




Draft Planning Enforcement Plan (June 2022)

2. Your details

1. In what capacity are you responding?				
Answer Choices			Response Total	Response Percent
1	Town or Parish Council		9	50%
2	Local resident		6	33%
3	Built environment professional		0	0%
4	Elected Stroud District Council councillor		3	17%
5	Other		0	0%
			answered	18
			skipped	0

3. Survey questions

2. Thinking about Section 1, from the contents of the plan, how well would you rate your understanding of what planning enforcement is?						
Answer Choices	1 – poor	2	3	4	5 – excellent	Response Total
	0.00% 0	0.00% 0	33.33% 6	66.67% 12	0.00% 0	18
					answered	18
					skipped	0

3. Still thinking about Section 1, how clear is the language used and how easily was the contents understood?						
Answer Choices	1 – unclear/hard to understand	2	3	4	5 – very clear/easily understood	Response Total
	5.56% 1	0.00% 0	33.33% 6	38.89% 7	22.22% 4	18
					answered	18
					skipped	0

3. Still thinking about Section 1, how clear is the language used and how easily was the contents understood?

Please comment if you would like to expand your answer: (6)

1	[REDACTED]	I can understand the language used, because I have a Councillor background for 20 years, but for the man in the street it may not be so easy.
2	[REDACTED]	The body of the plan is quite well explained but the Glossary confuses by introducing new jargon in an unsuccessful attempt to explain terms
3	[REDACTED]	It is very focused on legislation and the law and therefore there's loads of jargon that most people will not understand.
4	[REDACTED]	We understand and support the document. Our experience of recent of enforcement, fails to invoke the principles in section 1.
5	[REDACTED]	No further comment
6	[REDACTED]	6th para: This is very generalised. What are the guidelines for discretion in deciding planning enforcement? What does it mean that planning enforcement should only be undertaken where it is expedient to do so in the public interest? How is it judged what enforcement should be applied that is proportionate to the breach?

4. Turning to Section 3, how would you rate your understating of the limitations of confidentiality in a planning enforcement investigation?

Answer Choices	1 – unclear/hard to understand	2	3	4	5 – very clear/easily understood	Response Total	
	0.00% 0	11.11% 2	11.11% 2	22.22% 4	55.56% 10	18	
						answered	18
						skipped	0

Please comment if you would like to expand your answer: (6)

1	[REDACTED]	Probably the same comments as in Section 4.
2	[REDACTED]	It's not clear what factors would lead to names of complainants being released
3	[REDACTED]	I understand the lack of confidentiality, but I think that's likely to reduce people making a complaint
4	[REDACTED]	If you follow your guidelines then you should be fine.
5	[REDACTED]	Can I comment on the question below as there is no comment box to say that I might be put off depending on the circumstances and who is involved.

4. Turning to Section 3, how would you rate your understating of the limitations of confidentiality in a planning enforcement investigation?

6



No comment

5. Does Section 3 and the limitations on confidentiality in a planning enforcement investigation put you off making an enforcement complaint?

Answer Choices	Yes	No	Response Total
	22.22% 4	77.78% 14	18
			answered
			18
			skipped
			0

6. Looking at Sections 4 and 5, can you please rate how well the plan addresses:

Answer Choices	1 – unclear	2	3	4	5 – very clear	Response Total
What you can make a complaint about	5.56% 1	0.00% 0	27.78% 5	50.00% 9	16.67% 3	18
What the planning enforcement team will not investigate	0.00% 0	5.56% 1	33.33% 6	38.89% 7	22.22% 4	18
What we would do with your complaint if it was not something planning enforcement can assist with	0.00% 0	5.56% 1	33.33% 6	44.44% 8	16.67% 3	18
Complaints that will be turned away	0.00% 0	5.56% 1	33.33% 6	50.00% 9	11.11% 2	18
					answered	18
					skipped	0

7. With reference to both Section 6 of the plan and the accompanying flowchart, how well do you understand our proposed processes?

Answer Choices	1 – hard to understand	2	3	4	5 – very easily understood	Response Total
	0.00% 0	5.56% 1	27.78% 5	55.56% 10	11.11% 2	18
					answered	18
					skipped	0

7. With reference to both Section 6 of the plan and the accompanying flowchart, how well do you understand our proposed processes?

Please comment if you would like to expand your answer: (6)

1	[REDACTED]	Please better define what is classed as 'little harm', 'moderate harm' and 'significant harm'. This is open to interpretation and needs careful definition to be sure people know what the council means by these terms.
2	[REDACTED]	It's too complex and needs to be split into two: one that deals with things that you won't look at, and the other ones that you will/can
3	[REDACTED]	Our concern is not about the criteria for not investigating, we require much greater clarity and consistency about when you will investigate. Little or no harm may not mean much to an officer of the council, but we question whether the planning officer considers the local impact sufficiently.
4	[REDACTED]	The flow chart would benefit from having the timescales added to the processes to make it more understandable for a quick check.
5	[REDACTED]	There should be clear timescales for a planning enforcement investigation, 6 months is too long to resolve a planning enforcement investigation. This should really be no more than 3 months. If an investigation is likely to be protracted updates and interim reports should be made Clear reasons for your action or if no action and the reasons need to be made in a report.
6	[REDACTED]	Section 4 Does not refer to Advertisement Consent. Section 5 1st para: Reference to the Glossary would be useful. Furthermore, it is not clear what "other regulatory regimes" and "partner organisations" are. 2nd para: It is not clear why there is a difference of 4 and 10 years depending on the type of breach. 3rd para: Why not "anonymous complaints" or "persistent complaints" if these are reasonable? How is "reasonability" judged. Section 6 2nd para: The development does not have permission so last sentence should have "permitted" deleted. 3rd para: What does "little or no harm" mean? 4th para: What does "moderate or significant harm" mean? The Glossary is vague. Greater clarity regarding control of Developers activities needs emphasising. Given large scale developments may take a long time to complete it should be clear that compliance with planning permission will be inspected throughout with enforcement when necessary. The intention being to avoid development drift.

8. Thinking about Section 6, how confident would you be in the system (regardless of the outcome of the complaint)?

Answer Choices	1 – not confident	2	3	4	5 – very confident	Response Total
	22.22% 4	11.11% 2	38.89% 7	27.78% 5	0.00% 0	18
					answered	18
					skipped	0

9. We are still in the process of collecting and analysing data on our performance. That said, (with reference to our commitment to keep complainants informed on progress in Section 7) how reasonable is the target resolution timeframe in Section 8?

Answer Choices	1 – unreasonable	2	3	4	5 – very reasonable	Response Total	
	16.67% 3	5.56% 1	33.33% 6	27.78% 5	16.67% 3	18	
						answered	18
						skipped	0

10. Staying with the target resolution timeframe in Section 8, where on the scale do you think our target is?

Answer Choices	Too short	About right	Too long	Response Total	
	0.00% 0	72.22% 13	27.78% 5	18	
				answered	18
				skipped	0

11. Considering the plan as a whole, but particularly the parameters and limitations of planning enforcement, is there anything missing from the plan?

Answer Choices	Response Percent	Response Total
1 Open-Ended Question	100.00%	12
1 [REDACTED]		Is there enough Enforcement staff to carry pout investigations into breaches of planning consent?
2 [REDACTED]		Section 4 - this does not clearly set out where a 'development' that is not a building, e.g. commercial land based activities (for example, waste activities or doggy day care), might also be legitimate areas of complaint. Most public will not interpret the definition of 'development' as including this type of activity so it is important to include it as an example, alongside complaints about trees and listed buildings. It is also necessary to be clear that 'permitted development' is limited to certain areas and does not apply within protected or conservation areas such as AONB which is predominant in the Stroud area.
3 [REDACTED]		I would like to see more about who makes decisions and when and how a complaint will be called in to Development Control Committee. this section is missing from the previous version.
4 [REDACTED]		Yes. You say that the current plan is out of date, but you don't explain why and how this new one differs - that's basic. Secondly, you don't explain how you plan to resource the team. I know that the lack of staff in the team is common knowledge and has led some people just carrying on as they know that there's unlikely to be any comeback.
5 [REDACTED]		Realistic timescales for review
6 [REDACTED]		Yes. There is a totally disconnect between the laudable time frame expressed in your document and the reality of your current response to complainants with regards to enforcement. Further, frequently they receive no response apart from an initial receipt.

11. Considering the plan as a whole, but particularly the parameters and limitations of planning enforcement, is there anything missing from the plan?

7	[REDACTED]	Cllrs are concerned that the plan doesn't seem to have enough strength to follow through enforcement processes. Over the past few years the Parish Council have chased for answers on a number of enforcement issues in the parish with little correspondence received back, and little action seemingly taken. This plan needs to work. Cllrs currently feel that when they receive complaints about enforcement issues from parishioners, that when they report it to SDC enforcement, they never have any updates and are constantly chasing for any form of response. This causes frustration for both the Parish Council and parishioners as no answers are forthcoming and no visible action is being taken. The timetables being proposed MUST be adhered to, to gain any confidence back from the Parish Council and public in showing that action is being taken. There must be a clear status of each complaint / enquiry to enforcement where an end result is clearly given as to what action is being taken or why action is not being taken. Can better use of the court systems be had to carry out enforcement. Also the back log of cases that SDC has, could this be outsourced to other District Council's to allow SDC to catch up on work load and enable moving forward with the new policy to be productive and run smoothly?	
8	[REDACTED]	A clear reporting system of your findings in all cases. There is also no mention of upholding conditions that apply to planning applications	
9	[REDACTED]	Would like to see a shorter period of response time committed to, in addition to a commitment to explain exactly why cases are not deemed to be expedient/ in the public interest (if applicable).	
10	[REDACTED]	The plan, I hope is an improvement. The survey could have more comment boxes	
11	[REDACTED]	Section 9 1st para: What does "harmful impacts" mean? 2nd para: This seems contradictory. Could lead to unjust application of enforcement. What are the guidelines for this discretion?	
12	[REDACTED]	The new plan is very much easier for the layman to understand than the old one. A major concern, however, is that without clearly specified limits and penalties it is wide open to interpretation, particularly by large developers with expert lawyers.	
		answered	12
		skipped	6