

Respondent Information Form and Questions

Consultation on Fees for Planning Applications 2012



Please Note this form **must** be returned with your response to ensure that we handle your response appropriately

1. Name/Organisation

Organisation Name

Micro Hydro Association

Title Mr Ms Mrs Miss Dr *Please tick as appropriate*

Surname

King-Smith

Forename

Gavin

2. Postal Address

High Appin

Tynron

Thornhill

Dumfries & Galloway

Postcode DG3 4LF

Phone 01848 200770

Email

administrator@microhydroassociation.org

3. Permissions - I am responding as...

Individual

Please tick as appropriate

Group/Organisation

(a) Do you agree to your response being made available to the public (in Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site)?

Please tick as appropriate Yes No

(b) Where confidentiality is not requested, we will make your responses available to the public on the following basis

Please tick ONE of the following boxes

Yes, make my response, name and address all available

or

Yes, make my response available, but not my name and address

or

Yes, make my response and name available, but not my address

(c) The name and address of your organisation **will be** made available to the public (in the Scottish Government library and/or on the Scottish Government web site).

Are you content for your **response** to be made available?

Please tick as appropriate Yes No

(d) We will share your response internally with other Scottish Government policy teams who may be addressing the issues you discuss. They may wish to contact you again in the future, but we require your permission to do so. Are you content for Scottish Government to contact you again in relation to this consultation exercise?

Please tick as appropriate

 Yes

 No

Consultation on Fees for Planning Applications 2012

CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

Question 1: Are there any costs or benefits not identified in the draft BRIA?

Micro hydro schemes offer landowners, farmers and communities local benefits with few planning issues; where people operate as businesses they could merit fees more proportionate to the scale of their impact and cost of planning approval. (see answer to question 11)

Further low-risk cost reductions could be gained in providing for registration/permitted development of all small-scale hydro schemes subject only to the scheme proprietors undertaking to meet regulations concerning water abstraction and ecological controls (SEPA), heritage constraints (SNH) and neighbour notification.

Question 2: Do you have any information or can you suggest sources of relevant information on the costs and/or benefits detailed in the BRIA at Section C?

The Micro Hydro Association (www.microhydroassociation.org) can provide information concerning the costs and benefits of small scale hydro schemes.

Question 3: We would appreciate your assessment of the potential equalities impact our proposals may have on different sectors of the population. A partial EQIA is attached to this consultation at Section D, for your comment and feedback.

N/A to micro hydro schemes

Question 4: Do you consider that linking fees to stages within processing agreements is a good or bad idea? What should the second trigger payment be?

N/A to micro hydro schemes

Question 5: Do you agree or disagree with the proposal that where applications are required because permitted development rights for dwellings in conservation are restricted, then a reduced fee should be payable?

Agree Disagree

Question 6: Do you agree or disagree with the proposal that there should be a separate fee for renewals of planning permission?

Agree Disagree

Question 7: Do you agree or disagree that the new fee is set at an appropriate level?

Agree Disagree

Question 8: Do you agree or disagree with the proposal that the fee should increase on an annual basis?

Agree Disagree

Question 9: Is using site area the best method of calculating fees for windfarms of more than 2 turbines? If not, could you suggest an alternative? In your response please provide any evidence that supports your view.

Yes No

Re questions 6 and 7, delays beyond the control of the applicant in environmental approval for a scheme or in obtaining grid connection could result in planning applications for micro hydro schemes lapsing or needing to be revised or resubmitted – in these cases it would seem unreasonable to charge a fee for a renewal.

Re question 9: N/A to micro hydro schemes

Question 10: Please list any types of developments not included within the proposed categories that you consider should be.

no comment

Question 11: We would welcome any other views or comments you may have on the contents and provisions on the new regulations.

Microgeneration within the curtilage of an existing dwelling

The proposed £100 fee would be appropriate for all microgeneration equipment including micro hydro schemes even though these may in some cases involve more than one household (as in community schemes or schemes where one householder offers a wayleave or other recompense for allowing services, e.g. cable or penstock, crossing land outwith the curtilage.)

Micro hydro schemes for businesses

Hydro schemes below, say, 50kW or 100kW capacity pose negligible impact other than potential environmental effects which are already regulated through CAR by SEPA. In particular, visual impact is usually very small (penstocks and cables buried in fields, small sheds of 1-10 m² as turbine houses, typically small dams with 1-2 m² intake screens). The area visually affected is thus very small and existing land use can continue unaffected.

There should be no need for any more planning authorisation work than for residential microgeneration developments. It would be inappropriate to charge even the lowest proposed fee for a 100 sq m site area (£1000) which represents a 3-fold increase on the present fee and we suggest that the hydro microgeneration developments are all charged at the same £100 rate irrespective of the nature of the applicant (householder or business).