

Decision Maker: DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Date: Wednesday 18th March 2020

Decision Type: Non-Urgent Non-Executive Non-Key

Title: COUNCILLOR PLANNING APPLICATION 'CALL INS'

Contact Officer: Tim Horsman, Assistant Director (Planning)
Tel: 020 8313 4956 E-mail: Tim.Horsman@bromley.gov.uk

Chief Officer: Director of Housing, Planning & Regeneration

Ward: (All Wards)

1. Reason for report

As part of the recent service improvement recommendations, it was agreed that Councillor 'call-ins' for planning applications would be reported to Development Control Committee for information.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

Members note the report.

Impact on Vulnerable Adults and Children

1. Summary of Impact: N/A
-

Corporate Policy

1. Policy Status: Existing Policy:
 2. BBB Priority: Excellent Council:
-

Financial

1. Cost of proposal: Applications considered at committee cost more than those determined under delegated authority
 2. Ongoing costs: Recurring Cost:
 3. Budget head/performance centre: Planning / Development Management
 4. Total current budget for this head: £1.7m
 5. Source of funding: Existing budget
-

Personnel

1. Number of staff (current and additional): N/A
 2. If from existing staff resources, number of staff hours: N/A
-

Legal

1. Legal Requirement: Non-Statutory - Government Guidance:
 2. Call-in: N/A
-

Procurement

1. Summary of Procurement Implications: N/A
-

Customer Impact

1. Estimated number of users/beneficiaries (current and projected): N/A
-

Ward Councillor Views

1. Have Ward Councillors been asked for comments? No
2. Summary of Ward Councillors comments: N/A

3. COMMENTARY

- 3.1 A report is brought to DCC every six months summarising the number of Councillor planning application 'call ins' and this figure broken down by Ward.
- 3.2 Officers have delegated authority to determine applications in a range of circumstances except where a Councillor makes a written request to 'call in' a specific application to committee.
- 3.3 The data provided below is for 'call ins' relating to applications determined by the Council during 2019. The data is presented in two tables: Figure 1 compares the basic data with the previous data reported in October and provides a total for 2019, and Figure 2 shows the 2019 data in more detail including appeal outcomes where available.
- 3.4 The data includes all cases which were subject to a 'call in' request (including 'conditional' call ins) and thus includes cases which may not ultimately have been determined at committee.

Figure 1 - Number of planning application 'call ins' for applications determined in 2019

Ward	Number of call ins Jan - Jun 2019	Number of call ins Jul – Dec 2019	Total 2019
Petts Wood and Knoll	18	12	30
Chislehurst	16	12	28
Darwin	8	4	12
Bickley	8	3	11
Bromley Town	9	1	10
Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	5	5	10
Biggin Hill	4	5	9
Bromley Common and Keston	3	5	8
Shortlands	5	3	8
Crystal Palace	2	5	7
Farnborough and Crofton	4	1	5
Cray Valley East	2	2	4
Copers Cope	1	2	3
Hayes and Coney Hall	1	2	3
Orpington	2	1	3
Plaistow and Sundridge	3	0	3
Kelsey and Eden Park	1	1	2
Mottingham and Chislehurst North	1	1	2
Penge and Cator	1	1	2
West Wickham	0	2	2
Clock House	1	0	1
Cray Valley West	0	0	0
Total	95	68	163

Figure 2 - Call ins for applications determined in 2019 with additional detail

Ward	Number of 'call ins' for 2019	Appeal in Progress	Appeal Allowed	Appeal Dismissed	Recmdtn overturned at committee	Recmdtn Overturned and Appeal Allowed
Bickley	11	0	4	1	4	3
Biggin Hill	9	0	1	1	1	1
Bromley Common and Keston	8	0	1	0	2	1
Bromley Town	10	2	0	1	0	0
Chelsfield and Pratts Bottom	10	0	0	2	0	0
Chislehurst	28	0	2	3	4	2
Clock House	1	0	0	0	0	0
Copers Cope	3	2	0	1	0	0
Cray Valley East	4	1	1	0	1	0
Cray Valley West	0	0	0	0	0	0
Crystal Palace	7	1	0	2	2	0
Darwin	12	1	1	2	1	0
Farnborough and Crofton	5	0	0	2	0	0
Hayes and Coney Hall	3	0	0	0	0	0
Kelsey and Eden Park	2	0	0	0	0	0
Mottingham and Chislehurst Nth	2	0	0	0	0	0
Orpington	3	0	0	2	0	0
Penge and Cator	2	0	0	0	0	0
Petts Wood and Knoll	30	4	2	6	6	1
Plaistow and Sundridge	3	0	0	2	1	0
Shortlands	8	1	0	1	0	0
West Wickham	2	2	0	0	0	0
Total	163	14	12	26	22	8

With regard to the data in Figure 2, this will be updated in the next report as a number of the appeals against these decisions are still in progress

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Applications determined at committee result in a higher cost per application than those determined under delegated powers.

5. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

Applications determined at committee result in more staff time and in particular a greater requirement for staff working outside of normal hours.

Non-Applicable Sections:	Impact On Vulnerable Adults and Children; Policy Implications; Legal Implications; Procurement Implications
Background Documents: (Access via Contact Officer)	N/A