

Appendix 1 – Housing White Paper Consultation Questions and proposed responses

Question 1

Do you agree with the proposals to:

a) Make clear in the National Planning Policy Framework that the key strategic policies that each local planning authority should maintain are those set out currently at paragraph 156 of the Framework, with an additional requirement to plan for the allocations needed to deliver the area's housing requirement?

b) Use regulations to allow Spatial Development Strategies to allocate strategic sites, where these strategies require unanimous agreement of the members of the combined authority?

c) Revise the National Planning Policy Framework to tighten the definition of what evidence is required to support a 'sound' plan?

A. Yes

B. Yes

C. Yes

Question 2

What changes do you think would support more proportionate consultation and examination procedures for different types of plan and to ensure that different levels of plans work together?

Local Examinations are costly. The cost could be reduced by making hearing sessions shorter though better timetabling and/or allowing written representations on parts of the examination and just having hearing sessions on the most important issues.

Joint examinations for neighbouring authorities with related issues would also save time and money by preventing the same issues having to be discussed at multiple examinations.

Rationalising publicity requirements, in particular the removal of the requirement to publish notice in local paper which is costly and not necessarily the best method for getting information out. Local areas know their areas best and how best to make residents aware so some flexibility in publicity would increase efficiency.

Question 3

Do you agree with the proposals to:

a. amend national policy so that local planning authorities are expected to have clear policies for addressing the housing requirements of groups with particular needs, such as older and disabled people?

b. from early 2018, use a standardised approach to assessing housing requirements as the baseline for five year housing supply calculations and monitoring housing delivery, in the absence of an up-to-date plan?

A. Yes - although there is a cost of understanding those needs. It would also require working closely with strategic housing colleagues and other organisations such as the Clinical Commissioning Group and county councils.

Also, if the policies are intended to deliver the different types of housing as a proportion of the dwellings to be provided on residential developments, this raises the issue of viability as a result of specialist accommodation requirements. The indicative site thresholds for any allocated sites would also have to take additional types of housing into account on top of overall market housing need.

B. Yes – although the approach would need to reflect the local market.

Question 4

Do you agree with the proposals to amend the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that:

a) authorities are expected to have a clear strategy for maximising the use of suitable land in their areas?;

b) it makes clear that identified development needs should be accommodated unless there are strong reasons for not doing so set out in the NPPF?;

c) the list of policies which the Government regards as providing reasons to restrict development is limited to those set out currently in footnote 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework (so these are no longer presented as examples), with the addition of Ancient Woodland and aged or veteran trees?

d) its considerations are re-ordered and numbered, the opening text is simplified and specific references to local plans are removed?

A. Yes - although maximising the use of land isn't necessary sustainable and so it should be made clear that the principles of sustainability still apply.

B. Yes

C. Yes

D. Under the 'decision-taking' section, the 'Unless material considerations indicate otherwise' footnote is confusing and would be better placed within the text of points a) and b) to make it clearer.

Question 5

Do you agree that regulations should be amended so that all local planning authorities are able to dispose of land with the benefit of planning consent which they have granted to themselves?

Yes – consideration would need to be given to how issues normally included in s106 agreements would be dealt with as local authorities would not be able to enter into an agreement with themselves.

Question 6

How could land pooling make a more effective contribution to assembling land, and what additional powers or capacity would allow local authorities to play a more active role in land assembly (such as where ‘ransom strips’ delay or prevent development)?

The main benefit would arise from a faster CPO process. Land pooling would require staff resources with specialist skills in site assembly, de-risking and CPO. It would necessitate a new commercial approach to development for local authorities and the need to identify and promote opportunities. The model used in Germany allows for pooling before land allocation takes place and the uplift in land value is retained within the scheme. Local Plans are more long term and land allocation is in place well in advance which would lead to an expectation on land value.

Question 7

Do you agree that national policy should be amended to encourage local planning authorities to consider the social and economic benefits of estate regeneration when preparing their plans and in decisions on applications, and use their planning powers to help deliver estate regeneration to a high standard?

Yes - although we do not consider that the planning system is leading to low standard of estate regeneration or the lack of regeneration. The difficulty with estate regeneration includes homes in multiple ownerships, particularly as a result of right to buy, the timely and costly process of CPO, the lack of funding in HRA to deliver. Also the impact on the local housing market for what can be several years as a reduction in stock and need to decant existing residents adds extra pressure to those on housing waiting lists.

Consideration should be given to speeding up the CPO process, encouraging the HCA to take a lead role and properly fund estate regeneration particularly where there are enhanced social and economic benefits, including the ability to deliver more homes to meet local needs.

Experience has shown that regeneration schemes present unique challenges. Aspirations to improve design standards have been resisted on grounds of cost. Designs are often poor utilising standard house types from elsewhere in the Midlands. Landscaping is often poor and designed to be low maintenance to keep costs down. Car parking is also an issue with displaced vehicles from development sites not being accommodated elsewhere.

Question 8

Do you agree with the proposals to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to:

a) highlight the opportunities that neighbourhood plans present for identifying and allocating small sites that are suitable for housing?;

b) encourage local planning authorities to identify opportunities for villages to thrive, especially where this would support services and help meet the authority's housing needs?;

c) give stronger support for 'rural exception' sites – to make clear that these should be considered positively where they can contribute to meeting identified local housing needs, even if this relies on an element of general market housing to ensure that homes are genuinely affordable for local people?;

d) make clear that on top of the allowance made for windfall sites, at least 10% of sites allocated for residential development in local plans should be sites of half a hectare or less?;

e) expect local planning authorities to work with developers to encourage the sub-division of large sites?; and

f) encourage greater use of Local Development Orders and area-wide design codes so that small sites may be brought forward for development more quickly?

A. Neighbourhood plans are not for every place so guidance shouldn't restrict LPA's from allocating small sites in their plans. Small sites often come forward as a result of owners' initiative and it is difficult to predict when they will be available.

B. Yes - although Tamworth does not contain villages under this definition.

C. Yes - again, agree in principle but it is not entirely relevant to Tamworth.

D. We would agree with the principle of allocating small sites; however experience shows that it is difficult to allocate these types of sites as landowners do not always promote them as available or deliverable. It could be quite costly to identify and allocate potential sites.

We would query the reasoning behind choosing 10% as this seems a very arbitrary figure. If, for example, only 5 small sites can be identified, does that limit the total number of allocated sites to 50? It needs to be an aspirational target rather than a requirement with an onus on LPAs to explain why if it hasn't been achieved.

Furthermore, there is a risk that by including a minimum % of sites, it will reduce the overall supply of housing and affordable housing.

E. The wording should be amended to encourage developers to sub divide, particularly to meet needs for older people or self-build or gypsy and traveller for example. In practice this would be difficult to achieve as most large sites in Tamworth have outline planning permission and developers would not be inclined to co-operate. What level of encouragement would be required to meet the expectation? If a developer is unwilling to enter into a discussion about sub-division of a site, has the LPA met the expectation simply by asking the question?

F. Yes – Will Permission in Principle address this? There could be a cost implication of producing design advice.

Question 9

How could streamlined planning procedures support innovation and high-quality development in new garden towns and villages?

No comment – not applicable to Tamworth

Question 10

Do you agree with the proposals to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to make clear that:

a) authorities should amend Green Belt boundaries only when they can demonstrate that they have examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting their identified development requirements?

b) where land is removed from the Green Belt, local policies should require compensatory improvements to the environmental quality or accessibility of remaining Green Belt land?

c) appropriate facilities for existing cemeteries should not to be regarded as ‘inappropriate development’ in the Green Belt?

d) development brought forward under a Neighbourhood Development Order should not be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt, provided it preserves openness and does not conflict with the purposes of the Green Belt?

e) where a local or strategic plan has demonstrated the need for Green Belt boundaries to be amended, the detailed boundary may be determined through a neighbourhood plan (or plans) for the area in question?

f) when carrying out a Green Belt review, local planning authorities should look first at using any Green Belt land which has been previously developed and/or which surrounds transport hubs?

Government should undertake strategic review of green belt policy and green belt sites.

These amendments do nothing to clarify the government’s position on green belt sometimes most sustainable site may be Green Belt.

A. Some guidance on what ‘reasonable options’ are would be helpful. For example, if you only have Green Belt and flood zone 3, which is most ‘reasonable’ to develop on?

B. How would this be achieved if land to be improved is in different ownership? Also, does all Green Belt have to be ‘accessible’ in order to serve its purpose? The most accessible Green Belt land would surely be the most likely to be removed from the Green Belt to be used for development. Improving accessibility to remaining land would likely increase pressure to release that land for development in areas, like Tamworth, where land is in short supply. There may be instances where improvements to accessibility are not an option. Would this prevent other land from being removed from the Green Belt?

C. No comment.

D. No - individual developments should be considered on their own merits. Their appropriateness in the Green Belt should be considered irrespective of whether or not they are under a NDO.

E. No – Green Belt is a strategic policy and should be determined at that level; neighbourhood plans not subject to same level of rigour.

F. Yes – in line with brownfield first and other sustainability policies.

Question 11

Are there particular options for accommodating development that national policy should expect authorities to have explored fully before Green Belt boundaries are amended, in addition to the ones set out above?

No comment.

Question 12

Do you agree with the proposals to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to:

a) indicate that local planning authorities should provide neighbourhood planning groups with a housing requirement figure, where this is sought?;

b) make clear that local and neighbourhood plans (at the most appropriate level) and more detailed development plan documents (such as action area plans) are expected to set out clear design expectations; and that visual tools such as design codes can help provide a clear basis for making decisions on development proposals?;

c) emphasise the importance of early pre-application discussions between applicants, authorities and the local community about design and the types of homes to be provided?;

d) makes clear that design should not be used as a valid reason to object to development where it accords with clear design expectations set out in statutory plans?; and

e) recognise the value of using a widely accepted design standard, such as Building for Life, in shaping and assessing basic design principles – and make clear that this should be reflected in plans and given weight in the planning process?

A. No - neighbourhood groups should be given a housing requirement number by default, not just where one is sought.

B. Yes - all plan documents should set out clear design expectations including visual tools

C. Yes – the Localism Act requirement to consult on big schemes has never been brought in through regulation. Pre-app is important, but there is a danger that costs/benefits are not clearly explained and with some statutory undertakers now charging it may be more difficult to attract developers to undertake pre-app in the future. Costs of pre-app advice could be offset against fees (either as a deduction from the application fee or reducing the application fee by a set percentage if pre-app is undertaken).

There is a need to engage with local communities and councillors at an earlier stage. Current guidance says we should only engage with the community on developments of more than 200 dwellings. Engagement has to be done correctly though and should add real value rather than just ticking boxes. Anecdotal evidence suggests that some discussions can have a negative impact on development timescales.

D. Yes - however design is very much a subjective thing and policy can be very much open to interpretation. Even with design expectations set out in a statutory plan, it still may not be clear cut in all cases.

E. Yes.

Question 13

Do you agree with the proposals to amend national policy to make clear that plans and individual development proposals should:

a) make efficient use of land and avoid building homes at low densities where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs?;

b) address the particular scope for higher-density housing in urban locations that are well served by public transport, that provide opportunities to replace low-density uses in areas of high housing demand, or which offer scope to extend buildings upwards in urban areas?;

c) ensure that in doing so the density and form of development reflect the character, accessibility and infrastructure capacity of an area, and the nature of local housing needs?;

d) take a flexible approach in adopting and applying policy and guidance that could inhibit these objectives in particular circumstances, such as open space provision in areas with good access to facilities nearby?

Agree in principle. However, barriers to achieve include communities view to see density kept as surrounding area - in character, developers desire to have low density development to maximise profit, incorporate other types of home such as self-build and bungalows. Furthermore, minimum densities could be linked to minimum space standards to ensure good quality high density development.

A. High density development is not always appropriate as it can result in town cramming. A blanket policy on density would not always be appropriate, the character of the area also needs to be considered.

B. Acceptable in principle but again the character of the area would need to be taken into consideration, extending upwards may not be appropriate in all locations.

C. Yes – see answers to A and B

D. Yes

Question 14

In what types of location would indicative minimum density standards be helpful, and what should those standards be?

This should be left to LPAs to determine as previous attempts in PPG 3 at setting minimum targets were not successful.

Question 15

What are your views on the potential for delivering additional homes through more intensive use of existing public sector sites, or in urban locations more generally, and how this can best be supported through planning (using tools such as policy, local development orders, and permitted development rights)?

If these locations can support and demonstrate the need for development it should be supported. The intensity of development should evolve from the site characteristics, its sustainability and infrastructure, not ownership. Using action area plans, design codes, design briefs and LDOs these matters can be addressed and sites bought forward irrespective of ownership.

Agreement of shared priorities across public sector organisations and clarity on future use of buildings/land is important to enable identification of potential sites at an early stage and put together funding to unlock difficult sites.

Question 16

Do you agree that:

a) where local planning authorities wish to agree their housing land supply for a one-year period, national policy should require those authorities to maintain a 10% buffer on their 5 year housing land supply?;

b) the Planning Inspectorate should consider and agree an authority's assessment of its housing supply for the purpose of this policy?

c) if so, should the Inspectorate's consideration focus on whether the approach pursued by the authority in establishing the land supply position is robust, or should the Inspectorate make an assessment of the supply figure?

A. Most LPA already include flexibility so we would support this in principle but not if it was an additional buffer. Would this system even be required if the proposed standardised formula for calculating need and 5-year supply was in place?

B. Yes - there isn't an obvious better alternative than PINS for the task, but it could add significantly to their workload.

C. The assessment should focus on the approach but a level of vetting of the supply figure may be required. If the purpose of the proposal is to state whether or not a sufficient housing land supply exists, then they would only need to say if the LPAs calculations are right or wrong. But, the inspector would surely have to come up with a figure to judge the LPA's claim against if they were making a thorough assessment.

Question 17

In taking forward the protection for neighbourhood plans as set out in the Written Ministerial Statement of 12 December 2016 into the revised NPPF, do you agree that it should include the following amendments:

a) a requirement for the neighbourhood plan to meet its share of local housing need?;

b) that it is subject to the local planning authority being able to demonstrate through the housing delivery test that, from 2020, delivery has been over 65% (25% in 2018; 45% in 2019) for the wider authority area?

c) should it remain a requirement to have site allocations in the plan or should the protection apply as long as housing supply policies will meet their share of local housing need?

A. Yes.

B. No - the 65% target over the wider area could disadvantage neighbourhood plan areas with up to date plans and sufficient allocated sites through no fault of their own.

C. Yes - allocations should still be a requirement

Question 18

What are your views on the merits of introducing a fee for making a planning appeal? We would welcome views on:

a) how the fee could be designed in such a way that it did not discourage developers, particularly smaller and medium sized firms, from bringing forward legitimate appeals;

b) the level of the fee and whether it could be refunded in certain circumstances, such as when an appeal is successful; and

c) whether there could be lower fees for less complex cases.

A. Not charging up front; perhaps an agreement to pay at the end if required? Or have penalties for frivolous appeals, which would be determined by the inspector. This would strengthen the position of LPA's who would take the view that some developers would be put off appealing because of the cost – it may lead to more member overturns on political, not planning grounds. Applicants would be unlikely to be put off if they thought they would get their fee back if they won.

B. Fees could be set based on size of development or development value rather than a flat rate fee. Potentially the fee could be refunded where an appeal is successful or where it is unsuccessful but it was a genuine appeal (this links back to the idea of penalties for frivolous appeals instead of fees for all).

C. A sensible suggestion, but who determines the level of complexity and at what point during the process? Would the complexity be known before the fee was due to be paid? Perhaps the fee should be set on the basis of the time taken to process the appeal (both PINS and the LPA) benchmarking

has been done on how long planning applications take to process and a similar exercise could be undertaken with respect to appeals. Simple appeals would naturally be cheaper.

Question 19

Do you agree with the proposal to amend national policy so that local planning authorities are expected to have planning policies setting out how high quality digital infrastructure will be delivered in their area, and accessible from a range of providers?

How would the LPA be expected to influence the number of providers? There are no powers to enforce this. The same requirement doesn't exist for other infrastructure requirements. Policies could be used to ensure on-site infrastructure is appropriate, but off-site works would have to be delivered by other means.

Question 20

Do you agree with the proposals to amend national policy so that:

- the status of endorsed recommendations of the National Infrastructure Commission is made clear? and;***
- authorities are expected to identify the additional development opportunities which strategic infrastructure improvements offer for making additional land available for housing?***

Point 1: Yes.

Point 2: Shouldn't the development opportunities already be known if the Government is at the point of investing in the infrastructure? What happens if no additional opportunities are able to be identified at the point funding is committed?

Question 21

Do you agree that:

- a) the planning application form should be amended to include a request for the estimated start date and build out rate for proposals for housing?***
- b) that developers should be required to provide local authorities with basic information (in terms of actual and projected build out) on progress in delivering the permitted number of homes, after planning permission has been granted?***
- c) the basic information (above) should be published as part of Authority Monitoring Reports?***
- d) that large housebuilders should be required to provide aggregate information on build out rates?***

Whilst information may be interesting it is difficult to see how the information may be used. It presents challenges such as should there be a threshold on the size of development (would suggest

not), what constitutes a large housebuilder, and if it is an outline consent then the level of detail may not be known and will either be estimated or not provided at all which starts to weaken the usefulness of the data.

Need to consider if it will be required with PIP.

Resource implications for additional monitoring . What happens if they do not submit

A. No - there would be no point to collecting the data if the accuracy can't be assessed. The commencement would be required to be within the life of any permission granted anyway. Developers would naturally suggest that they are raring to go – what is the penalty for not starting in accordance with their estimated start date.

B. Yes - this would be more useful than projected start date information because more accurate information should be available. However, should LPAs take this info at face value when it could be in the developer's interest to not provide accurate information (where s106 trigger points could be reached for example)? NHBC returns lag well behind completions so accuracy of information submitted must be questioned.

C. Again, the accuracy of the data would be questionable and would need to be published with disclaimers to that effect. Council tax and planning have difficulty in getting accurate information now – what would change?

D. This data would be meaningless without context. Some sites will be more complex than others, but aggregated data wouldn't take account of that. Any developers building out hard to deliver sites (which should be encouraged) could come out looking bad.

Question 22

Do you agree that the realistic prospect that housing will be built on a site should be taken into account in the determination of planning applications for housing on sites where there is evidence of non-implementation of earlier permissions for housing development?

No – there could be a multitude of reasons why previous permissions have not been implemented on a site and to penalise an applicant who may be able to develop a site based on previous circumstances beyond their control would be counterproductive and not conducive to good working relationships between LPAs and developers. Times change and sites that may have been unviable in the past may become viable. If previous permissions have not been implemented for reasons that make the site unsuitable for housing, those reasons may be material considerations sufficient to refuse the application anyway.

Question 23

We would welcome views on whether an applicant's track record of delivering previous, similar housing schemes should be taken into account by local authorities when determining planning applications for housing development.

This proposal could unfairly penalise applicants who take on riskier sites where a failure to deliver on a site for valid reasons could count against them in future. Every site is different and so schemes that

may seem 'similar' on paper may in fact have quite different requirements for delivery. Also, as planning permission enures for the benefit of the land, who makes the application is almost irrelevant as any other party could implement (or not implement) the permission at a later date.

Question 24

If this proposal were taken forward, do you agree that the track record of an applicant should only be taken into account when considering proposals for large scale sites, so as not to deter new entrants to the market?

We do not consider that the proposal should be taken forward for the reasons outlined above. However, were the proposal to be taken forward, the exclusion of smaller sites assumes that all new entrants to the market would be restricted to smaller sites when this may not be the case. What would happen in the event of an applicant with a good track record gaining planning permission for a site and then selling part of that site to another developer with a poor track record who does not deliver?

Question 25

What are your views on whether local authorities should be encouraged to shorten the timescales for developers to implement a permission for housing development from three years to two years, except where a shorter timescale could hinder the viability or deliverability of a scheme? We would particularly welcome views on what such a change would mean for SME developers.

Changing the timescales for implementation would make little difference to housing delivery as an applicant could do the minimum required to implement a permission at which point they are no longer restricted by the statutory timeframe.

We do however consider that for outline planning permissions the period for submission of reserved matters should be shortened to two years, with a commencement within the following year which would then give an overall time of 3 years in line with the full consent option.

Question 26

Do you agree with the proposals to amend legislation to simplify and speed up the process of serving a completion notice by removing the requirement for the Secretary of State to confirm a completion notice before it can take effect?

Yes. If LPAs will be expected to serve more notices to speed up delivery, the implications for the LPA of non-compliance by the developer would need to be clarified. Would the LPA be required to step in and complete the development and then try and recover the cost from the developer?

Question 27

What are your views on whether we should allow local authorities to serve a completion notice on a site before the commencement deadline has elapsed, but only where works have begun? What impact do you think this will have on lenders' willingness to lend to developers?

It is unlikely that a development would start within a short time of obtaining permission and then not be completed. If a developer was to carry out the minimum required works to have commenced the development, for the purposes of preventing the permission from lapsing, it is more likely that this would occur just before the commencement deadline.

Once a development has commenced, the commencement deadline should no longer be relevant and, if the development is being unreasonably delayed, serving a completion notice should be a valid option. This would depend on what was considered to be a reasonable time between commencement and completion.

Question 28

Do you agree that for the purposes of introducing a housing delivery test, national guidance should make clear that:

a) The baseline for assessing housing delivery should be a local planning authority's annual housing requirement where this is set out in an up-to-date plan?

b) The baseline where no local plan is in place should be the published household projections until 2018/19, with the new standard methodology for assessing housing requirements providing the baseline thereafter?

c) Net annual housing additions should be used to measure housing delivery?

d) Delivery will be assessed over a rolling three year period, starting with 2014/15 – 2016/17?

A. Yes – but where a plan has only recently been adopted it should be noted that delivery in the first few years will be a result of the situation prior to the plan being adopted and will not be a fair reflection of the new effectiveness of the new plan.

B. Yes

C. Yes

D. No - a longer period should be considered, perhaps 5 years as the longer period would be more effective at evening out peaks and troughs and give a more accurate picture of delivery.

Question 29

Do you agree that the consequences for under-delivery should be:

a) From November 2017, an expectation that local planning authorities prepare an action plan where delivery falls below 95% of the authority's annual housing requirement?;

b) From November 2017, a 20% buffer on top of the requirement to maintain a five year housing land supply where delivery falls below 85%?;

c) From November 2018, application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development where delivery falls below 25%?;

d) From November 2019, application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development where delivery falls below 45%?; and

e) From November 2020, application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development where delivery falls below 65%?

A. This depends on what would be required to be included in an action plan. If the action plan created a significant amount of work, then the threshold should be lower than 95% as a single year of slightly low delivery could trigger the need for an action plan.

B. LPA's already include a buffer when calculating their housing targets to allow for market conditions or unforeseen problems with delivery. It is unclear whether the 20% buffer proposed would be on top of the annual requirement or on top of the whole five year supply figure including the existing buffer. It is also unclear at what point the 20% buffer would take effect as it would be based on figures released in November when most five year supply calculations would not be determined until the end of the financial year. How soon could the additional buffer be removed once delivery picks up? In places such as Tamworth where we unable meet our housing need, if delivery falls below 85% then do neighbouring authorities have to pick up the additional 20%?

C,D,E. No – it is unclear how this would work in the event that a LPA has an up-to-date five year supply of housing land. LPAs have very limited influence over the delivery of housing once permission is granted. In small local authority areas, like Tamworth, where the housing requirement number is small, a small reduction in delivery could have a significant impact on the delivery rate percentage. This could leave the system open to exploitation where developers could ensure a period of low delivery in order to trigger the presumption in favour to open up unallocated sites despite there being an up-to-date five year supply in place.

Question 30

What support would be most helpful to local planning authorities in increasing housing delivery in their areas?

Better support for comprehensive strategic infrastructure planning would be helpful especially as there are significant numbers dwellings either permitted or proposed within and immediately adjacent to Tamworth.

More help from the Homes and Communities Agency for smaller local authorities as the focus currently appears to be on larger metropolitan areas and a more consistent and simplified approach to programmes of support which currently are frequently changing and not always followed through.

The removal of Right to Buy (RTB), or at the very least the retention of 100% of RTB receipts for local authorities to enable more properties to be built and/or purchased to provide affordable housing. The current 30% retention is not sufficient to increase the housing numbers or replace sales on a like for like basis.

Question 31

Do you agree with our proposals to:

a) amend national policy to revise the definition of affordable housing as set out in Box 4?;

b) introduce an income cap for starter homes?;

c) incorporate a definition of affordable private rent housing?;

d) allow for a transitional period that aligns with other proposals in the White Paper (April 2018)?

A. The definition of affordable would be more helpful if it was clearer and simpler. It would be helpful to have consistency in terms of the definition and in terms of the number of products available.

B. Yes – an income cap on starter homes should be supported, however the cap should be relative to the local market conditions rather than a blanket rule of £80,000.

C. As above, the addition of extra affordable products makes the definition of affordable housing less clear and should be avoided where possible.

D. Yes.

Question 32

Do you agree that:

a) national planning policy should expect local planning authorities to seek a minimum of 10% of all homes on individual sites for affordable home ownership products?

b) that this policy should only apply to developments of over 10 units or 0.5ha?

A. No - national policy should require LPAs to consider a variety of affordable products tailored to the local market. The viability of each individual development will affect the type and amount of affordable provision on site. Setting a figure of 10% could lead to developments that could support more affordable units providing the minimum amount as minimum expectations often become maximums.

B. As outlined above, we do not consider that the 10% policy is appropriate in general. However, if it were to be implemented it should be able to apply to sites of 10 units or less where affordable units would be viable.

Question 33

Should any particular types of residential development be excluded from this policy?

If the policy were to be introduced, it would be sensible to exclude certain types of specialist accommodation.

Question 34

Do you agree with the proposals to amend national policy to make clear that the reference to the three dimensions of sustainable development, together with the core planning principles and policies at paragraphs 18-219 of the National Planning Policy Framework, together constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development means for the planning system in England?

No comment.

Question 35

Do you agree with the proposals to amend national policy to:

a) Amend the list of climate change factors to be considered during plan-making, to include reference to rising temperatures?

b) Make clear that local planning policies should support measures for the future resilience of communities and infrastructure to climate change?

A. Yes.

B. Yes.

Question 36

Do you agree with these proposals to clarify flood risk policy in the National Planning Policy Framework?

Yes— any clarification would be welcomed.

Question 37

Do you agree with the proposal to amend national policy to emphasise that planning policies and decisions should take account of existing businesses when locating new development nearby and, where necessary, to mitigate the impact of noise and other potential nuisances arising from existing development?

Yes - but this appears a step backwards to the advice that was contained in previous PPGs and PPSs. We have always adopted this approach and it's enshrined in local policy. It should be made clear what impacts are to be considered as this could give rise to an increased number of objections to planning applications on grounds that are not material considerations.

Question 38

Do you agree that in incorporating the Written Ministerial Statement on wind energy development into paragraph 98 of the National Planning Policy Framework, no transition period should be included?

No Comment.

This page is intentionally left blank