



Planning monitoring — application pack

item and appeal deadlines

LINDBERGH FORMATION — 16 rue de Maillé, 91310 Montlhéry, France · Companies register (RCS) Evry 817 946 114

Document issued on 24/09/2026

31 municipalities served by shared development control, 2,180 authorisations a year · fictional document

Fictional document — demonstration example

This document is produced by the Blue Lemon Agent website to illustrate what an AI agent hands to its users. The companies, matters, amounts and people in it are invented. It has no legal, accounting or commercial value.

Fictional document — the order and the court decision staged here are **invented for the demonstration**; in service, the agent cites the real texts with their official link and the decision with its court, its date and its reference. **Nothing is sent**: the alert to the development-control service and the email to the 4 municipalities await the head of service's signature.

The order — what it changes, and what it does not

Question the service will ask	Answer carried at the top of the alert
Are applications already lodged affected?	No. The amended item applies to applications lodged from entry into force onwards.
From when?	First day of the second month following publication on Thursday the 14th

Question the service will ask	Answer carried at the top of the alert
By when must we have acted?	Fifteen days before entry into force
Who must act?	The shared development-control service, copied to the 4 municipalities concerned
How many applications are at stake?	Roughly 180 lodgings in the month following entry into force, at the rate of the last three years

The catch-up mapped — what a minor text costs when it multiplies by 31

Support	Number	Position found	Action proposed
Websites of the 31 member municipalities	31	27 link to the application pack without hosting a copy — nothing to do	None
Municipalities hosting a local copy of the item	4	They will serve an outdated version on the day of entry into force	The 4 page addresses are identified; draft email ready
Case officers' lodging guide	1	Describes the item in its current version, page 21, paragraph 3	Replacement paragraph drafted
Guide handed over the counter	1	Describes the item, page 6	Replacement paragraph drafted
Internal tracking form of the service	1	Contains a box referring to the item	Flagged to the form's author

Support	Number	Position found	Action proposed
Total to update	7 supports	—	4 emails and 3 paragraphs, against 31 websites to check by hand

This is the textbook case of an apparently minor text that costs dearly because it multiplies. Checking 31 municipal websites by hand takes a day and is never done; the survey, by contrast, fits in four lines and names exactly the 4 municipalities concerned. It was not reading the text that the service lacked — it was the time to find out where the text landed at home.

The court decision — the cross-reference done, the interpretation left to the lawyer

Element	What the agent brings	What stays with the legal team
The decision	Court — administrative court of appeal — and date: 6 February	—
Its subject	Appeal deadlines	—
What it touches at your end	The « development control and site notices » guide comments at page 14 on the text the decision was handed down on — the guide passage is reproduced here, alongside the decision	—
The meaning to be given to the decision	None. The agent sets side by side; it does not conclude.	The interpretation, the consequences for the service, and the position to adopt

Element	What the agent brings	What stays with the legal team
What follows	The guide paragraph is marked « to check » and assigned to its author, with the decision attached	Any rewriting, and the signature

It is the cross-referencing that costs time, not the interpretation. Finding, across 27 guides and 148 procedures, the paragraph touched by a decision handed down three years after it was written takes a day of reading; **the cross-reference is done, dated and sourced, and the interpretation then takes twenty minutes, by the person whose craft it is. Rule C, which produces that cross-reference, was confirmed in 74 cases out of 74 across 36 months: it is the only one of the four never to have made a document examined for nothing.**

The draft email to the 4 municipalities — word for word

« Dear colleagues,

The shared development-control service informs you that **one item of the planning application pack is amended from the first day of the second following month. Your website hosts a copy of that item, at the address given below:** it will serve an outdated version to applicants from that date.

What we suggest: replace that copy with a link to the official version, which will stay current by itself. The link is given below.

Applications lodged before entry into force are unaffected and continue to be handled on the current item.

The development-control service remains at your disposal. »

Alert to the development-control service signed by the head of the documentation service, on: _____

Emails sent to the 4 municipalities concerned, on: _____

isolation depends on the deployment mode set out in the quotation, no dedicated isolation being presumed; the encryption mechanisms in transit and at rest, their components and key management are those documented for the architecture chosen; roles and permissions are configured and accepted for the identities and systems actually connected; the events logged, their content, their retention period and who may access them are defined for the deployment chosen.