

Organisation	Do you find the terms helpful and/or what other alternative or additional terms should we include?	Do you consider this to be a proportionate and effective approach to delivery of planning enforcement in Milton Keynes? If not, why, and what other approach(es) should be taken?	Do you consider the proposed, minimum contact points throughout an investigation are proportionate, noting that additional contact will be made as necessary during more complex and lengthier investigations, and having regard to prudent use of MKCC's resources? If not, when should we update complainants?	Do you agree this approach accords with national guidance which advocates a proportionate response to individual breaches of planning control? If not, what approach should be taken to the different types of breach listed?	When considering that planning enforcement is a discretionary function of the Planning Service at MKCC, do you have any views on whether these customer service expectations are fair and appropriate to meet the needs of the communities MKCC services?	When considering the revised LEP as a whole, are there any other ways the LEP could be further improved, or is there further advice and guidance which could be added? Are there any other observations that you have?
Wolverton and Greenleys Town Council	The terms are very helpful and give a better insight for those who don't fully understand the process	<p>My concern is more within CA's I am concerned that expediency sometimes gives the impression that people can get on with development with the knowledge that it is likely not to be enforced because is it not deemed to be expedient.</p> <p>Response 1: adjustment made to the table at 6.1.</p>	Enforcement feedback has improved greatly and I find that I am much better informed than in previous years	I agree with this	no	I think the LEP is well written, clear and concise
New Bradwell Parish Council	The terms are self explanatory and do not need to be changed	I consider this to be proportionate	<p>This seems reasonable but you should also ensure that the same information is copied to the party who is alleged to have breached planning.</p> <p>Response 2: there is already communication with the landowner/developer when a complaint is investigated. However, it is not possible to provide the detail of the complaint or of evidence provided without risk of undermining the Council's position should it need to take formal action, or without risk of identifying the complainant.</p>	I agree	I have no view	<p>You should ensure that all parties are kept informed. At the moment it seems that the complaint is given more information than the party who is alleged to have breached.</p> <p>Response 3: see response 2. It must also be recognised that the complainant has an expectation to have their complaint addressed, being the primary customer, and communication when working towards a resolution is therefore important.</p> <p>Change made to para 4.2 in any event.</p>
Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council	<p>Bletchley and Fenny Stratford Town Council has reviewed the revised LEP and has no comments to make other than to question the requirement for reporting potential breaches via an online form only. Whilst understanding the need to shift to digital communication for efficiency reasons it is the town council's view than there are still many residents who may need or prefer to use other types of communication and would ask that this is reconsidered.</p> <p>Response 4: lengthy consideration has been given to this matter. The requirement for reporting alleged breaches using the online form has been in place January 2021, with the 2017 Enforcement Plan promoting this method only. This is therefore not a change of approach, and the form enables effective information gathering to ensure action is appropriate and proportionate, as well as increasing the immediate ability to filter non-planning complaints to the correct service or organisation. Modern technology enables those with disabilities to still access and complete the form, whilst it is possible to seek assistance from Customer Services or a local elected representative to raise the complaint on their behalf. This method will also hugely assist with the speed at which complaints can be acknowledged and initially investigated under new planning software.</p>					

Organisation	Do you find the terms helpful and/or what other alternative or additional terms should we include?	Do you consider this to be a proportionate and effective approach to delivery of planning enforcement in Milton Keynes? If not, why, and what other approach(es) should be taken?	Do you consider the proposed, minimum contact points throughout an investigation are proportionate, noting that additional contact will be made as necessary during more complex and lengthier investigations, and having regard to prudent use of MKCC's resources? If not, when should we update complainants?	Do you agree this approach accords with national guidance which advocates a proportionate response to individual breaches of planning control? If not, what approach should be taken to the different types of breach listed?	When considering that planning enforcement is a discretionary function of the Planning Service at MKCC, do you have any views on whether these customer service expectations are fair and appropriate to meet the needs of the communities MKCC services?	When considering the revised LEP as a whole, are there any other ways the LEP could be further improved, or is there further advice and guidance which could be added? Are there any other observations that you have?
Principal Licensing Officer - MKCC Regulatory Services	The explanation on the interpretation of discretionary is helpful.	<p>I see no mention of including other MKCC departments as being stakeholders and working with them to achieve compliance.</p> <p>Response 5: <i>this is referenced in para 1.5 of the draft LPEP, but it is acknowledged that the cross-service approach embedded in the delivery of Council services is not prominently set out. Amendments included to enhance this messaging, including changes to paras 2.3 and 5.2 (as renumbered).</i></p>	no comment	Agree	<p>Service expectations of customers is reduced when they can only use online reporting to report a breach, as not all customers will have access to such platforms to contact the PE service.</p> <p>Response 6: <i>see response 4. An online form approach appears to be consistent with reporting noise nuisance complaints.</i></p> <p>Some of the above are covered within the Corporate Enforcement Policy, has a comparison check been undertaken to ensure that there is no conflict between the two? Which could possibly lead to problems if enforcement action was taken.</p> <p>Response 7: <i>The Corporate Enforcement policy addresses matters under other legislative provisions, with different actions possible. It also must be recognised that licenced premises are generally known so there can be more proactive dialogue to prevent breaches from occurring, and this mould does not fit the planning enforcement function. Nonetheless, amendments have been included to emphasise cross-service interests.</i></p>	<p>The ridged use of one point of contact via a reporting tool is restrictive.</p> <p>Response 8: <i>see response 4.</i></p> <p>I can find no mention of the MKCC Corporate Enforcement Policy which would obviously need to be carefully considered to help direct which enforcement action should or not be taken by any MKCC service. It is strange that no mention is made of such within this plan.</p> <p>Response 9: <i>see response 7</i></p>
Emberton Parish Council	Yes these are helpful	Yes	<p>Yes, but the parish council would like to advise when enforcement is being reported on behalf of a resident.</p> <p>Response 10: <i>the online form can be amended to include this option.</i></p>	Yes	No	

Note: paragraph 5.2 from the consultation draft has been moved to paragraph 5.8 in the final version, so to aid the flow of sections and understanding of the Plan. All intervening paragraph numbers have moved back by one.