A separate table has been produced setting out all other London boroughs available information on charging of applicants and fees payable to reviewers for design review services. This is based on publicly available information and contacting the councils directly.

This analysis uses these figures. This is backed up by the UCL study. This found that panel members were paid between £200 and £400, with an average of £300 across all panels and chairs being paid about 1/3 more.

A range of types of review are offered as well as initial and subsequent reviews, which attract different fees, and some boroughs produce tables. Based on this analysis, a similar arrangement is suggested for Merton.

It is important that the system of fees and charging remains cost neutral, so a 'worst case scenario' is envisaged in order to set the minimum fee. The types of review are set out in the table below.

	Full Review _(Chair +5 reviewers)_	**Workshop/Early Review** _(Chair + 3 reviewers)_	**Desktop Review** _(Chair + 1 reviewer)_
First Review	_Maximum_ Fee Charged Cost = £2,000	Cost = £1,400	Not Available
Subsequent Reviews	Cost = £2,000	Not Available	_Minimum_ Fee Charged Cost = £800

Note: a desktop review is only considered suitable for a scheme returning to the panel after a full review, so is not available as a first review. An informal workshop review is most appropriate for an early stage review so this is not considered appropriate for a subsequent review. Definitions could be linked to the RIBA work stages.

Work expected for reviewer fees

It should be noted that the costs, which are the fees paid to the reviewers are a single cost. This is irrespective of how many schemes are on the agenda.

The format proposed is that a review session takes place in the afternoon, with a maximum of three schemes reviewed in any one session. Each scheme would be allocated a maximum of 60 minutes on the agenda, though this could take less time depending on the size, complexity and how far advanced the design was.

Panel members would be expected to visit all the sites being reviewed. It is envisaged that, for the sake of flexibility, this does not need to be done collectively (though this could be

arranged). Therefore, the morning would be allocated for members to undertake their site visits. Thus, the time taken out of a reviewer's day job would be a maximum of one day.

Currently members are expected to review the on-line plans and documents in their own time in the week preceding the panel meeting. This arrangement would remain. Panel members who don't/cannot attend a meeting for any reason, will not get paid. There is also the option of charging applicants 'no-show' penalties (like non-returnable deposits), which is done by Haringey according to a sliding scale.

The new role of the Chair would include more work outside this in terms of co-ordination and discussion with the panel administrator, some duties outside the meetings as well as the management and running of the meeting itself. This is set out in the UCL review and is the reason why the chair's fee is higher. Attendance at PAC by the chair is also considered a possibility and this would be renumerated separately.

Cost Scenarios

The fees outlined above are irrespective of the number of reviews. The 'worst case' scenario in terms of income would be for only one item to be on the agenda as a **Subsequent Review** in the form of a **Desktop Review**. The cost of this would be £800, so the lowest fee should be no lower than this.

The 'best case' scenario would be for there to be three items on the agenda as a **Full Review** at **First Review** stage. The cost of this would be £2,000, so the highest fee should be no lower than this.

Other things need to be factored into this. This includes a general 'contingency', catering costs (£25 per meeting currently – but not included in calculations below) and whether increased officer time should be taken into account. This includes not just the administrator but also case officer attendance, even though this would take place during the working day. There is also the opportunity to set fees to provide some level of subsidy to running the DRP service.

Out-sourced DRP services set fees to cover their overheads – including staff costs, which in-house services do not generally have. Private companies (as opposed to DC CABE), according to the UCL review team, make a healthy profit out of providing design review services.

Proposed Fees

Proposed fees are set out in the table below and include a nominal allowance for the 'extras' outlined above. It should be noted that these fees are lower than any other borough charges.

	Full Review *(Chair +5 reviewers)*	Workshop/Early Review *(Chair + 3 reviewers)*	Desktop Review *(Chair + 1 reviewer)*

First Review	£3,000	£2,000	N.A.
Subsequent Reviews	£2,500	N.A.	£1,000

Income/Profit Scenarios

Six review meetings a year, all with three Full Review, First Review fees charged would produce an annual income of £54,000. After costs of members fees of £12,000, this would be a nominal 'profit' of £42,000. If this was increased to a panel meeting every month, the income would be £108,000 and the nominal profit would be £84,000. This is the best-case scenario.

The worst-case scenario is highly unlikely but this would be based on six review meetings a year at which only one item was on the agenda at the Subsequent Desktop stage. This would produce an income of £6,000 and a nominal profit of £1,200. If this was increased to 12 meetings a year, the income would be £12,000 with a nominal profit of £2,400.

The average between the best and worst scenarios for six meetings is £21,600. The average for 12 meetings is £43,200. The closest comparable DRP to Merton in terms of set-up and location is Wandsworth. The on-line information available states there is a single fee of £2,406, though this is likely to be a few years out of date. The UCL study found the average review fee to be £3,670.

This page is intentionally left blank