

PC11-20 | PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

Consultation questions

NALC will be responding to the consultation questions as follows:

1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?

Housing, Contentious, Pedantic

2. Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area? [Yes / No]

Yes

(a). If no, why not? [Don't know how to / It takes too long / It's too complicated / I don't care / Other – please specify]

3. Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future? [Social media / Online news / Newspaper / By post / Other – please specify]

As a Parish council we receive a weekly list and would wish for that to continue, people directly affected should be notified by post and the present system of site notices should continue with wider distribution around the affected area.

4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? [Building homes for young people / building homes for the homeless / Protection of green spaces / The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change / Increasing the affordability of housing / The design of new homes and places / Supporting the high street / Supporting the local economy / More or better local infrastructure / Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas / Other – please specify]

We would prioritise Protection of green spaces, the provision of essential local infrastructure (medical, educational, public transport and the enforcement of the provision of this infrastructure preceding development) and the design of new homes and places to blend in with our conservation areas and local historic buildings.

5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Local plans should be simplified, but these proposals do not address all the issues and are aimed solely at speeding up the planning process and not the safety of the decisions.

6. Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No, some improvement and clarification of policies is required to minimise the risk of decision makers justifying conflicting views. National rules will not respect local needs.

7. Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of “sustainable development”, which would include consideration of environmental impact? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

(b). How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?

It would be difficult to introduce a sustainable development test that would suit the environmental impact of all locations, cross – boundary issues should continue to be the decision of the ministry.

8. (a) Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No, the use of standard methods or algorithms will produce distorted results, this would inevitably be a threat to the Green Belt that would lead to inappropriate development

(b). Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No this would pose the same threat to the green belt.

9. (a). Do you agree that there should be automatic outline permission for areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. Automatic outline permission should never form part of the planning process, even in proposed growth Areas applications need to be decided on their own merits.

(b). Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. Development in renewal and protected areas should be viewed as identified local needs first and foremost.

(c). Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No to allow development to be listed in such a category leaves the planning system open to abuse and manipulation.

10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No. Whereas some improvement could be made the proposals go too far and do not address all the issues.

Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes. Most L.P.A's already use public access planning portals

11. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Not sure that 30 month would be appropriate in all cases it is far more important that the plans are fully consulted on and of benefit to the Community.

12. (a) Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes there is a place for Neighbourhood Plans, the incentive to produce plans was initially for parish councils to access 25% of the C.I.L. neighbourhood fund, without a neighbourhood plan only 10% was made available.

(b). How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?

In proposal 9 on the preceding summary there is an indication that before making a neighbourhood plan the community should reflect these new planning proposals in their plans. To adopt this sort of approach would make local community opinion irrelevant. Naturally digital tools are becoming more popular and community preference on design should be taken into account

13. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No To attempt to speed up the process in this manner would more often than not be at the expense of quality control.

14. What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area? [Not sure or indifferent / Beautiful and/or well-designed / Ugly and/or poorly-designed / There hasn't been any / Other – please specify]

In our area there are mixed opinions on the design of new development we would have preferred not such a stark difference in house types and materials on the large development and more space between houses is more attractive and more thought should have gone into the vehicle access to the development one access to a large development creates logistical problems.

15. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area? [Less reliance on cars / More green and open spaces / Energy efficiency of new buildings / More trees / Other – please specify]

The Priority for sustainability must always be the provision of the infrastructure to accommodate the increase in the local population. This should include community transport and easy access to rail networks, exactly the opposite of what has happened in Ackworth's latest and largest development.

16. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Not sure that this is relevant enough to have a major influence on good planning practises, it has more to do with speed than quality.

17. Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

- **Definitely Not**

18. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Not sure this is the right subject to be giving free rein to lobbyists.

20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No we cannot agree to this, such legislation would be open to manipulation and abuse of the planning process. The ideas around the "creation of beautiful spaces" are subjective and do not necessarily reflect the locality. eg Ackworth has a tradition of stone builds which should be reflected in the new buildings.

21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it? [More affordable housing / More or better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health provision) / Design of new buildings / More shops and/or employment space / Green space/ Don't know / Other – please specify]

More or better infrastructure.

22. (a) Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes a combined levy would be easier to manage and more open. Section 106 agreements have always been secretive. The main improvement should be that the levy should not have a time restriction placed on it for the money to be spent, Far too much of the money collected has been handed back to developers because local authorities haven't spent it, this is counterproductive to national support of local authority budgets

(b) Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally? [Nationally at a single rate / Nationally at an area-specific rate / Locally]

Locally with guidance.

(c) Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities? [Same amount overall / More value / Less value / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Same amount overall. The presumption that you are capturing money from developers for infrastructure from the increase in the land value is a fantasy Developers pass all such costs directly on to the house buyer C.I.L. is nothing more than purchase tax.

(d) Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

No they don't have a good record on using the money they have received in the past.

23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes no special case should be made.

24. (a). Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Not sure we have the expertise to comment

(b). Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Not sure but the right to purchase sounds the fairest rather than divert C.I.L away from providing infrastructure.

24 (c). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes the ratepayer needs protection.

24 (d). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes value for money is essential.

25 Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Yes Different communities have different needs.

(a) If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Not sure that affordable housing should be so closely linked to the financial incentivisation of the planning system.

26. Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?

We don't think we have the expertise to give a qualified answer to this question.