

Policy and Resources Committee	
Meeting Date	10 September 2025
Report Title	New and Amended Fees for Applications made to the Planning Service
EMT Lead	Emma Wiggins Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods
Head of Service	Joanne Johnson Head of Place
Lead Officer	Carly Stoddart Continuous Improvement Lead
Classification	Open
Recommendations	1. That members recommend to Full Council the introduction of charges for amendments to undetermined applications in accordance with the fee schedule as set out in paragraph 2.5 of this report. 2. That members recommend to Full Council the introduction of fees for monitoring biodiversity net gain (BNG) in accordance with the fee schedule as set out in paragraph 2.11 of this report. 3. That members recommend to Full Council the fee schedule for Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs) as set out at paragraph 2.10 of this report. 4. That members recommend to Full Council the revised pre-application and post-decision advice fee schedule as set out in Tables 1, 2 and 3 at paragraph 2.6 of this report.

1 Purpose of Report and Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report provides an update to an item that was considered at the 12 June 2025 Policy and Resources Committee where it was deferred to allow for a Task and Finish Group to be set up to discuss the proposals in more detail. The Task and Finish Group met twice to discuss the proposals.
- 1.2 At the 12 June 2025 Committee, the Planning Service proposed to make service improvements through the introduction of fee schedules to recover costs for services that it provides that are not part of the statutory provision. The proposals were for the introduction of charging applicants to amend their undetermined applications either through the alteration of previously submitted details or the submission of new supporting information. A fee schedule and related procedure to cover the process was set out.
- 1.3 It was also proposed to introduce fees for the monitoring of biodiversity net gain (BNG). A separate fee schedule and related procedure was set out to cover this process.

- 1.4 Taking a holistic approach and review of the non-statutory services within the Planning Service, an explanation of the interplay with associated Planning Service fees such as pre-application and post-decision advice, and Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs) was given. New fees were proposed for PPAs and amendments proposed to existing pre-application advice fees.
- 1.5 In reviewing and considering the proposals within the report it was decided at Policy and Resources Committee on 12 June 2025 to defer the item for further information and clarification to be discussed by a Task and Finish Group.
- 1.6 This report summarises the outcome of the Task and Finish Group discussions and seeks Committee approval of the recommendations to introduce new fees and amend existing fees.

2 Background

- 2.1 The purpose of the Task and Finish Group was to discuss and provide clarification on the deferred Policy and Resources item *New and Amended Fees for Applications made to the Planning Service* with the outcome to reach agreement of appropriate fees to present back to Policy and Resources Committee.
- 2.2 Each political party was invited to nominate a representative to be part of the Task and Finish Group. Subsequently, a total of two meetings were held to discuss the deferred item. Comparison tables of pre-application advice fees currently being applied by Kent Local Planning Authorities were sent out ahead of the first meeting at members' request (Appendix I).
- 2.3 At the Task and Finished meetings, those present summarised the queries and concerns their Groups had expressed following the item's discussion at the 12 June Policy and Resources Committee meeting and the concerns expressed more widely by Committee members. The areas of clarification, the response and outcome are set out in the table below.

Area of Clarification	Response
Benchmarking – Information requested to show comparison with Kent authorities.	Two tables were circulated to all invitees ahead of the meeting. One table showed Swale's current pre-application fees against all other Kent authorities and the other showed the fees proposed within the P&R item against all other Kent authorities. Both tables highlighted the most expensive and the cheapest option per category. Members present advised the comparison tables were very helpful. Outcome: no further queries in this regard.

Householder Fees	Recollection from the P&R meeting was there was a question around whether the fee for householders is too punitive for householders and that the spread of fees made some members feel the householder fee was proportionately higher. Officers confirmed that the fees for pre-application advice for householders and minors remained as agreed by Members in February. In terms of amendments, officers advised that some authorities do not charge for householder amendments. A member raised concern regarding particular impact on homeowners in conservation areas when applications are required for very small matters. The concern was that it might create a barrier to follow the proper route and lead to enforcement cases. The potential to waive fees entirely for householder pre-application advice was raised. It was felt the fee for amendments was not problematic. Officers advised that the conservation area status didn't create too many more situations above non-conservation areas in terms of what requires planning permission and that the burden is greater on Listed Buildings. Clarification was also provided that the householder pre-application advice fee and the amendment charge are both cheaper than a second application fee. Where previously it was possible to submit a revised application free of charge within one year of decision, this was removed from the process by central Government. Officers advised that this fee had not changed and was in line with what members had agreed in February. Outcome: no change to the officer report proposed.
Why limit the number of amendments? Concern around whether Ward Cllrs' or other relevant parties'	Officers explained that the limit in terms of the number of rounds of amendments is proposed to encourage take up of the pre-application advice service (and PPAs) as a first step to achieving a higher quality scheme from the outset at submission. This is in line with national policy and practice guidance.

concerns would not be able to be taken into account to achieve a better outcome.	If applicants are limited to only being able to submit amendments if they have been through the pre-application advice process, this should mean that the proposal coming in should be of a high quality from the start. For smaller applications, this should result in there not being any need for an amendment if the pre-application advice is followed, but if the situation does arise, there is the ability to undertake one round. For larger applications, there is more chance of amendments being required, given that generally there is a greater number of consultees, who may raise issues requiring amendments. This is why the process is written to include for two rounds if the applicant has entered into a PPA. In recognition of the fact that some consultees may be late in providing their response or that a straight forward change to the scheme could make for a better outcome (which could've been raised by a member, Parish Council, driven by public responses, the case officer etc.), the process as proposed includes a caveat that further rounds of amendments may be permitted at the discretion of the Planning Manager (Planning Applications) level or above within the Planning Service. It is agreed that the Council should not prevent the opportunity for a scheme to be improved through a simple amendment and the inclusion of the caveat to allow further rounds ensures there is flexibility within the process. Restricting/controlling the rounds of amendments allowed and being clear in that on our website and literature means that the Council does not have to accept round after round of amendments which contributes to a backlog and often causes friction and misunderstanding with those members of the public that are living within the vicinity of an application that is being continuously amended and consultation letters sent out to them. Setting out the restriction/control over the number of rounds of amendments will make the Council's position publicly clear in terms of its processes. This puts the Council in a better position to refuse proposals at an earlier stage where it is considered that changes required are more substantial and that simple amendments will not result in a satisfactory outcome. A clear process that is publicly set out will also
---	---

	help defend those decisions to refuse at appeal by demonstrating the reasonable behaviour of the Council in its consideration and determination of such applications. Outcome: no further queries in this regard.
What is a 'round' of amendments?	It was felt that there may be some confusion around the terms 'amendment' and/or 'round of amendments'. What usually happens in the case of considering an application is that it is validated and allocated to a case officer. Consultation letters, and/or site and press notices are posted. Following (and during) the consultation period, the case officer will be reviewing the comments received and looking at whether a response suggests changes and/or further information that is required to either/or be in a position to determine the application and/or to improve the proposal. Requests for further information and/or changes may come from one or several responses, usually statutory consultees but may include ward members and/or Parish Councils. The case officer will consider these requests in the context of the legislation and planning policy and will advise the applicant of <u>all</u> the requested changes at the time of review. If the applicant chooses to respond and submit the requested further information/changes, in the majority of cases they will usually address all the requested amendments in one go and submit it as a 'package' on one date. This would constitute one round of amendments, and the relevant proposed fee applied. Should the applicant wish to submit the requested information in separate submissions across multiple days/weeks, which can happen if say, for example, a highways response is ready before an ecology response, then it would constitute multiple rounds of amendments. In the multiple rounds scenario, officers across the service would have to check and perform the admin associated with the submission including sending consultation letters (which could be multiple letters to the same people) across multiple days.

	In the case where a consultee response is significantly late and if a requested change is necessary, this may require the caveat being instigated where the applicant is allowed a 'round' of amendments beyond the stated limit and at no additional fee if an amendment fee has already been paid for an earlier round. Outcome: no further queries in this regard.
Can Members get involved in pre-application advice discussions?	The proposals set out in the P&R paper include presentations to members within the fee structure for those applicants entering into PPAs. Concern was expressed that the presentations are developers selling their schemes to members rather than a dialogue. It was noted that there is an element of it being a marketing exercise, but that the purpose of the presentations is an opportunity for applicants to set out and explain to members what their development proposals are. It is also an opportunity for members to ask questions and make comments. The presentations would be open for all members to attend should they want to. Ward members in attendance would be in the position to provide any local knowledge that may inform the proposals one way or another should they want to. Members that sit on Planning Committee would need to be mindful that should they wish to vote on the proposals at such time that they may be presented to the Planning Committee, that they don't prejudice or pre-determine their position in their comments. Outcome: no further queries in this regard.
Concern the P&R discussion excluded the proposed BNG fees from debate.	Concern was expressed with regard to the BNG process as a whole and that the BNG benefits are not necessarily provided on or close to the sites in question. Officers explained that the BNG process within the legislation sets out a hierarchy which is a preference for BNG to be provided on site, then off-site and at the end is the ability to purchase credits. There is nothing to prevent the applicant choosing any of those options other than the cost implications they would bear. It is understood that the cost of credits is intentionally expensive to deter applicants from this option except as a last resort.

	It was asked that if applicants provided BNG on sites closer to the application site, could there be a reduction or could we waive the monitoring fee as an incentive? It was advised that the land has to be available and suitable for the relevant habitat creation. It is likely in most cases that the applicant does not own land nearby and that is suitable. Based on training sessions attended and Kent wide officer engagement sessions on BNG, it is likely that in most cases with off-site provision, the applicant will purchase biodiversity units from a habitat bank. The frustrations with the BNG legislation and process was noted but it is what we have to work with currently and the requirement for monitoring for 30 years has an implication on Council resources. This is why the proposal in the P&R paper is seeking to recover costs associated with monitoring activity. It was confirmed that the costs have been produced accounting for the anticipated time and monitoring activities undertaken from KCC Ecological Advice Service and Swale Borough Council officers. Outcome: no further queries in this regard.
Member Protocol	It was agreed to remove this from the P&R process and take it to the Constitution Working Group as a formal update to the second appendix to part 4.1 of the Constitution, "Engaging in pre-application planning discussions". Outcome: new approvals route agreed.

2.4 Following the Task and Finish Group meetings there was no changes to the proposed new and amended fees for applications made to the Planning Service with associated procedures where applicable.

2.5 The fees and charges proposed are as follows:

Submission of Amendments / Additional Information Draft Fee Schedule

Application Type	Description	Fee per submission
------------------	-------------	--------------------

Lawful Development Certificate (existing and proposed) Householder	Householder alterations and extensions only.	£129
Lawful Development Certificate (existing and proposed) Other	Development involving establishing lawful use of properties.	£210
Householder	Householder development (affecting a single home) including extension, outbuildings and other works within the property boundary.	£240
Minor Development	- Includes between 1 to 9 dwellings. - Covers up to 0.5 hectares. - Commercial development less than 1,000 square metres	£300
Major Development	- Includes between 10 to 49 houses or flats. - Covers between 0.51 to 2 hectares. - Commercial development between 1,001 to 4,999 square metres	£600
Large Major Development	- Includes 50 - 249 houses or flats. - Covers between 2.1 to 5 hectares. - Commercial development between 5,000 to 9,999 square metres	£750 10% discount when part of a PPA
Strategic Major Development	- Includes 250+ houses or flats. - Covers more than 5 hectares. - Commercial development of 10,000 square metres or more	£1000 10% discount when part of a PPA
Listed Building Consent	Development of a listed building including extensions and internal alterations.	£240
Discharge of Condition	Applications for the discharge of planning conditions.	£210

Advertisements and Shopfronts and any other proposals not listed above.	Shop fronts, signs and adverts for a shop or attached to a business premises. Any other proposals not listed above.	£210
---	--	------

Note: The Council reserves to the right to review whether a further amendment will be allowed for exceptional, complex proposals. The relevant fee set out above will apply for each submission.

2.6 Revised Pre-application advice and post-decision advice fee schedules

Table 1: Pre-application advice fees

Householder Pre-App – £360.00 Site visit at officer discretion Minor Developments Pre-App – £989.50 A minor development is one where any of the following applies: • Includes between 1 to 9 dwellings. • Covers up to 0.5 hectares. • Commercial development less than 1,000 square metres Major Developments Pre-App – £3,545.50 A major development is one where any of the following applies: • Includes between 10 to 49 houses or flats. • Covers between 0.51 to 2 hectares. • Commercial development between 1,000 to 4,999 square metres Large Major Developments Pre-App – £5,395.50 A large major development is one where any of the following applies: • Includes 50 - 249 houses or flats. • Covers between 2.1 to 5 hectares. • Commercial development between 5,000 to 9,999 square metres Strategic Major Development Pre-App - £6,500 + Discounted PPA (see separate fee schedule for PPAs) • Includes 250+ houses or flats. • Covers more than 5 hectares.
--

- Commercial development of 10,000 square metres or more

Other Fees

Listed Building (householder) – written advice only – you will pay £150.00.

Heritage & Urban Design attendance at meeting (PER HOUR) – £260.00

NB: the Listed Building and the Heritage and Urban Design fees are in addition to those above, however written advice will continue to be provided on a case-by-case basis.

Any other advice not set out above – meeting and or written at officer discretion - hourly rates– price on application.

*** Parish Councils, Voluntary Organisations, National Charities or Charities that are not ‘not-for-profit’** will be charged at 50% of the above pre-application advice fee

Design Review – To be advised at the time of request

Admin Fee – An admin fee of £75 will be applied to any refund that may have been agreed due to exceptional circumstances.

The fees set out in this schedule cover the cost of a meeting followed by a written response.

Table 2: Post decision and follow-up pre-application advice fees

Advice	Suggested Fee
Follow up advice – minor amendments to a proposal following initial advice.	Hourly rate – to be calculated at submission and worked out depending on the amendment or can be invoiced after and could be charged at an hourly rate or part thereof
Post decision advice – refusal	50% of relevant pre-app fee
Amendments to an approved scheme	Hourly rate – to be calculated at submission and worked out depending on the amendment or can be invoiced after and could be charged at an hourly rate or part thereof
Discharge of conditions	Hourly rate – to be calculated at submission and worked out depending on the number of conditions and what they cover or can be invoiced after and

	could be charged at an hourly rate or part thereof
--	--

Table 3: Hourly rates

Officer	Hourly Rate (including relevant on-costs)
Planning Assistant	£108
Planning Officer	£140
Principal Planner	£162
Team Leader	£182
Planning Manager	£215
Urban Design	£260
Heritage	£170
Council Officers from other departments providing advice such as affordable housing, greenspaces	£170

2.7 Planning Performance Agreement Fee Schedule

2.8 For clarity in relation to the PPA fee schedule set out below the fee stated in the table as (£ amount + VAT) is the fee as given in the 12 June Committee 2025 report and is correct fee.

2.9 A £1000 administration fee is then applied to the PPA fee, which is also subject to VAT. The total amounts given in bold of the 12 June 2025 Committee did not take account of VAT being applied to the £1000 administration fee. These values given in bold below are therefore different to those in the original Committee paper, but this is solely due to that error being corrected

2.10

Development Category	Fee inc. VAT
50-100 homes 1,000 to 4,999 sqm commercial floorspace	(£15,586.00 + VAT) £19,903.20
101-199 homes 5,000 – 9,999 sqm commercial floorspace	(£22,612.00 + VAT) £28,334.40
200+ homes 10,000+ sqm commercial floorspace	(£39,059.00 + VAT) £48,070.80
Pre-application / Pre-decision Presentation to Members	(£1050 + VAT) £2460 per presentation

This option should only be offered and secured as part of a PPA in relation to sites of significance and in accordance with Member-Developer Protocol for pre-application and pre-decision engagement.	
--	--

Note: All fees include administration fee of £1000.

2.11 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Monitoring Fee Schedule

Threshold Category	Calculation
All development that is not Major development, qualifies for Small Sites Metric and results in Significant Biodiversity Gain	Ecologist + Planning Tech Officer (+all other costs set out within Mycelia) $£1,412.66 + £3,313 = £4,725.66$ $+ £233.72 \text{ (Contingency/SV)} = £4,959.38$ $+ £227.95 \text{ (Enf. Day Rate x 1 day)} = £5,187.33$ $+ £302.40 \text{ (Legal Day Rate x 1 day)} = \textbf{£5,489.73}$
Major Developments up to 10 Biodiversity Units	Ecologist + Planning Tech Officer (+all other costs set out within Mycelia) $£2,825.32 + £3,313 = £6,138.32$ $+ £934.86 \text{ (Contingency + SV)} = £7,073.18$ $+ £341.93 \text{ (Enf. Day Rate x 1.5 day)} = £7,415.11$ $+ £453.60 \text{ (Legal Day Rate x 1.5 day)} = \textbf{£7,868.71}$
Major Developments between 11 and 20 Biodiversity Units	Ecologist + Planning Tech Officer (+all other costs set out within Mycelia) $£6,776.55 + £3,890 = £10,666.55$ $+ £1,869.72 \text{ (Contingencyx2 + SVx2)} = £12,536.27$ $+ £455.90 \text{ (Enf. Day Rate x 2 day)} = £12,992.17$ $+ £604.80 \text{ (Legal Day Rate x 2 day)} = \textbf{£13,596.97}$
Major Developments over 21 Biodiversity Units	Ecologist + Planning Tech Officer (+all other costs set out within Mycelia) $£9,035.40 + £3,313 = £12,348.40$ $+ £3,739.44 \text{ (Contingencyx4 + SVx4)} = £16,087.84$ $+ £569.88 \text{ (Enf. Day Rate x 2.5 day)} = £16,657.72$ $+ £756.00 \text{ (Legal Day Rate x 2.5 day)} = \textbf{£17,413.72}$

3 Proposals

- 3.1 That members recommend to Full Council the introduction of charges for amendments to undetermined applications in accordance with the fee schedule as set out as set out in paragraph 2.5 of this report.
- 3.2 That members recommend to Full Council the introduction of fees for monitoring biodiversity net gain (BNG) in accordance with the fee schedule as set out in paragraph 2.11 of this report.
- 3.3 That members recommend to Full Council the fee schedule for Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs) as set out at paragraph 2.10 of this report.
- 3.4 That members recommend to Full Council the revised pre-application and post-decision fee schedule as set out in Tables 1, 2 and 3 at paragraph 2.6 of this report.

4 Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

- 4.1 To continue to not charge for the submission of amended plans. This represents the cheapest option for applicants. However, this discourages the use of the Council's pre-application service, encourages speculative applications and applications of a lower quality and causes costs to be incurred by the Council that primarily benefit applicants rather than the wider community. This is not recommended. Lower quality schemes often add a significant amount of time to the assessment and determination of applications which in turn has the potential to create backlogs. Extended periods of time to determine applications provides uncertainty for both the applicant and surrounding residents.
- 4.2 The Council could apply the charge to a selection of application types rather than all application types. However, as the Council incurs the costs of processing amendments for all types of applications, it is recommended that all types of applications should be liable for the charge.
- 4.3 Given the discretion that exists in relation to the processing of amendments and additional information, the Council could refuse to process changes after an application has been validated. In some instances, this can be a sound approach. However, there are also instances where this would put the Council at some risk of costs being awarded to appellants in any appeal process. Moreover, this approach would prevent applications being improved during the course of an application. In this regard, where there are some applications that can be granted planning permission because the planning balance indicates that the overall benefits outweigh the harms, these are often the types of cases where there is scope to achieve improvements that further increase the benefits. It is not recommended to take away the opportunity to improve schemes.

- 4.4 The Council could choose not to impose a fee for the monitoring of BNG sites. This leaves the Council with the burden of finding resource in existing budgets for financing appropriate software for assessing and monitoring sites and engaging with KCC EAS for their expertise in reviewing reports and absorbing the cost of the time for existing staff within the Planning Service and Legal Services taking on additional monitoring duties for a period of 30-years for each relevant BNG site. Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010 No 948, as amended by the Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) (England) (No. 2) Regulations 2019 (The CIL Regulations) gives specific powers for monitoring fees. There is current practice already within Legal Services to charge for work on S106 agreements (for any purpose). This proposal relates to additional planning and administration officer time associated with these additional S106 agreements. It is considered that the introduction of a fee schedule for monitoring BNG is a reasonable approach.
- 4.5 The Council could continue applying the current pre-application advice fees and methodology for generating a fee for PPAs. Whilst there will be some continuation of applicants utilising the service, this is not recommended as it will lead to confusion and inconsistencies in the pre-application fees being applied to development proposals falling outside of the defined categories; it will continue to result in inconsistencies in the fee being applied to PPAs and some services will also continue being provided without cost recovery, thus not maximising the Council's opportunities in this regard. Inconsistencies and significant increases in fees will likely deter applicants from engaging in these processes, resulting in poorer quality in proposals submitted at application stage, increased risk of appeals and the associated costs and inefficient use of officer time resulting potential backlogs.

5 Consultation Undertaken or Proposed

- 5.1 Further to consideration of the report at Policy and Resources Committee on 12 June 2025 (which set out the related processes which supported the proposed fees being derived) a Task and Finish Group was set up to seek clarification and to reach agreement on the proposals.

6 Implications

Issue	Implications
Corporate Plan	The proposals would align with the Corporate Plan as it would enable the Planning Service to better operate within its resources whilst maintaining the ability to engage with communities and deliver the service in a transparent and efficient way.

Financial, Resource and Property	The proposal to introduce a fee schedule for the submission of amendments / additional information would enable the Council to recover the costs associated with this discretionary process that is already undertaken. The proposal to introduce a fee schedule for monitoring BNG sites would enable the Council to recover costs associated with monitoring activities for a significant period. The proposal to introduce a revised pre-application advice and post decision fee schedule and a new PPA fee schedule would enable to the Council to maximise the recovery of costs associated with this discretionary process that is already undertaken. The agreed Council budget for 25/26 indicates an additional £50k planning fee income will be secured across chargeable services. These fees will contribute towards that, as well as to wider service budgetary pressures.
Legal, Statutory and Procurement	The provision of a planning function and processing applications made to the Planning Service is a statutory requirement. However, the submission and processing of amendments and additional information to undetermined applications, the provision of pre-application and post-decision advice and entering into PPAs, are discretionary elements of the planning function that already occurs within Swale. In accordance with Section 93 of the Local Government Act 2003 and Section 3 of the Localism Act 2011, the suggested approach to recover costs associated with this work is lawful and has no other legal or procurement implications. The CIL Regulations allow for the cost of monitoring BNG to be secured and therefore the suggested approach to recover costs in this way is manner is also lawful and has no other legal or procurement implications.
Crime and Disorder	There are no implications for crime and disorder.
Environment and Climate/Ecological Emergency	With regard to the introduction of fees in relation to the submission of amendments / further information, the revision of pre-application and post-decision advice fees and the introduction of a fee schedule for PPAs, there are no direct implications in respect of the environment and the climate/ecological emergency. Including an Officer discretion at managerial level within the department to discount the fee or allow further amendments where an improvement to an acceptable scheme is proposed (perhaps to deliver energy efficiency or renewable energy facilities) could

	ensure that the suggested approach does not prohibit gains in this regard. The introduction of fees for monitoring BNG would have a positive impact on the environment and would contribute positively towards addressing the ecological emergency. The introduction of monitoring fees would ensure the Council has adequate resources to undertake their duty to monitor and report on the delivery of BNG and take appropriate action where this may be failing.
Health and Wellbeing	There are no implications for health and wellbeing.
Safeguarding of Children, Young People and Vulnerable Adults	There are no implications for the safeguarding of children, young people and vulnerable adults.
Risk Management and Health and Safety	With all the proposals set out, there is a risk in the potential change to the image of the Council arising from the introduction of a practice that is adding more cost for applicants. However, the introduction of fees in relation to discretionary services and to monitor BNG is becoming commonplace and it is considered that the benefits will outweigh the costs. No Health and Safety issues are anticipated.
Equality and Diversity	None at this stage.
Privacy and Data Protection	None at this stage.

7 Appendices

- 7.1 The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report:
- 4.2 Appendix I: Comparison tables of pre-application advice fees currently being applied by Kent Local Planning Authorities.

8 Background Documents

- 8.1 Item 10 Policy and Resources Committee 12 June 2025 - New and Amended Fees for Applications made to the Planning Service.

Link: (Public Pack)Agenda Document for Policy and Resources Committee, 12/06/2025 19:00

Appendix I

**Comparison tables of pre-application advice fees currently being applied by Kent
Local Planning Authorities**

Comparison of Current Pre-app Fees with Kent Authorities

* indicates the highest amount.

** indicates the lowest amount.

	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting SV & Written	Meeting	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written
Category	Swale (Current)	Ashford	Canterbury Inc SV	Dartford	Dover	Folkestone and Hythe	Gravesham	Maidstone	Medway	Sevenoaks	Thanet Updated (19/05/2025)	Tonbridge & Malling	Tunbridge Wells
Householder (works to an existing dwelling)	360.00	353.00	515.00	360.00	220.00	218.00	*489.00	367.00	233.00 (meeting only)	186.30	215.00	312.00 (written only)	**110.00
Minor Development (where any of the following applies: Includes between 1-9 dwellings Covers upto 0.5ha Commercial development less than 1000sqm	989.50	Resi 832-1386 Comm 198.50 - 1588	1500.00	Resi 1038.00 – 1218.00 Comm 1038	Resi 720.00 – 1100.00 Comm 355.00 – 1320.00	735.00 – 1130.00 Comm 360.00 – 1359.76		755.00 – 1069.00	802.00	698.63	675.00	*1221.00 (1-4) - 1832.00 (5-9)	**220.00
Major Development (where any of the following applies: Includes between 10-49 dwellings Covers between 0.51 – 2 ha Commercial development between 1000-4999sqm	*3545.00 – £3600.00 +100 per additional dwelling	Resi 3307.50 Comm. 1440.00 + 600.00 per 500.00 sqm	5250.00	2534.40 + 816.00 for unallocated sites	1320.00 Comm 1285.00 + 535.00 per 500.00 sqm	3500.00 Comm 1359.76 + 437.50 per 525 sqm		**1509.00	2405.00	2296.10	3200.00	2973.00 (10-99)	500.00 per hour - 995.00 per hour

Large Major Development (where any of the following applies: Includes between 50-249 dwellings Covers between 2.1 – 5 ha Commercial development between 5000-9999sqm	*6000.00 + 100.00 per addition dwelling *For 200 dwellings the fee is 21000.00 Comm over 10000 sqm 6000.00	Resi 5292.00	7494.00	3414.00 +1650.00 for unallocated sites	5475.00	5700.00		**1793.00	4808.00	3415.52	6000.00 (50-199) – 8000.00 (200+)	2973.00 (10-99) - 3850.00 (100+)	995.00 per hour
Strategic Major Development (where any of the following applies: Includes between 250+ dwellings Covers more than 5 ha Commercial development of 10000sqm or more	*Fees above applicable. *For 250 dwellings the fee is 26000.00	6000.00 + PPA	7494.00	3414.00 +1650.00 for unallocated sites	5475.00	5700.00		**1793.00	4808.00	3415.52	8000.00	3850.00 (100+)	995.00 per hour
Heritage and Urban Design attendance at meeting (per hour) NB: This fee is in addition to those above, however written advice will continue to be provided on a case by case basis	£257.00	Per hour		210.00				252.00 – 565.00	*280.00		**150.00		

Listed building (householder) – Written advice only	£123.50	441.00	515.00		450.00	294.00	*520.00	**94.00	170.00				
Local not-for-profit charities	**Free	*50% of fee			*50% of fee	*50% of fee							Free unless represented and then fee based on above dependent on scale of development
Others not in category above charged at an hourly rate	Price on application. Hourly rates proposed			504		*800.00						473.00 (written only)	
* Parish Councils, Voluntary Organisations, National Charities or Charities that are not ‘not-for-profit’ will be charged based on development size	Fee will be charged on dev. Size.	50% of fee or at discretion of Assistant Director			50% of fee	50% of fee							**Free unless represented and then fee based on above dependent on scale of development
Design Review													
Admin Fee Applied to any refund that may have been agreed due to exceptional circumstances.													

Comparison of Proposed Pre-app Fees with Kent Authorities

* indicates the highest amount.

** indicates the lowest amount.

	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting, SV & Written	Meeting	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written	Meeting & Written
Category	Swale (Proposed)	Ashford	Canterbury Inc SV	Dartford	Dover	Folkestone and Hythe	Gravesham	Maidstone	Medway	Sevenoaks	Thanet Updated (19/05/2025)	Tonbridge & Malling	Tunbridge Wells
Householder (works to an existing dwelling)	360.00	353.00	515.00	360.00	220.00	218.00	*489.00	367.00	233.00 (meeting only)	186.30	215.00	312.00 (written only)	**110.00
Minor Development (where any of the following applies: Includes between 1-9 dwellings Covers upto 0.5ha Commercial development less than 1000sqm)	989.50	Resi 832-1386 Comm 198.50 - 1588	1500.00	Resi 1038.00 – 1218.00 Comm 1038	Resi 720.00 – 1100.00 Comm 355.00 – 1320.00	735.00 – 1130.00 Comm 360.00 – 1359.76		755.00 – 1069.00	802.00	698.63	675.00	*1221.00 (1-4) - 1832.00 (5-9)	**220.00
Major Development (where any of the following applies: Includes between 10-49 dwellings Covers between 0.51 – 2 ha Commercial development between 1000-4999sqm)	*3545.00	Resi 3307.50 Comm. 1440.00 + 600.00 per 500.00 sqm	5250.00	2534.40 + 816.00 for unallocated sites	1320.00 Comm 1285.00 + 535.00 per 500.00 sqm	3500.00 Comm 1359.76 + 437.50 per 525 sqm		**1509.00	2405.00	2296.10	3200.00	2973.00 (10-99)	500.00 per hour - 995.00 per hour
Large Major Development (where any of the following applies: Includes between 50-249 dwellings Covers between 2.1 – 5 ha Commercial development between 5000-9999sqm)	5395.00	Resi 5292.00	7494.00	3414.00 +1650.00 for unallocated sites	5475.00	5700.00		**1793.00	4808.00	3415.52	*6000.00 – 50-199) – 8000.00 (200+)	2973.00 (10-99) - 3850.00 (100+)	995.00 per hour

Strategic Major Development (where any of the following applies: Includes between 250+ dwellings Covers more than 5 ha Commercial development of 10000sqm or more	6500.00 + discounted PPA	6000.00 + PPA	7494.00	3414.00 +1650.00 for unallocated sites	5475.00	5700.00		**1793.00	4808.00	3415.52	*8000.00	3850.00 (100+)	995.00 per hour
Heritage and Urban Design attendance at meeting (per hour) NB: This fee is in addition to those above, however written advice will continue to be provided on a case by case basis	£260.00	Per hour		210.00				252.00 – 565.00	*280.00		**150.00		
Listed building (householder) – Written advice only	£150.00	441.00	515.00		450.00	294.00	*520.00	**94.00	170.00				
Local not-for-profit charities	**Free	*50% of fee			*50% of fee	*50% of fee							Free unless represented and then fee based on above dependent on scale of development
Others not in category above charged at an hourly rate	Price on application. Hourly rates proposed			504		*800.00						473.00 (written only)	
* Parish Councils, Voluntary Organisations, National Charities or Charities that are not ‘not-for-profit’ will be charged based on development size	50% of the above relevant pre-application advice fee.	50% of fee or at discretion of Assistant Director			50% of fee	50% of fee							**Free unless represented and then fee based on above dependent on scale of development
Design Review	To be advised at the time of request												

Admin Fee Applied to any refund that may have been agreed due to exceptional circumstances.	£75.00												
---	---------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--