

To:
Kate Barker
Barker Review of Land Use Planning
HM Treasury
1 Horse Guards
LONDON
SW1A 2HQ

From:
Brian Skittrall
8 Fir Tree Grove
Bozeat Northamptonshire
NN29 7NQ
by e-mail: skittrall@yahoo.co.uk

20th September 2006

Dear Ms Barker

Review of land Use Planning

I feel that the review has not addressed a core problem that is seriously hampering the planning system. This is the number of speculative, contentious applications that enter the system and tie up large amounts of the resources available to planning departments. Such applications are characterised by the scheme providing large profits to the developer and having a significant impact on communities close to the proposed development.

I believe that there are three reasons that there are so many of this type of application in the system:

- the size of the profit from a successful planning application
- the low cost of submitting an application
- the lack of compensation paid to those adversely affected should the application succeed

Because of the way that the system currently works, developers often submit large numbers of applications at different, largely inappropriate, sites hoping that just one will be accepted.

To prevent this abuse of the system the following measures could be taken:

- make the charges for processing a planning application proportionate to the either the size/cost of the project or the cost of processing the application
- introduce compensation into the planning process for those who are adversely affected by it

If these two measures were introduced the market would police the planning system. Inappropriate applications would be significantly decreased because the cost of a failed application would be significant to the developer. Developers would also gravitate away from sites where there would be a significant adverse impact on local communities because of the impact on the profits of the development. There would be much less "NIMBY" opposition to developments by communities because the negative financial impact on home-owners would be removed.

I urge you to consider these as recommendations for your final report.

Yours sincerely,

Brian Skittrall