with a similar IT system.

Additional resources could also be used to great effect to deal with capacity and financial pressures in some key partner organisations, as highlighted earlier in relation to highways.

Team working and communication across the service, and with other Council teams, could be improved. For example, best practice in development management is not always shared across the two area teams and there have been clear differences of interpretation of planning policy and appeal decisions between planning policy and development management staff, resulting in conflicting officer advice to Development Management Committee.

Internal consultee responses (for example from the Council's Landscape Officer) sometimes seem at odds with the overall policy context and planning guidance. On other occasions the decision of whether to consult internally with other teams on planning applications or policy formulation appears inconsistent. Whilst it is important to allow

professional integrity, the lack of a joined up approach within the Council means that reports can appear inconsistent and contain conflicting messages. This is important because it does not provide clarity and certainty to developers and members about what is and what is not acceptable in planning terms. The peer team feel that a much more systematic approach to team meetings and briefings in the planning service, and a more structured approach to internal consultation, would help develop a more consistent response to planning applications.

The perception of the peer team is that development management staff feel "unloved". The team believe that this results from a combination of factors discussed elsewhere including: the pressures of operating in a policy vacuum including difficult member relationships in Committee; cuts in remuneration; working with outdated systems and technology; lack of cross team working; a lack of positive feedback for the work they do; and the lack of visible management and political commitment to address service issues.

The pre-application service is well used but is not comprehensive. As pointed out above, the lack of input from key external consultees, such as highways, results in pre-application advice sometimes being overturned when an application is received. This results in a perception that the advice is inconsistent and can lack credibility.

Opportunities exist to improve the operation of the Development Management Committee. We found reports to be very lengthy and it appeared that members had not read, or understood, them fully. We think that a short presentation to the committee by the case officer bringing out the salient points and answering any questions would be helpful. The reports would benefit from being shorter and written in plain English with a single page summary at the front - setting out the key points.

In addition, setting out conflicting views of internal consultees does not aid decision making without balanced reasoning and weighing up the overall assessment to reach a clear conclusion. We found that in one case the personal opinion of one internal consultee was included in a report, and that this conflicted with their objective planning assessment of the case. This personal opinion was not relevant and may have influenced the decision of the Committee. The Council also recognises that it needs to address the lack of highways advice to the Committee.

The Committee also considers applications that could be delegated. Under the current scheme of delegation a councillor can call in a planning application for determination by the Committee at any time, rather than there being a deadline following receipt of the application. This impacts on performance. We found some relatively minor applications being considered by the Committee.

The practical arrangements of the Committee do not give a good impression. The Council recognises the importance of engaging the public in planning decisions and it does provide a webcast of the meeting. But we found that ward councillors sat immediately behind committee members and this meant it was not clear to the public which councillors were involved in the decision making process. Name cards did not explain the roles of the attendees.

At the meeting we attended (and subsequently viewed in full on the webcast), some basic issues to do with meeting conduct seemed confused. At times members seemed uncertain about what to do. For example, after the vote on one item members assumed that they had refused the application contrary to officer advice but this was not the case. It took some considerable time for it to be recognised that a motion to refuse, with planning

reasons, was required. Officers did eventually provide this advice to the Committee, but not in a timely fashion

Our view, and that of some of the partners we spoke to, was that the Committee came across as parochial and anti-development. It did not consistently apply objective planning reasoning in its decisions. Inappropriate pressure was also put on officers in the meeting to come up with reasons for refusal, for example, for an application where there did not appear to be any valid planning reasons. Where members of the Committee require clarification about planning policy or about the technical aspects of a proposal, they may find it helpful to discuss individual applications with case officers prior to the Committee, or to channel these requests through the Chairman's briefing process, which could be made better use of. Members told us that they are concerned about pre-determination but, particularly given the local policy vacuum, it is appropriate for members to seek officer advice and support prior to Committee. Officers are willing to provide this support and this should be encouraged. The peer team's view is that further training is necessary for Committee members.

3.5 Achieving outcomes

Strengths

The Council's officers provide good customer service and operate well in the absence of a local plan. Officers promote an "open for business" culture. When determining planning applications they appropriately apply: the Council's own saved policies; the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).

The Council is successfully delivering affordable houses in urban developments such as High Oaks Grove, Ware. However, it rarely achieves its target of 40 per cent affordable housing but this is not unlike many councils given the challenges of development viability and the competing pressures for community infrastructure investment.

The Council is maximising public benefit from large development schemes such as the Bishops Stortford North urban extension. On this site, the Council reported that its negotiations have resulted in 30 per cent affordable housing as well as a legal agreement to secure £53.8 million of infrastructure benefits. This is a significant achievement and helps to demonstrate to the community that growth can bring tangible benefits.

Areas for consideration

The Council's lack of an adopted local plan results in pressure for unwanted development. The Council is aware of this. It recognises that it needs to ensure a 5 year land supply to be able to effectively control development in the area and ensure that its spatial vision for East Herts is protected and achieved. Care will be needed to address, and explain, the peaks and troughs in supply in the housing trajectory before large sites come on stream.

The Council recognises that it needs to prioritise developing its community infrastructure levy (CIL) charging schedule and geographical coverage. This will be important to ensure that the Council continues to maximise the benefits from new development. It will also be important to agree with partners the priorities for spending future CIL income well in advance of its introduction.

Development in urban areas continues to provide affordable housing. In rural areas, registered providers have been delivering affordable housing by redeveloping existing garage sites. This supply is now drying up and in any event, is not systematically linked to local need. The Council has an opportunity to look at how it can deliver rural affordable

housing more effectively in the future. For example, the rural housing enabler can help willing local communities to work with registered providers. The outcome could be bespoke small scale developments that match community aspirations and needs.

Planning Advisory Service - recommended support

The Planning Advisory Service (PAS) offers a wealth of information, tools and activities.

Information is available at:

<http://www.pas.gov.uk>

PAS will engage with East Herts Council to discuss further relevant support activities. We have listed some specific areas of information and support relevant to the recommendations from the peer challenge. There may be some scope to support learning from another authority on some particular issues such as the implementation of the new IT system.

Development Management support: Performance Framework for Quality Planning Services

The framework is a collection of tools and techniques that can help you to understand how your Development Management service is performing and to deliver service improvement

<http://www.pas.gov.uk/planning-quality-framework>

Pre-application advice

<http://www.pas.gov.uk/pre-application>

Planning Committee and Councillor support: Councillor briefings

http://www.pas.gov.uk/web/pas1/councillors-page/-/journal_content/56/332612/15306/ARTICLE

Planning Committee Peer Challenge

We do offer a peer challenge specifically focused on the planning committee which might be of interest. It would be useful to take a look at the sample brief to ask help you to look at your committee processes.

http://www.pas.gov.uk/web/pas1/peer-challenge/-/journal_content/56/332612/6286978/ARTICLE

Probity in Planning Guide

PAS has published a guide reflecting the changes in the Localism Act around probity in planning for councillors. This guide helps councillors to understand roles and responsibilities, and how to make sure they can be an effective councillor without getting into 'probity' difficulties.

http://www.pas.gov.uk/web/pas1/councillors-page/-/journal_content/56/332612/5638784/ARTICLE

Plan Policy support:

Local plan production update Information and support

<http://www.pas.gov.uk/local-planning>

Local Plan Direct Support

We have a range of free direct support available to aid local authorities to produce their local plan, ranging from evidence and plan reviews to specific advice on production time tables and councillor training.

http://www.pas.gov.uk/web/pas1/local-planning/-/journal_content/56/332612/15148/ARTICLE

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) support and information:

We have a range of information and support available on setting CIL charging schedules.

<http://www.pas.gov.uk/community-infrastructure-levy>

CIL Direct Support

We can provide free direct support for the local authority to help develop the CIL charging schedule.

http://www.pas.gov.uk/web/pas1/39-cil-direct-support/-/journal_content/56/332612/15080/ARTICLE

Neighbourhood Planning advice

<http://www.pas.gov.uk/neighbourhood-planning>



Local Government Association

Local Government House
Smith Square
London SW1P 3HZ

Telephone 0207 664 3000
Fax 0207 664 3030
Email info@local.gov.uk
www.local.gov.uk