

Final stage impact assessment

Title: **Reforms to Local Authority charges for building control**

Type of measure: Secondary legislation, statutory guidance

Department or agency: MHCLG...

Contact for enquiries: buildingcontrolcharges@communities.gov.uk

Date: **14 September 2026**

1. Summary of proposal

The reforms aim to:

- Enable full cost recovery for a broader range of building control functions to meet Managing Public Money (MPM) principles. Help to create a resilient and financially sustainable building control profession and service.
- Support the delivery of Government priorities including housing reforms, cladding remediation, net zero, and social infrastructure.
- Respond to the Grenfell Tower Inquiry Phase 2 Report and the Government's commitment to delivery of a financially sustainable vision for building control services.

2. Strategic case for proposed regulation

Since the Building (Local Authority Charges) Regulations were last substantively updated in 2010, the scope and complexity of building control activity have increased significantly. Following the Grenfell Tower fire and Dame Judith Hackitt's Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety (2017-18), the Government committed to reform of the building safety system, leading to the Building Safety Act 2022 and the establishment of the Building Safety Regulator.

Local authority building control bodies (LABCBs) now undertake a broader range of statutory functions, including enhanced scrutiny of complex buildings, greater interaction with national regulators, increased compliance and enforcement activity, and support for stronger objectives regarding energy efficiency, climate resilience and accessibility.

However, charging powers have not kept pace with these changes. Evidence from local authorities indicates persistent structural deficits, an ageing workforce, recruitment and retention challenges, and constrained investment in training and digital systems.

Without intervention, these pressures would continue to undermine service resilience, increase reliance on council tax subsidy, and limit the ability of building control to deliver effective assurance and enforcement. Updating the charging framework is therefore necessary to ensure financial sustainability, support delivery of post-Grenfell reforms, and maintain public confidence in the safety and performance of buildings.

The Government convened an independent panel (chaired by Dame Judith Hackitt) in 2025 in response to the Grenfell Tower Inquiry's final report's recommendation that such a panel should review the Inquiry's findings for the delivery of building control functions for most building work in England.

The independent panel published its findings on 20 May 2026 and supported implementation of the review of the 2010 Regulations. The reforms will enable fuller cost recovery for a wider range of statutory building control functions, modernise the charging framework, and support investment in workforce capability and digital improvements as part of the Government's wider building control reform programme. In doing so, a review should seek to remove outdated restrictions that prevent services investing in the staff, technology and skills they need, including for training and enforcement, which should drive up better construction quality. An aim is to increase capacity for such investment as fuller cost-recovery for better services takes effect locally. This will complement a £55m investment in building control capacity and capability, which was announced on 26 March 2026.

The panel also found that building control must also transition to a modern digital system, establishing a digital backbone that can be utilised easily by regulators, building control authorities and those seeking building control approval. This would be accompanied by clear national data standards.

Implementation of these regulations will be monitored alongside the wider programme of building control reform, including related work on digital systems and data standards.

Furthermore, in March 2026, the Government confirmed the final technical specifications for the Future Homes and Buildings Standards (FHBS), laid a Statutory Instrument, and updated statutory guidance as well as the approved methodology to make the necessary changes. The FHBS will drive up the energy performance standards for new homes and buildings, lowering energy bills, while ensuring that new buildings are zero carbon ready. However, the current Building Regulations prohibit the relaxation or dispensation of several energy efficiency regulations, which could prevent development in circumstances where a building control body deems it unreasonable for a building to meet the requirements of the FHBS.

3. SMART objectives for intervention

These regulations will allow local authorities to recover the costs of a wider range of building control functions. This will help create more financially sustainable services, reduce

reliance on local funding, and support delivery of wider Government priorities, including new housing, cladding remediation and net zero.

Managing Public Money principles for services, such as building control, require service users (or polluters in the broadest sense) to pay for them rather than from other local funding, such as council tax.

The consultation on most of the proposed changes received wide backing from local authorities and the Building Control Independent Panel, which was set up by the Government in response to the Grenfell Tower Inquiry's final report's recommendations. In the Government's response, it said it would work with the sectors to make local authority services more financially sustainable. Private sector building control providers were not supportive of the proposals where costs would fall to them, but they have the choice to absorb costs or pass them on to clients.

Objective Area	SMART Objective	Indicators of Success	Alignment with HMG Objectives
Financial sustainability	Enable Local Authority Building Control Bodies (LABCBs) to recover, as fully as possible, the costs of expanded number of statutory building control functions from September 2026, reducing reliance on council tax subsidy.	• Data on local authority finances	Supports fiscal sustainability
Fairness and polluter-pays	Shift the cost burden from local taxpayers to those commissioning or generating building control activity (e.g. allowing their buildings to become dangerous), in line with HM Treasury charging principles. Require LAs to publish their charges and financial statements online yearly, thereby increasing transparency.	• Share of total building control costs recovered through charges (where published) • Stakeholder feedback on fairness and transparency	Supports growth, fairness, and HM Treasury Managing Public Money principles
Improved capacity in the sector	Fuller cost recovery through the exercise of more chargeable functions should enable LAs to recruit, train and develop more building inspectors and	• Increase in numbers of Registered Building Inspectors (data collected by the	Supports growth ambitions (e.g. home building, net zero, and construction quality and safety.

	improve digital processes, which can all add greater efficiency to the building control service	Building Safety Regulator). • Reduction in reported building control recruitment and retention challenges (LGA surveys) • Improvements in annual reportable data on operational standards rules returns KPI 4: competence (knowledge & expertise)¹ • Increase in activity in securing compliance for poor quality workmanship and reduced numbers of dangerous buildings (operational standards rules returns KPI 2)	
Facilitating Development	Allow for dispensation and relaxation of certain energy efficiency regulations where a local authority/the Building Safety Regulator, as appropriate, considers that the operation of the relevant requirement would not be reasonable in the specific circumstances of the case to which a dispensation/relaxation application relates.	Stakeholder feedback on the proportionality of the Building Regulations.	Supports growth ambitions for home building and net zero.

¹ [Operational standards rules monitoring arrangements - GOV.UK](#)

4. Description of proposed intervention and explanation of the logical change process whereby this achieves SMART objectives

The preferred intervention replaces the Building (Local Authority Charges) Regulations 2010 to expand the list of chargeable functions, clarify charging principles, and update requirements for charging schemes. This includes enabling charging for a wider range of statutory activities under the Building Act in addition to the Building Regulations. LABCBs will be empowered to recover direct and indirect costs, charge for specified compliance-related activities, and charge for processing notices and certificates submitted by Registered Building Control Approvers under Part II of the Building Act 1984.

The theory of change is that enabling fuller cost recovery will improve the financial sustainability of LABCBs. This will support recruitment and retention of Registered Building Inspectors, investment in competence and digital capability, and more consistent regulatory activity. Improved capacity will lead to timelier processing of applications, earlier intervention, stronger compliance, and better safety, environmental and equality outcomes across the built environment.

The preferred intervention will also remove the current restriction within the Building Regulations 2010 that prohibits the relaxation or dispensation of Regulations 25A, 25B and 26, which relate to energy efficiency measures in buildings. This would avoid lowering the ambition of the Future Homes and Buildings Standards whilst not restricting development in the circumstances where the operation of the standards might be considered to be unreasonable. It is our view that the use of the dispensation/relaxation power to dispense with the requirements in Regulations 25A, 25B or 26 will be rare, and this power does not extend to educational buildings, buildings of statutory undertakers and buildings of the Crown, including work undertaken for or on behalf of the Crown.

5. Description of policy options

Two options were considered:

Option 1: Do nothing

- The do-nothing option (i.e. non-legislative and maintaining the existing framework measures) was discounted as insufficient to address structural funding issues; it would perpetuate deficits, constrain capacity and undermine safety. Many users of services would continue to have them supplied free, which would mean either costs being borne by taxpayers, or services being cut further. This would mean the service would continue to be non-compliant with Managing Public Money principles.

- The do-nothing option would not bring into effect the ability to charge for activities and functions under s105B of the Building Act 1984 itself, which came within scope through Building Safety Act 2022 amendments.
- This option would also retain the current restrictions that would prohibit the dispensation or relaxation of some energy efficiency requirements relating to the Future Homes and Buildings Standards. This could prevent development in circumstances where meeting the new Future Homes and Buildings Standards is genuinely not achievable. Examples might include remote off-grid sites (where we might expect alternative non-electric heating such as biofuels) or novel low-carbon heating trials.

Option 2: Legislative reform

- Legislative reform includes extending the range of functions and activities for which LABCBs can charge.
- The most common set of these concerns the acceptance of notices and certificates submitted by Registered Building Control Approvers to local authorities. This activity has provided the largest data around costs in this Impact Assessment. Partly due to low capacity in the sector concerning many of the other new chargeable functions, data concerning costs or frequency of use of these is very limited.
- Such chargeable functions include the issuing of notices (underpinned by inspections and any necessary tests or reports) seeking compliance with the Building Regulations 2010 where workmanship on a site is inadequate; and where it is established that an existing building is dangerous, or a demolition is requested or required.
- It is expected that legislative reform will improve longer-term capacity alongside the Government's £55m investment announced on 26 March 2026.
- More cost recovery will result in better capacity in the sector to support construction-related growth, including the building of more and better-quality new homes, which, in turn will reduce the use of temporary accommodation and the poor outcomes that often is associated with such accommodation.
- More capacity and cost-recovery are also likely to result in more compliance inspections and notices. Although data is weak on compliance-related activity, the knock-on effect of such action could result in better quality building works as local authorities clamp down on poor quality construction, fewer complaints and journeys to put things right, and better productivity in the longer-term.
- Legislative reform was therefore identified as the only viable option to achieve the policy objectives.
- Legislative reform would enable the necessary amendments to be made to permit for dispensation and relaxation of certain energy efficiency regulations (Regulation 25A, 25B and 26 of the Building Regulations 2010) where a local authority or the Building Safety Regulator, as appropriate, considers that the operation of these requirements would be unreasonable in the specific circumstances of the case to which the dispensation/relaxation application relates.

6. Regulatory scorecard for preferred option

(1) Overall impacts on total welfare		Directional rating
Description of overall expected impact	The monetised impact of this policy represents a transfer of costs from local authority building control to private sector building bodies/applicants. There is minimal additional economic activity, to consider relaxation and dispensation requests for energy efficiency regulations, compared to the do-nothing option. The additional economic activity for local authorities to consider any additional relaxation and dispensation requests is estimated as £185,000 in year 1, £56,000 in year 2 and £19,000 from year 3 onwards. As such, it is not estimated to have a significant net impact on overall social welfare. Increased fee income from new chargeable functions is expected to contribute to increased local authority building control capacity, potentially resulting in increased economic activity under the policy. This has not been monetised. Higher public sector capacity may indirectly bring benefits to building safety.	Positive Based on all impacts (incl. non-monetised)
Monetised impacts	The monetised impact of this policy represents a transfer of costs from local authority building control to private sector building bodies/applicants. There is minimal additional economic activity, to consider relaxation and dispensation requests for energy efficiency regulations, compared to the do-nothing option. The additional economic activity for local authorities to consider any additional relaxation and dispensation requests is estimated as £185,000 in year 1, £56,000 in year 2 and £19,000 from year 3 onwards. As such, it is not estimated to have a significant net impact on overall social welfare. No direct social benefits from this policy have been monetised.	Neutral Based on likely £NPSV
Non-monetised impacts	There are possible direct benefits from this policy that have not been monetised due to lack of data.	Positive

	As local authorities will now be able to raise additional revenue to cover direct and indirect costs including costs of new hires and retention and training of staff, this may result in additional economic activity under the policy. This may include faster processing of notifications and increased building control activities. These impacts are non-monetised due to the lack of data but are expected to have a direct benefit to overall social welfare. Higher public sector capacity may indirectly bring benefits to building safety.	
Any significant or adverse distributional impacts?	No significant adverse distributional impacts have been identified.	Neutral

(2) Expected impacts on businesses

Description of overall business impact	Monetised net present cost to private sector building control bodies through chargeable functions is estimated as £134.2m (low: £22m; high: £654.8m) over the 10-year appraisal period. To note, this is based on an assumed volume of common building control notices and associated local authority resource requirement which would be chargeable. Due to uncertainty in these assumptions, results are presented as a range and central estimates may represent an underestimate of total cost to business. Additional fees to cover 'new' activities or improvements to existing activities (previously unfunded) have not been monetised due to lack of data, with the exception of charges for considering requests for dispensation/relaxation in relation to the requirements in Regulations 25A, 25B or 26, as detailed in the table above. There is a monetised equivalent net direct annual cost to business (EANDCB) of £15.6m (low: £2.6m; high: £76.1m).	Negative
---	---	-----------------

Monetised impacts	Monetised net present cost to private sector building control bodies through chargeable functions is estimated as £134.2m (low: £22m; high: £654.8m) over the 10-year appraisal period. To note, this is based on an assumed volume of common building control notices and associated local authority resource requirement which would be chargeable. Due to uncertainty in these assumptions, results are presented as a range. There is a monetised equivalent net direct annual cost to business (EANDCB) of £15.6m (low: £2.6m; high: £76.1m). There are no direct monetised benefits of this policy on business.	Negative Based on likely business £NPV
Non-monetised impacts	Transfer of costs of reviewing notices from public to private sector building control bodies may make private sector building control bodies relatively less competitive. This impact will depend on the price elasticity of demand of consumers, and the ability of private sector building control to absorb cost increases into their margins. Additional charges to cover 'new' activities or improvements to existing activities (previously unfunded) have not been monetised due to lack of data, with the exception of charges for considering requests for dispensation/relaxation in relation to the requirements in Regulations 25A, 25B or 26, as detailed in the table above.	Negative
Any significant or adverse distributional impacts?	No significant adverse distributional impacts identified.	Neutral

(3) Expected impacts on households

Description of overall	There are not expected to be any direct impacts on households from this policy.	Positive
-------------------------------	---	-----------------

household impact	There may be some indirect benefits if increased revenue translates to higher local authority building control capacity and therefore building safety outcomes. However, the impact of these is uncertain and has not been quantified. There may be some non-monetised costs to households where the additional costs to private sector building control bodies are passed-through to consumer prices.	
Monetised impacts	There are not expected to be any direct impacts on households from this policy.	Neutral Based on likely household £NPV
Non-monetised impacts	There may be some indirect benefits if increased revenue translates to higher local authority building control capacity and therefore building safety outcomes. However, the impact of these is uncertain and has not been quantified. There may be some non-monetised costs to households where the additional costs to private sector building control bodies are passed-through to consumer prices. This will depend on elasticity of demand of consumers for functions where public and private building control bodies overlap, and the extent to which private sector cost increases are absorbed into margins.	Positive
Any significant or adverse distributional impacts?	No significant adverse distributional impacts identified.	Neutral

Part B: Impacts on wider government priorities

Category	Description of impact	Directional rating
Business environment: Does the measure impact on the ease of doing business in the UK?	As this policy represents a cost transfer from public to private sector building control bodies, there may be a drop in relative competitiveness of private sector building control services. Increased revenue for public sector building control bodies may also result in an increase in competitiveness.	Uncertain

	This will depend on elasticity of demand of consumers for functions where public and private building control bodies overlap, and the extent to which private sector cost increases are absorbed into margins.	
International Considerations: Does the measure support international trade and investment?	No significant direct impact on international trade is expected.	Neutral
Natural capital and Decarbonisation:	No significant impact on the environment is expected. Allowing dispensations or relaxations of the requirements in Regulations 25A, 25B or 26 could have a limited negative environmental effect, as we anticipate that a small number of developments may be permitted to exceed the emissions targets set by the Future Homes and Buildings Standards (where deemed reasonable by the relevant building control authority). However, the overall impact would be minimal, for the following reasons: • The number of dispensation requests is expected to be very low, with even fewer likely to be approved. Based on consultation with Local Authority Building Control, we project 50 relaxation or dispensation applications nationally in the first year, 15 in the second year, and 5 from the third year onwards. • Some dispensations/relaxations may not result in higher emissions - for example, those granted for trials of novel low-carbon technologies or which relate to regulation 25A.	Neutral

7. Monitoring and evaluation of preferred option

The Government will monitor implementation through data on published charging schemes, statements published on surpluses and deficits, service delivery, sustainability, workforce capacity and complaints.

Post-implementation review will assess whether the reforms are meeting objectives, including impacts on safety, disability groups and SMEs as far as possible, and will inform any future adjustments. This will be carried out within the Government's wider programme of Building Control reform, including the Digital Building Control Roadmap and consideration of the recommendations of the Building Control Independent Panel.

8. Minimising administrative and compliance costs for preferred option

The reforms are expected to have no or minimal administrative costs to RBCAs/applicants. The administrative costs associated with applications are mostly already in existence (in the do-nothing option/baseline) so the only additional administrative cost is in making payments to LABCBs.

While the reforms will allow LABCBs to charge for a much wider set of functions and activities, they build on existing charging scheme processes. LABCBs will publish schemes online which will improve transparency for users of such services helping dutyholders understand and anticipate costs.

Specifically on the reforms to enable the consideration of dispensation or relaxation requests in relation to regulations 25A, 25B and/or 26, we expect there to be some additional costs to LABCBs arising from a potential increase in new dispensation and relaxation requests (as detailed in previous sections).

Where the Building Safety Regulator is the building control authority for higher-risk building work, existing charging arrangements already enable recovery of the costs of assessing applications for directions dispensing with or relaxing building regulations. Higher-risk buildings are subject to enhanced regulatory oversight, and as such, we do not anticipate applicants to seek to depart from energy efficiency requirements for these building types.

The Building Safety Regulator is also responsible for determining appeals where a local authority has refused an application for dispensation or relaxation, as such we expect the number of appeals relating to Regulations 25A, 25B and 26 to be capped at the upper-bound estimates for local authority applications set out above. Under the Building Safety Regulator's existing charging regime, it can recover the costs of considering appeals where the original decision is upheld. We therefore expect these changes to impose minimal additional administrative costs on the Building Safety Regulator.

We have assumed no costs attributable to 'one-off' implementation costs or familiarisation with the measure to permit dispensation/relaxation applications for regulation 25A, 25B and 26. It is assumed local authorities and the Building Safety Regulator will have existing processes and governance structures in place, alongside staff with the necessary skills to assess dispensation/relaxation requests or be able to hire those with the necessary skills to do so.

Declaration

Department:

Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government

Contact details for enquiries: Paul.Whittlesea@communities.gov.uk

Minister Responsible: Minister for Building Safety, Fire and Resilience, Baroness Blake of Leeds

Evidence base

Impact Assessment: Reforms to Local Authority charges for building control

1. Strategic case for proposed regulation and summary of proposal

Problem under consideration

Building Control as a local authority service has been in decline for many years, resulting in services that have often become ill-equipped to support sustained major housing, public sector and commercial development ambitions and requirements. Symptoms of this include a workforce that is skewed to people fast approaching retirement, under-resourced services, and a workforce that has been lacking in necessary skills or sufficient numbers to help the Building Safety Regulator (BSR) in its work through Multi-Disciplinary Teams in assessing proposed works regarding higher-risk buildings^[1] (HRBs).

The current Building Regulations prohibit the relaxation or dispensation of several energy efficiency regulations, which could prevent development in circumstances where meeting the newly published Future Homes and Buildings Standards may be considered unreasonable by building control bodies.

What evidence is there to support the problem statement?

A search of Local Authority Building Control service websites revealed that most services that have published relevant information have operated at a significant and growing deficit. This has been confirmed through engagement with local authorities across England.

There are a considerable number of non-chargeable activities that Local Authority Building Control Bodies (LABCBs) have to provide. This limitation means that their capacity is split between non-chargeable and chargeable work. This limits the revenue that LABCBs can generate and therefore, they are frequently not able to fund the recruitment and development of staff sufficiently; in a few cases LABCBs' websites have said recently that they do not have the capacity to handle any new building control applications. Local Government Association/LABC workforce survey² in 2024 showed that there were significant levels of vacancies that local authorities were carrying.

A key example of non-chargeable set of functions is the fact that local authorities are providing their private sector competitors, Registered Building Control Approvers (RBCAs), with a free service in checking and logging documents at the beginning and final stages in their building control processes. RBCAs provide several building control services for individuals or developers, often spanning several local authority areas, or even across the whole of England. Their compliance and enforcement activities are more limited than LABCBs, but they have to submit their documentation for various checks to the LABCB in which any given building project is located.

Government had proposed in the Future Homes and Buildings Standards consultation to allow developers to apply for dispensations/relaxation of regulation 26 and to revoke regulations 25A and 25B. Responses were generally supportive of this proposal, though issues of adequate local

² LG Workforce Strategy Survey, 2024.

authority building control resource were raised given that they would currently be unable to charge for the consideration of such applications. The FHBS consultation response explained that regulations 25A and 25B would be kept as they may serve as a useful backstop to guarantee a baseline of energy efficiency in certain types of buildings that might otherwise be exempt from stricter requirements (e.g. Crown buildings). The consultation response also explained that removing the prohibition on dispensation/relaxation of regulation 26 was to be kept under review pending the outcome of the fees and charges consultation, given the concerns raised about LABCBs not being able to be charge for reviewing dispensation applications.

Following the response of the fees and charges consultation, subsequent work identified that regulations 25A and 25B are closely linked to regulation 26, creating uncertainty where a dispensation/relaxation from regulation 26 is granted. We are therefore proposing to enable dispensation and relaxation from regulations 25A and 25B alongside regulation 26 in circumstances where this is reasonable, to ensure the regime operates coherently.

Why is government intervention necessary?

The proposed reforms seek to expand the range of chargeable functions and activities for LABCBs to support them achieve greater cost recovery and create a more competitive building control sector. These reforms will particularly bring into scope charges where LABCBs currently provide free services to their private sector competitors. Other changes will enable authorities to charge for functions and activities that facilitate better inspection and compliance. The Government's proposed intervention to do this is through amending the regulations that set the parameters of chargeable functions and activities and how the charges are to be calculated, because this has not been done to any significant extent since 2010^[3].

The change to permit dispensation or relaxation of certain energy efficiency requirements will be delivered through an amendment to regulation 11(3) of the Building Regulations 2010. The ability to charge for the consideration of these dispensation/relaxation requests will be through amending the parameters of chargeable functions and activities, as above.

What gaps or harms would occur if government doesn't intervene?

Without intervention local authorities will continue to be underfunded due to having to provide non-chargeable services and the following problems remaining.

LABCBs are currently not resourced for checking RBCA notices. If LABCBs were able to charge, this would enable them to carry out more effective scrutiny of notices or other chargeable checking activity.

Without this change, the lack of time spent on chargeable activities, would mean lower revenues for LABCBs. This could lead to LABCBs continuing to struggle in hiring more staff or sufficiently training staff meaning an on-going reliance on an ageing workforce whose retirement would further reduce capacity in the sector. There would be an increased reliance on the use of more expensive agency staff to fill gaps.

Lack of capacity would continue to cause delays in building control approval, limiting the work that LABCBs can undertake (restricted to some statutory duties), and reduced scrutiny over the building control process, including minimal site visits and very low levels, if any, of requiring compliance relating to poor construction work.

Furthermore, without this change to the dispensation/relaxation requirements in relation to regulations 25A, 25B and/or 26, development may be unfairly restricted in areas where required compliance with the Future Homes and Buildings Standards is deemed unreasonable. These circumstances may arise for remote off-grid sites or for novel low-carbon heating trials.

2. Description the proposed option

Assumptions applicable to all analysis

Since the consultation's published assessment of impacts, MHCLG has gathered additional survey data from the organisations Local Authority Building Control and the Association of Building Control Approvers (ABCA). This has increased the sample size of building control bodies surveyed compared to consultation stage and allowed for the refinement of analytical assumptions around volumes of notices and typical wage ranges.

However, there are limitations to this approach. Firstly, as responses to the survey were voluntary, there may be a degree of selection bias. Figures provided were also self-reported by respondents, meaning the quality assurance process is uncertain. Secondly, ABCA do not represent all RBCAs, notably the National House Building Council (NHBC) – the largest private building control company in the UK.

To reflect the uncertainties around key assumptions and representativeness of the sample of building control bodies who responded, all policy analysis is presented in ranges.

Importantly, the analysis below estimates the economic transfer cost between RBCAs and LABCBs by assuming future volumes of common building control notices. These are assumed to comprise a large proportion of chargeable functions which LABCBs are proposed to receive revenue from but should not be taken as an exhaustive list. The presentation of the estimated costs is presented as a range to reflect this uncertainty.

An outline of data sources used in this Impact Assessment is presented in the Annex. Prices are presented in the 2026 price year. Hourly rates of LABCB Registered Building Inspectors (RBIs) (and any other costs borne by LABCBs) are assumed to increase in line with inflation. To account for reasonable overheads charged on economic activity which would have occurred regardless of the policy, an assumed non-wage cost uplift of 27%³ is applied to all wage cost assumptions. Additional charges to cover 'new' economic activity above what is assumed in the counterfactual has not been monetised due to lack of data.

An analytical assumption of how LABCB staff processing Initial notices (INs) divide their time is also applied:

- Technical staff – all time spent processing INs which require further information
- Non-technical staff – time split equally processing INs where further information is required and INs where no further information is required

The survey return about Initial Notices by LABCBs, includes time spent processing INs (excluding time spent on cancellations, amendments, extensions, completions). Time spent processing rejections is included in time spent processing INs.

This analysis incorporates both published and unpublished data sources, including internal MHCLG analysis and survey data collected from stakeholders. The unpublished data have been used to address evidence gaps. However, as these

³ Proportion of total labour costs per hour for public administration staff (SIC O) which are categorised as 'other'. ONS, Index of Labour Costs Per Hour, Seasonally Adjusted, December 2020.

statistics are not part of an official published statistical series, they have not been subject to the same level of external validation and quality assurance and should therefore be interpreted with appropriate caution.

Do nothing option

Currently LABCBs are restricted by the existing 'charging principles' set out in regulations, which prevent them from charging for significantly more of their statutory functions, or prevent them from being able to carry them out at all. This would continue the overall decline in capacity and, in some cases, continue the decline of compliance-seeking activity.

Doing nothing would not take advantage of the flexibilities now available through changes to the Building Safety Act that permit the Government to broaden the scope of chargeable activities and functions for LABCBs.

However, the private sector RBCAs, which have fewer compliance responsibilities, are not subject to any charging regulations or restrictions and can charge for all their activities. Doing nothing would maintain the uneven playing field, with LABCB teams continuing to provide a free service to their competitors, sometimes resulting in RBCA documents not being checked within the prescribed periods set out in legislation for RBCAs^[4].

A do-nothing scenario would lead to the building control system becoming less robust over time.

The preferred option: Changing the regulations to make more functions and activities chargeable

The proposals will enable LABCBs to charge for specified functions that they currently undertake but for which they are not compensated. The analysis presented is based on notices which are commonly submitted to LABCBs by RBCAs which will be in-scope of charging under the policy. This is not an exhaustive list of notices or activities which LABCBs will be able to charge for due to data limitations on less common notifications. The main direct impact of the policy is the transfer of costs from LABCBs to RBCAs. Outside of the consideration of dispensations relating to Regulations 25A, 25B and 26 of the Building Regulations 2010, this is the only monetised impact of the policy and is expected to result in no overall net impact on social value.

In addition, there are expected to be direct benefits to building control capacity through increased revenue (e.g. training and hiring of staff, where this is a reasonable overhead) which may lead to additional economic activity beyond that assumed in the counterfactual. This impact is non-monetised due to lack of data. Increased economic activity of LABCBs may bring an indirect benefit of improving building safety outcomes. Overall, it is assumed that this will have a net positive impact on social value.

The increase in costs on RBCAs may result in a reduction in relative competitiveness to LABCBs for functions which there is overlap, especially where there is a pass-through of costs to consumers. These are uncertain due elasticity of demand and ability of RBCAs to absorb cost increases into their margins, therefore have not been monetised.

Costs

Initial Notices – checks on receipt of INs

At present LABCBs cannot charge for the checks and processing of Initial Notices (INs) submitted by RBCAs to them under section 47 of the Building Act^[5]. INs are the documents that RBCAs send to LABCBs with proposed building plans to let them know that they will be providing building control services for building work to be started in their areas^[6]. It is estimated that approximately 185,000 (106,000 – 304,000) INs are submitted to LABCBs each year. This estimate is based on the Building Safety Regulator's (BSR) Building Control Body Key Performance Indicator (KPI) data⁴. However, this is based only on the first return of data under Operational Standards Rules (OSRs)^[7] under recently commenced provisions under the Building Safety Act 2022. This data is undergoing a process of validation, so there is a level of uncertainty present. Assumptions have been made about the proportion of non-responses to the BSR and a wide range in the proportion of INs to be submitted by RBCAs has been added to reflect the uncertainty. The number of INs submitted is highly correlated with the size of the building stock and therefore is estimated to grow by 0.9% (this is estimated to range from 0.7% to 1.1%) per year to reflect growth across the building stock.

Based on a survey of LABCBs it has been determined that the processing of INs where no further information is required takes on average 15 minutes at a cost of £85 per hour (this is estimated to range from £64 to £108 per hour). The variability around the cost of filing these notices was based on LABCBs reporting the use of different professions or pay grades of LABCB officers for these tasks and variation in time spent processing INs. The central estimates are based on the median value while the range is based on the lower and upper quartiles. There is uncertainty in these estimates.

This produces a net present total estimated cost of £40.7m (this cost is estimated to range from £11.0m in a low scenario to £127.8m in a high scenario) over 10 years.

Initial Notices – INs that require further information

Processing an IN is usually a straightforward process. However, there are some occasions where this process becomes more complex, and further information is required by LABCBs. This is estimated to occur in 4.8% (range of 0.5% to 9.1%) of IN submissions, resulting in 8,900 (range from 500 to 27,700) INs needing further information. The proportion is based on ABCA and LABCB returns, and number of INs is based on the first return of OSR data, and the range around these estimates reflects uncertainty. These INs necessitate an estimated 5.6 (this is estimated to range from 2.3 to 11.3) hours and cost £105 per hour (range from £88 to £117 per hour), based on analysis of data from LABCBs.

This leads to a net present estimated cost of £46.5m (this cost is estimated to range from £1m in a low scenario to £327.8m in a high scenario).

INs received by LABCBs may be rejected. MHCLG analysis of data supplied by ABCA and LABCBs suggests this happens in approximately 2.0% of cases (range of 0.7% to 3.3%). Data limitations mean it is not possible to isolate how much time is spent on rejecting INs. It is assumed that time spent rejecting INs is accounted for by LABCBs when reporting the number of hours spent processing INs. There is uncertainty around this, but as few INs are rejected, this is expected to have a negligible impact on the analysis.

Initial Notices – Amendment Notices

Some INs will require amending from what was originally submitted and therefore the RBCA will need to send an Amendment Notice to the LABCB^[11]. This will require additional time to check and process the Amendment Notice. As with INs, these may also be accepted or rejected on prescribed grounds or subject to imposed requirements as a condition, all of which requires officers' time. These are estimated to occur in 3% (this is estimated to range from 1% to 5%) of IN submissions,

⁴ This figure is based on BSR KPI data provided in 2025. It had been adjusted to 2026 by assuming the number of INs received per annum increased by 0.9%, the average growth in the number of dwellings from 2014 to 2024

based on consultants' estimates, resulting in 5,600 (this is estimated to range from 1,000 to 15,200) INs. They necessitate an additional 0.25 hours (this is estimated to range from 0.13 to 0.5 hours) of LABCB time in the central scenario and incur higher costs of £91 (this is estimated to range from £70 to £110) per hour, based on data from LABCBs.

This leads to a net present estimated cost of £1m (range from £0.1m in a low scenario to £7.4m in a high scenario) over 10 years.

Initial Notices – Extension of Time

There are some circumstances whereby an LABCB can extend the period of an initial notice under regulation 19(7) of the RBCA regulations. The work in understanding these circumstances uses time that could be spent on chargeable work. These are estimated to occur in 3% (this is estimated to range from 1% to 5%) of IN submissions, based on consultants' estimates, resulting in 5,600 (this is estimated to range from 1,100 to 15,200) INs. This is an area of significant uncertainty. They necessitate an additional 0.23 hours (this is estimated to range from 0.11 to 0.45) of LABCB time in the central scenario and incur costs of £91 (this is estimated to range from £70 to £110) per hour, based on data from LABCBs.

This leads to a net present estimated cost of £1m (range from £0.1m in a low scenario to £6.7m in a high scenario) over 10 years.

Cancellation Notices

There are a number of circumstances under which a Cancellation Notice is either given to the LA or issued by the LA relating to the ability of the RBCA in carrying out the work

- the nature of the work being unsuitable for the RBCA or the RBCA is unwilling to act;
- the RBCA is of the opinion that work being carried out contravenes the building regulations and has not been rectified within a prescribed time;
- the RBCA is subject to a disciplinary order, or its registration has been cancelled;
- the work in an IN has not commenced within three years;
- the LA becomes aware that the RBCA is subject to different types of disciplinary orders;
- the work becomes work on a Higher-Risk Building (HRB), which means that the Building Safety Regulator would become the building control body at that point;
- there is a change of RBCA.

In some cases, the RBCA or the person carrying out the work will therefore file a Cancellation Notice with the LABCB to cancel the Initial Notice. This will require additional time from the LABCB to process the Cancellation Notice which could have been spent on chargeable work.

In other cases, the LABCB will need to issue Cancellation Notices. Cancellations are estimated to occur in 1.5% (this is estimated to range from 0.8% to 2.3%) of all IN submissions, based on BSR KPI data, resulting in 2,800 (this is estimated to range from 800 to 6,800) INs. Similarly to above, this is based on the first return of data, so a range is included around these estimates to reflect the uncertainty. They necessitate an additional 0.23 hours (this is estimated to range from 0.11 to 0.45) of LABCB time in the central scenario and incur costs of £91 (this is estimated to range from £70 to £110) per hour, based on data from LABCBs.

This leads to a net present estimated cost of £0.5m (range from £0.1m in a low scenario to £3m in a high scenario) over 10 years.

Final Certificates

Once an RBCA is satisfied that the work to which an IN relates has been completed, the RBCA will need to submit a Final Certificate to the LABCB^[12]. The LABCB will then need to file the Final Certificate requiring time that could be spent on chargeable work. There are estimated to be 1 (this is estimated to range from 0.9 to 1.1) times the number of Final Certificates compared to INs,

resulting in 185,000 (this is estimated to range from 95,000 to 334,000) Final Certificates in the central scenario. Some INs will require multiple Final Certificates, while some INs will not lead to any Final Certificates. For example, a single IN can be submitted for a new housing development but if the houses are completed in blocks, each block will need a Final Certificate submitted in order to be sold. On the other hand, cancelled INs will not result in a Final Certificate. This is an area of uncertainty. Final Certificates are estimated to require 0.25 (this is estimated to range from 0.13 to 0.50) hours of LABCB time in the central scenario and incur costs of £91 (this is estimated to range from £70 to £110) per hour, based on data from LABCBs.

This leads to a net present estimated cost of £37.3m (range from £7.4m in a low scenario to £163.7m in a high scenario) over 10 years.

Charges for non-RBCA work – Demolition Notices

Where the whole or part of a building is to be demolished a notice of intent needs to be submitted to LABCBs before demolition can commence. The LABCB may give a notice about the intended demolition work, which can set certain conditions. If they do, they need to send it to the owner and occupier of adjacent land, the Fire & Rescue Authority and possibly some statutory undertakers for gas, electricity and water. LABCBs inside of London can already charge for the filing of Demolition Notices^[13] and it is estimated that a proportion of LABCBs outside of London charge for Demolition Notices too. It is estimated that there were an average of 5,600 demolitions recorded outside of London in 2015-2025, as per the Housing Supply: Net Additional Dwellings statistics^[14]. However, it is estimated that 10% (this is estimated to range from 20% to 5%) of these Demolition Notices are already being charged for, based on consultants' estimates, however this estimate is uncertain. This results in 5,000 (this is estimated to range from 4,500 to 5,300) Demolition Notices for which LABCBs are not currently charging. These are estimated to require 1.75 (this is estimated to range from 0.88 to 3.50) hours of LABCB time in the central scenario and incur costs of £91 (this is estimated to range from £70 to £110) per hour, based on data from LABCBs.

This leads to a net present estimated cost of £7.1m (range from £2.4m in a low scenario to £18.2m in a high scenario) over 10 years. This would be charged to owners or operators of buildings to be demolished, and not to RBCAs.

Table 1: Cost transfers from LABCB charging policy measures using LABCB provided costs, net present value (£m, 2026 prices, ten-year appraisal period)

Proposals	Low estimate (£m)	Central estimate (£m)	High estimate (£m)
Initial Notices	11.0	40.7	127.8
Initial Notices - further conditions imposed	1.0	46.5	327.8
Initial Notices – Amendment Notices	0.1	1.1	7.4
Initial Notices – Extension of Time	0.1	1.0	6.7
Cancellation Notices	0.1	0.5	3.0
Final Certificates	7.4	37.3	163.7
Demolition Notices	2.4	7.1	18.2
Total^[15]	22.0	134.2	654.8

* note figures may not sum due to rounding

Table 2: Equivalent Annualised Net Direct Cost to Business (£m, 2026 prices)

	Low estimate (£m)	Central estimate (£m)	High estimate (£m)
Equivalent Annualised Net Direct Cost to Business	2.6	15.6	76.1

The costs calculated above largely reflect a transfer from RBCAs to LABCBs, excluding demolition notices, as these costs were covered by LABCBs through their inability to charge for this work. As a result, these costs do not represent a direct cost to society from the policy.

Costs to Consider Requests relating to Regulations 25A, 25B and 26 of the Building Regulations 2010

The additional costs to local authorities for additional responsibilities in considering dispensation or relaxation requests relating to Regulations 25A, 25B and 26 have been calculated separately using a different set of assumptions, reflecting that these are new responsibilities where existing data cannot be used to support analysis. To note that local authorities would be able to charge for considering these relaxation/dispensation requests under the proposed option.

The costs of the proposal have been appraised in accordance with the principles set out in the Green Book where relevant. Estimates of cost were arrived at by calculating a cost per hour of work (£92.73) taken from Local Authority Building Control (LABC) data. This was then multiplied by the numbers of hours worked per dispensation/relaxation request, and the number of requests per year. For these two variables, sensitivity estimates were developed based on engagement with LABC in 2025:

Sensitivity	Hours per request	Cost per request	Annual number of requests
Low	20	£1,900	5
Central	40	£3,700	15
High	80	£7,400	50

Costs per request are rounded to the nearest £100 while total costs are rounded to the nearest £1,000.

For our final estimates, we used the central sensitivity option for cost per relaxation following consultation with LABC.

There is some evidence that the high/ central ranges for the number of dispensation or relaxation requests would be most appropriate initially, as developers interpreted the new guidance to work out where dispensation/relaxation might be possible. Over time, we expect the low sensitivity range would become most appropriate to align with the very low volume of dispensation and relaxation requests across the Building Regulations. As such, we generated estimated total costs to local authorities:

Year	Number of Requests	Total Costs (central estimate)	Total costs (low – high range)
Year 1	50	£185,000	£95,000 - £370,000
Year 2	15	£56,000	£28,500 - £111,000

Year 3 onwards	5	£19,000	£9,500 - £37,000
----------------	---	---------	------------------

These cost estimates are across all local authorities annually. However, the volume of dispensation requests is unlikely to be shared equally across local authorities, as some areas (e.g. more rural authorities) will be more likely to have developments where it would be reasonable to seek dispensation/relaxation of Regulations 25A, 25B and 26.

We have assumed no costs attributable to 'one-off' implementation costs or familiarisation with the measure. It is assumed local authorities and the Building Safety Regulator will have existing processes and governance structures in place, alongside staff with the necessary skills to assess dispensation/relaxation requests or be able to hire those with the necessary skills to do so.

As per Section 8 of the Impact Assessment, we do not anticipate significant additional burdens on the Building Safety Regulator to consider new dispensation/relaxation requests for Higher-Risk Buildings, and we expect the increased number of appeals to consider related to regulations 25A, 25B and 26 will be capped at the upper-bound estimates for local authority applications as set out above. We therefore expect these changes to impose minimal additional costs on the Building Safety Regulator.

We have produced these estimates with the understanding that we will produce non-statutory guidance illustrating examples of factors that building control authorities may wish to take into account when determining applications. This should help reduce speculative requests and support consistent decision-making. We will also monitor implementation and application volumes to ensure the policy intent of the Future Homes and Buildings Standards is maintained.

Benefits

The main direct and indirect benefits of this legislative change are to deliver outcomes arising from the broader flexibility given to LABCBs through the proposed changes to chargeable activities and functions. These outcomes are complex and difficult to monetise.

The challenge of underfunding in LABCBs appears to have arisen because they are expected to recover most of their costs through a limited set of building control charges, under the current Building (Local Authority Charges) Regulations^[16]. These regulations do not reflect the much wider range of functions and activities they carry out.

This could strengthen competition with private sector building control bodies (RBCAs) because LABCBs currently do more non-chargeable work than RBCAs but are competing for the same fee bearing projects.

LABCBs should be setting the rates for their chargeable services at a level where they can cover all of their direct and indirect costs (i.e. as per CIPFA guidance from 2010^[17], which is now unavailable but is being updated to reflect the new chargeable functions). RBCAs are also setting fees to ensure cost recovery or operate at a profit, but do not undertake much of the non-chargeable work that LABCBs do (e.g. on securing better compliance) and therefore are able to achieve full cost recovery with lower fees per project.

Therefore, in practice, because the LABCBs are in competition with RBCAs, there is sometimes a market-driven cap on the levels that can be charged for building control work, as the party which charges the greater fees will likely receive lower demand for their services.

In cases where there is a deficit between non-chargeable costs and income from charges, the suggestion from consultees is that this gap is subsidised by taxpayers through the local authority making up for the gap or simply providing a poorer service.

Implications for the LABCBs

After engaging with a small number of LABCBs, it has been suggested that the LABCB deficit has a number of implications which include:

- Reduced staffing expenditure, including both wages and the number of employees
- Reduced non-salary expenditure, such as reduced training
- Less time which can be spent on each building control project, due to competing priorities
- Lower quality, for example by not being as quick to respond to requests to visit a site, due to competing priorities, or missed cases of non-compliance with Building Regulations.

Overall, this has the result of putting pressure on the ability of LABCBs to provide or maintain the quality and quantity of functions and activities needed to meet the construction ambitions that the Government has set out, for example, on increased housing supply^[18], remediation of unsafe cladding systems^[19], and for increasing and improving the stock of public sector buildings^[20].

A related issue is that a significant volume of the non-chargeable work undertaken by LABCBs is servicing notices and certificates for RBCAs. Therefore, this creates a 'public good' externality where the service is overused because it is free. If LABCBs could charge for these processes, then this may give them more capacity to regulate the quality of these notices.

Impacts of the policy proposals

The main impact of the proposals will be for LABCBs to set charges for the previously non-chargeable functions paid for by RBCAs. This will increase LABCB's revenue and help to level the playing field. This may result in increased building control fees charged by RBCAs to their clients to cover the additional charge for processing the notices.

This aims to create a more competitive market for building control activities where LABCBs can provide better services. Therefore, this should increase choice for the consumer, the consumer being those commissioning building works. The increased consumer choice may have an impact on the price of building control services, but it is more likely to raise compliance and quality.

Additional income from policy changes to building control should result in additional capacity, or increased training for LABCB staff. This should lead to a higher quality building control sector where notices can be more effectively scrutinised and LABCBs have more resources to undertake greater enforcement activities. This should lead to improved building quality.

It is worth noting that because LABCBs may become more competitive, RBCAs could become less competitive because they will have increased costs to recover from their clients. This could result in RBCAs either charging higher fees, or absorbing their impact, for example by having less income available for training, etc. If this translates into higher income, it could make LABCBs relatively more competitive resulting in potentially more work for local authorities.

3. Small and Micro-Business Assessment

Most of the costs set out in this document are proposed to be charged to RBCAs and the majority of RBCAs are small and micro businesses. This is due to the nature of the firms only needing a small number of highly skilled individuals. RCA firms that submitted to the BSR's Building Control Body KPI data, self-reported into a number of 4-digit SIC codes such as:

- 4339: other building completion and finishing
- 7111: architectural activities
- 7112: engineering activities and related technical consultancy

- 7410: specialised design activities
- 7490: other professional, scientific and technical activities n.e.c.
- 8299: other business support service activities n.e.c.

Based on the latest ONS UK business dataset, 99% or above of firms within all these SIC codes have fewer than 50 employees, and all of them are at least 92% micro businesses. This would indicate that the costs are likely to fall largely on SMEs. However, there are some high-profile exceptions such as the National House Building Council (NHBC) which acts as a RBCA for a large number of new-build developments.

It is estimated that the costs would largely fall on these SMEs. However, we would expect the costs to be passed on to consumers of building control services through higher prices. This is because these costs would be applied at an industry-wide level which has a greater elasticity of cost pass-through than costs applied at the firm-level^[21].

For businesses requiring building works there are expected to be some extra administrative and compliance costs beyond the current limited set of chargeable LABCB functions and activities. This may require RBCAs and other businesses to familiarise themselves with LABCBs' latest charging schedules, however, the policy is not forecast to require a significant administrative burden.

For local authorities, the proposed policies will require an increased administrative burden through updating their charging schemes and the processing, collection and enforcement of charges. However, LABCBs already have a process in place from which to issue charges and this should be able to be expanded to account for the newly chargeable elements relatively easily.

^[1] <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/guidance-on-the-criteria-for-being-a-higher-risk-building>

^[2] https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/workforce_capacity_survey_-_building_control.pdf

^[3] <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2010/404/contents>

^[4] <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2024/110/contents>

^[5] <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1984/55/section/47>

^[6] <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2024/110/schedule/1> see form 1

^[7] <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/building-control-bodies-professional-codes-and-standards/operational-standards-rules>

^[8] <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2024/110/schedule/2>

^[9] <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2024/110/regulation/7>

^[10] <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2024/110/schedule/1> see forms 6 and 7

^[11] <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1984/55/part/II> - see sections 51A, 51B and 51C

^[12] <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1984/55/part/II> see section 51

^[13] [ukla_19390097_en.pdf](#) see Part VII, paragraph 66, page 59

^[14] [Live tables on housing supply: net additional dwellings - GOV.UK](#)

^[15] Some totals may not sum due to rounding.

^[16] <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2010/404/contents>

^[17] The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy published a guide for LABCBs in 2010, but this has been taken off its website. CIPFA will provide a new version to reflect the changes that result from this consultation around the time that the new measures take effect.

^[18]

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6751af4719e0c816d18d1df3/Plan for Change.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6751af4719e0c816d18d1df3/Plan_for_Change.pdf) see page 24

^[19] <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/remediation-acceleration-plan-update-july-2025/remediation-acceleration-plan-update-july-2025>

^[20] <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/patients-and-pupils-to-benefit-from-school-and-hospital-repairs>

^[21] RBB Economics – Cost pass-through: theory, measurement, and potential policy implications, February 2014, p.139

Annex

Table A1 – Key data sources

Data Source	Outline of Data Provided
Large survey of LABCBs – for final IA	Number of INs received by LABCB in typical one-month period, number of INs rejected in typical one-month period, proportion of INs requiring further information, staff wages, additional costs to LABCBs, methods for processing INs, category of RBI/other staff processing INs
Survey of ABCA members – for final IA	Number of INs submitted in a typical one-month period, proportion of INs rejected, proportion of INs that require further information, proportion of INs accepted proactively/automatically
Small survey of LABCBs – for consultation assessment of impacts	Hourly rate, hours spent and cost of processing the following: • INs (superseded in this analysis by large LABCB sample) • Amendment Notices • Extensions of Time • Cancellation Notices • Completion Notices • Demolition notices
BSR KPI data	Number of initial notices for Q1 2025
MHCLG Live Tables	Number of dwelling demolitions recorded outside London
Consultant Assumption	Proportion of demolitions already charged for outside London, proportion of INs that

	have an Amendment Notice issued, proportion of INs that are followed up with a Cancellation notice
Estimates for considering dispensation or relaxation of Regulations 25A, 25B and 26 of the Building Regulations 2010	Estimated hours per dispensation/relaxation request, estimated hourly rate, estimated annual number of dispensation/relaxation requests

Note, the above table does not provide an exhaustive list of all data collected

Summary of Survey Data

LABC Survey

LABC conducted a survey of its members (LABCBs) in England on behalf of MHCLG which was received on March 4th 2026. 51 of c.244 LABCBs in England responded to the survey, giving a response rate of approximately 21%. Table A2 provides some key statistics from this survey.

Table A2 – key statistics from LABC survey of their members

Average (mean) number of INs received in a typical one-month period	54
Median number of INs received in a typical one-month period	43
Estimated proportion of INs that are rejected	9.1%
Estimated proportion of INs processed by desktop review only	73%
Estimated proportion of INs where a site visit is undertaken	17%
Estimated proportion of INs automatically accepted after 5 days	4%
Number of LABCBs surveyed stating they routinely undertake site visits when reviewing INs	9
Average (mean) number of INs rejected by one LABCB in a typical one-month period	1.7
Estimated proportion of INs that are rejected	2.3%
Median rejection rate of INs across LABCBs	3.3%

The following tables summarise the responses relating to hourly rates of, and number of hours worked by, staff processing INs:

Table A3 – Hours worked by category of staff that typically process INs in a typical one-month period:

	Building Control Technical Support	Class 1 RBI	Class 2 RBI	Class 3 RBI	Class 2 & 4 RBI (Technical Manager)	Class 3 & 4 RBI (Technical Manager)	Manager (non-technical)	Other
Total Hours	1158	49	256	31	59	90	19	121
Proportion	65%	3%	14%	2%	3%	5%	1%	7%

Table A4 – Hourly rates for staff processing INs

	Building Control Technical Support	Class 1 RBI	Class 2 RBI	Class 3 RBI	Class 2 & 4 RBI (Technical Manager)	Class 3 & 4 RBI (Technical Manager)	Manager (non-technical)	Other
Mean Hourly Rate	£62.88	£75.80	£79.34	£88.23	£89.88	£83.15	£85.17	£89.69

Lower Quartile Hourly Rate	£48.05	£60.00	£65.00	£72.50	£72.00	£72.00	£72.00	£76.00
Median Hourly Rate	£65.00	£78.68	£80.00	£85.00	£85.00	£85.00	£86.50	£89.57
Upper Quartile Hourly rate	£83.68	£89.50	£88.00	£100.09	£104.00	£91.00	£99.75	£97.70

ABCA Survey

On behalf of MHCLG, ABCA sent a questionnaire to their members, receiving responses from 25 of their 57 members, a response rate of 44%. Some key findings from this survey are shown in table A5

Table A5 – key statistics from ABCA survey

Proportion of INs requiring further information	<1%
Proportion of INs rejected	<1%
Proportion of INs accepted automatically	65%