

Closed meeting to consider parish response to the three government consultations looking at the Planning System.

Tuesday 15 September 2020; Attendees: Cllrs Coker, Collett, Doyle, Smith and Walker

Consultation one: Changes to the current planning system – deadline 1 October 2020

Q1: Do you agree that planning practice guidance should be amended to specify that the appropriate baseline for the standard method is whichever is the higher of the level of 0.5% of housing stock in each local authority area OR the latest household projections averaged over a 10-year period?

No Comment

Q2: In the stock element of the baseline, do you agree that 0.5% of existing stock for the standard method is appropriate? If not, please explain why.

No Comment

Q3: Do you agree that using the workplace-based median house price to median earnings ratio from the most recent year for which data is available to adjust the standard method's baseline is appropriate? If not, please explain why.

No Comment

Q4: Do you agree that incorporating an adjustment for the change of affordability over 10 years is a positive way to look at whether affordability has improved? If not, please explain why.

No Comment

Q5: Do you agree that affordability is given an appropriate weighting within the standard method? If not, please explain why.

No Comment

Q6: Authorities which are already at the second stage of the strategic plan consultation process (Regulation 19), which should be given 6 months to submit their plan to the Planning Inspectorate for examination?

Yes

Q7: Authorities close to publishing their second stage consultation (Regulation 19), which should be given 3 months from the publication date of the revised guidance to publish their Regulation 19 plan, and a further 6 months to submit their plan to the Planning Inspectorate? If not, please explain why. Are there particular circumstances which need to be catered for?

Yes

Q8: The Government is proposing policy compliant planning applications will deliver a minimum of 25% of onsite affordable housing as First Homes, and a minimum of 25% of offsite contributions towards First Homes where appropriate. Which do you think is the most appropriate option for the remaining 75% of affordable housing secured through developer contributions? Please provide reasons and / or evidence for your views (if possible):

- i) Prioritising the replacement of affordable home ownership tenures, and delivering rental tenures in the ratio set out in the local plan policy.**

- ii) ~~Negotiation between a local authority and developer.~~
- iii) ~~Other (please specify)~~

With regards to current exemptions from delivery of affordable home ownership products:

Q9: Should the existing exemptions from the requirement for affordable home ownership products (e.g. for build to rent) also apply to apply to this First Homes requirement?

No

Q10: Are any existing exemptions not required? If not, please set out which exemptions and why.

Not sure, but any exemptions which are applied must be done so consistently

Q11: Are any other exemptions needed? If so, please provide reasons and /or evidence for your views.

Consider exemptions for disability accessible homes eg Spacious single story with outdoor space

Q12: Do you agree with the proposed approach to transitional arrangements set out above?

Yes

Q13: Do you agree with the proposed approach to different levels of discount?

No Comment

Q14: Do you agree with the approach of allowing a small proportion of market housing on First Homes exception sites, in order to ensure site viability?

No

Q15: Do you agree with the removal of the site size threshold set out in the National Planning Policy Framework?

Yes

Q16: Do you agree that the First Homes exception sites policy should not apply in designated rural areas?

Yes

For each of these questions, please provide reasons and / or evidence for your views (if possible):

Q17: Do you agree with the proposed approach to raise the small sites threshold for a time-limited period? (see question 18 for comments on level of threshold)

Yes

Q18: What is the appropriate level of small sites threshold?

- i) ~~Up to 40 homes~~
- ii) ~~Up to 50 homes~~
- iii) Other (please specify) **Up to 25**

Q19: Do you agree with the proposed approach to the site size threshold?

Yes

Q20: Do you agree with linking the time-limited period to economic recovery and raising the threshold for an initial period of 18 months?

Yes

Q21: Do you agree with the proposed approach to minimising threshold effects?

Yes

Q22: Do you agree with the Government's proposed approach to setting thresholds in rural areas?

Yes

Q23: Are there any other ways in which the Government can support SME builders to deliver new homes during the economic recovery period?

Where large development sites are not building to expected/planned rate, explore strategies to bring in smaller developers to accelerate development on parcels of land.

Q24: Do you agree that the new Permission in Principle should remove the restriction on major development?

Yes Q25: Should the new Permission in Principle for major development set any limit on the amount of commercial development (providing housing still occupies the majority of the floorspace of the overall scheme)? Please provide any comments in support of your views.

Consider a minimum limit of "non residential" (not only commercial) land. Communities need more than houses and commercial – consider Health care provision, sporting provision, community facilities, churches and other community buildings

Q26: Do you agree with our proposal that information requirements for Permission in Principle by application for major development should broadly remain unchanged? If you disagree, what changes would you suggest and why?

Yes

Q27: Should there be an additional height parameter for Permission in Principle? Please provide comments in support of your views.

No

Q28: Do you agree that publicity arrangements for Permission in Principle by application should be extended for large developments? If so, should local planning authorities be:

- i) ~~required to publish a notice in a local newspaper?~~
- ii) ~~subject to a general requirement to publicise the application or~~
- iii) **both?**
- iv) ~~disagree. If you disagree, please state your reasons.~~

In addition, large community groups on social media which have numbers equal to 5% or more of a local population (by parish or ward) should be able to register for notifications of Permission in Principle applications.

Q29: Do you agree with our proposal for a banded fee structure based on a flat fee per hectare, with a maximum fee cap?

Defer to Local Planning Authority

Q30: What level of flat fee do you consider appropriate, and why?

Defer to Local Planning Authority

Q31: Do you agree that any brownfield site that is granted Permission in Principle through the application process should be included in Part 2 of the Brownfield Land Register? If you disagree, please state why

Yes

Q32: What guidance would help support applicants and local planning authorities to make decisions about Permission in Principle? Where possible, please set out any areas of guidance you consider are currently lacking and would assist stakeholders

Yes

Q33: What costs and benefits do you envisage the proposed scheme would cause? Where you have identified drawbacks, how might these be overcome?

No Comment

Q34: To what extent do you consider landowners and developers are likely to use the proposed measure? Please provide evidence where possible.

No Comment

Q35: In light of the proposals set out in this consultation, are there any direct or indirect impacts in terms of eliminating unlawful discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations on people who share characteristics protected under the Public Sector Equality Duty? If so, please specify the proposal and explain the impact. If there is an impact – are there any actions which the department could take to mitigate that impact?

See response to Q11.

Next Steps

These responses to be considered and ratified at Planning & Transportation Committee ahead of submission on 1 October.

The next meeting to look at the second white paper, "Planning for the Future" will be considered on Monday 5 October and further reviewed at October Planning along with Transparency and competition: a call for evidence on data on land control

The group also considered whether a letter to the Rt Hon Robert Jenrick MP, local MP Adam Afriyie and copied to the Director of Planning, Place and Regeneration at BFC with specific examples (such as Foxley Oaks and Tilehurst Lane appeals) to support the consultation submissions. This requires further consideration.