

Bramshott & Liphook Parish Council
Proposed Response: Planning for the Future

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

- Slow
- Inconsistent
- Complicated

2. (a). Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area?

Yes

(b). If not, why not?

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?

Consultation by planning authority

Advertisement on site and locally and postal notification to adjacent property owners.

4. What are your top 3 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]

- 1. Infrastructure including recreation space and biodiversity*
- 2. Traffic management adaptation and planning to ensure all forms of transport including access and movement for people*
- 3. To produce a vibrant community taking account of climate change and the environment*

5. Do you agree that local plans should be simplified in line with our proposals?

Yes

- 1. Preparation takes too long and is too expensive, inspection delay is unacceptable*
- 2. Too frequent revision required, impossible to adhere to an implementation of the plans*

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

*Standard national policies will make it easier but local policies will still be needed to further define national policies to suit local communities.
Neighbourhood Development Plans will still be needed to ensure local communities have the final say on the development of their areas.*

- 7. (a). 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?**

We are unconvinced that sufficient detail has been outlined to enable us to say whether environmental impact is being given sufficient importance in the criteria that will be adopted. There should be no negative impact on the natural environment. A new planning system must take account of existing and emerging environmental legislation to ensure it includes biodiversity net gain, nature recovery networks and nature recovery strategies.

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

The Duty to Co-operate should be retained and monitored to ensure all authorities are working together for the good of the communities they serve.

- 8. (a). Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced?**

Yes

- (b). Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated?**

We do not feel that we are equipped to comment on this question.

- 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?**

This needs to be subject to a robust zoning policy with agreed national criteria.

- (b). Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas?**

In principal we agree the proposal that development will still be initiated through planning applications.

- (c). Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime?**

We do not feel that we are equipped to answer this question fully but feel that very large new settlements will require a great deal of local consultation to establish vibrant communities.

10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain?

The proposals need to be more geared to taking account of and meeting the needs of the local community rather than meeting the needs of developers. Speed does not necessarily produce better long-term solutions and good consultation is necessary.

11. Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans?

Not until there is universal broadband accessible to all to enable universal participation, this does not exist at present and should be in place before a web-based scheme is adopted. The needs of non-web-based households need to be considered.

12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans?

Not until there can be a confirmed timetable including inspection and final decision making and a very clear life span given to a produced and adopted local plan which enables the planning authorities and local communities time to ensure infrastructure and public transport is in place before excessive development is imposed on a town or village. This has been neglected in the past and has not kept pace with development.

13. (a). Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system?

Yes. Neighbourhood Development Plans give more power to local communities to input local knowledge and requirements into allocating land for specific land uses. NDPs help to improve local areas through well placed sustainable development and in particular planning for needed facilities that take account of existing issues and requirements within a Parish. This ability should not be 'watered down', and should be encouraged and in particular encourage Local Planning Authorities to help develop NDPs for best planning policies specific to local areas.

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

*By encouraging LPAs to work more with NDPs to develop the neighbourhood plans and integrate them into their Local Plan online mapping systems, rather than requiring one to look up each individual NDP on top of the Local Plan requirements.
NDPs do not have the funding for digital tools, so the LPAs need to help assist this.
Community preferences about design are part of the NDP process, and developing of Design Codes for different areas within a Parish.
There are concerns that breaking down Neighbourhood Plans to allow individual streets to make their own plans will result in conflicts between areas and may 'paralyse/confuse' the production of plans rather than encouraging more cohesive and sustainable plan-making. Individual streets could have specific policies within an overall NDP for the parish/allocated area.*

- 14. Do you agree that there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments?
And, if so, what further measures would you support?**

There should be a time limit between planning permission being granted and the first properties being completed. A substantial charge should be levied to prevent developers buying site and then sitting on them such as requiring the payment of CIL or a substantial proportion of it when planning permission is first granted.

- 15. 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]**

Boring and of poor quality which has a negative effect on the wellbeing of residents. Lack of innovation in design resulting in a failure to build strong communities. Much more thought should be given to local character and be reflected in the design and mixture of the properties. It should not preclude quality modern design in the right surroundings

- 16. 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]**

Sustainability is a holistic concept and it should not be a case of identifying one priority of another. The climate and biodiversity crises are of equal immensity and concern, and it is extremely worrying that neither of them are mentioned in this consultation. There is no mention of energy efficiency in the new housing proposals.

- 17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes?**

We feel that the idea is a fine aspiration but unless backed by resources to enforce and quality officers it will remain an aspiration without affecting outcomes.

- 18. 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, we agree in principle but if this is an additional post in planning departments across the country it will not be effective unless resources permit the employment of post holders of good qualification and experience.

A national body to raise standards, awareness and outcomes and to support officers would be welcome. For each authority to have a chief officer for design and place making would also be welcomed as helping to raise the profile and importance of planning.

This should ensure a high standard of design of both buildings and surrounding soft landscaping to make the development a pleasant and sustainable location to enhance the residents lives and wellbeing.

19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England?

As presently outlined, we feel that this is an aspirational concept and feel that much more detail needs to be published and consulted on before changes to the planning guidance comes into effect.

20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty?

We do not see a pathway to implementation clearly set out and do not see how this concept differs in implementation from observing better design codes. We feel that permitted development is an area where much tighter design codes would be beneficial and improve the appearance of communities.

21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it?

Better traffic movement with public transport to reduce traffic movements around the settlement areas with access and health provision in place before additional housing is added to the community to ensure health and wellbeing of the community.

22. (a). Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and S106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold?

Much depends on the spending criteria for the proposed new levy which we feel should be spent within the parish or local area which has to absorb the development. The S106 has spending criteria which have been useful. We feel there should be consultation about the use of the levy before the scheme is approved.

(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]

This would be the simplest and most easily understood option and would ensure that the additional costs faced by London and the South East receive a fair share of funding. The cost of roads, land and building are all far higher in this area which would be reflected by the higher value of the development.

(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?

We feel it should aim to capture the same overall amount but should be paid at an earlier stage in order to ensure infrastructure develops at the same time as extra development.

(d). Should we allow Local Authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area?

No, the CIL funds should be paid over at an earlier stage, say on the grant of outline permission to ensure infrastructure keeps pace with development.

23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights?

Yes

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?

We feel that there should be a standard proportion of affordable housing on each site containing more than 10 housing units and it should be on site without the possibility of moving it off site or reducing the percentage to be built on any grounds.

(b). Should affordable housing be secured as an in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a “right to purchase” at discounted rates for local authorities?

No, it is a separate issue. The issue is which local authority, the county council, the district council or the parish council?

(c). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk?

(d). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality?

25. Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy?

(a). If yes, should an affordable housing ‘ring-fence’ be developed?

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?