

Responses to the questions asked by Mr Paul Elstone at the Scrutiny Committee Meeting held on 25 November 2020

*Thank you for your questions which are answered as follows:*

*Question 1 response: You have highlighted that in one scenario (identified breach with no further action) an outcome is not fed back to the original complainant. Thank you for highlighting this – the point will be put before Cabinet for them to discuss the inclusion of this complainant feedback loop for this scenario – which was intended to be included. No other issue could be identified within the flow diagram and, as such, there is not considered to be a need to re-draft the flow diagram. Also; the report was for noting by Scrutiny, it having already been recommended to Cabinet for approval by the Planning Policy Advisory Group (PPAG).*

*Question 2 response: It is not considered that the application of a scoring mechanism for planning enforcement would materially assist in the processing of enforcement cases; the risk/categorisation of planning enforcement cases can be subject to change during the life of a case and so scoring may quickly become out of date requiring re-scoring. Furthermore, each planning enforcement investigation is unique due to a number of factors including location, harm and breach reported and so it is considered that the development of a universal scoring system would be problematical. Conversely, the 'high, medium, low' rating quickly allows officers to identify the risk category of a case and make subsequent adjustments. The approach set out is therefore considered to be effective and efficient and a change to a scoring system is not considered necessary.*

Responses provided by the Director of Place and Economy.