

**Membership as from May 2020**

Councillor Appleby
Councillor Caesar - Chairman
Councillor Drummond
Councillor Fitzgerald
Councillor Hirst
Councillor Hood
Councillor Hulbert
Councillor Jeffreys
Councillor Kerby
Councillor O'Neill – Vice Chairman

The Memorial Hall, High Street, Newmarket Suffolk CB8 8JP
TEL: 01638 667227

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the
DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
Monday 7th September 2020 at 6pm on Zoom
AGENDA

The meeting is open to the public who are encouraged to join the meeting and participate at the appropriate time. The meeting is held on the online Zoom platform, no special software is required. The link to join the meeting is as follows: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85389862002?pwd=b0JROW9GSnR0NFJRS203bktvcjQzUT09>

Or by telephone: +442034815240/Meeting ID 853 8986 2002 & password 089859

The meeting will be conducted in the usual way with one person speaking at a time, those wishing to speak putting their hands up and the Mayor determining whose turn it is to speak. Voting will be orally, by roll call.

Occasionally matters relating to contractual or staffing issues do have to be held in the confidential part of the meeting. Members of the public and press may not report or comment about a meeting as it takes place if present at a meeting of the Council, but otherwise may:

- a. film, photograph or make an audio recording of the meeting;
- b. use any other means for enabling persons not present to see or hear proceedings at a meeting as it takes place or later;
- c. report or comment on the proceedings in writing, during or after a meeting or orally after the meeting.

The meeting will be recorded. Any member of the public in attendance who does not wish to be included in the recording can disable their video although this would prohibit their ability to participate in the meeting at the appropriate time.

1. **CHAIR TO ANNOUNCE** that proceedings are being recorded and to advise that all participants will be muted by the host of the meeting who will unmute the individual the Chairman has invited to speak.
2. **APOLOGIES** To receive and accept apologies for absence.
3. **REGISTER OF INTERESTS** Declaration of Members' Interests & to remind Councillors of the need to keep up to date their Register of Members' Interests and to consider any requests received for Members' Dispensation.
4. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING** To receive and confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 17th August 2020 and any matters arising.
5. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** An invitation to members of the public to put questions or statements of not more than 3 minutes duration. Resolutions can only be made on items that are on the agenda, but Councillors are very happy for matters relating to the Town to be brought to their attention.
6. **NEWMARKET NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICIES**
7. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS** – West Suffolk Council – Lists 33, 34,35 (Herewith)
8. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS** – Amended and Deferred Plans
9. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS** – East Cambs
10. **PLANNING DECISIONS AND PLANS WITHDRAWN** – West Suffolk Council – Lists 33, 34,35 (Herewith)
11. **DELEGATION PANEL DECISIONS** To discuss any decisions by Delegation Panel
12. **LICENSING** To discuss any Licensing Applications
13. **REFORM OF THE PLANNING SYSTEM:** MHCLG/NALC consultation (Herewith)
14. **CORRESPONDENCE:** DC/20/0134/FUL Granby Street
15. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING:** Monday 21st September 2020
16. **ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE NEXT MEETING**

Signed:

Debbie Baines, Town Clerk

DATE: 1/9/2020

To: Chair & Members of D&P Committee, Other Council Members, Press & the Public



Minutes of a Meeting of the Development & Planning Committee
Held on Monday 17th August 2020 at 6.00pm via Zoom

Attendance:

Councillor C O'Neill (Chairman)
Councillor A Appleby
Councillor A Drummond

Councillor R Hood
Councillor P Hulbert
Councillor Y Fitzgerald
Councillor M Jefferys

Also Present: Debbie Baines – Town Clerk, Cathy Whitaker- RFO, Julie Ashton – Minute Assistant, and 4 Members of the Public.

Minute	Action by
D/20/08/16 <u>CHAIRMAN TO ANNOUNCE THAT PROCEEDINGS ARE BEING RECORDED AND TO ADVISE THAT ALL PARTICIPANTS WILL BE MUTED BY THE HOST OF THE MEETING WHO WILL UNMUTE THE INDIVIDUAL THE CHAIRMAN HAS INVITED TO SPEAK</u> The Chairman opened the meeting and announced that proceedings were being recorded and asked if anyone else intended to record the meeting. There were no requests.	
D/20/08/17 <u>APOLOGIES</u> Apologies were received from Cllrs Caesar and Kerby.	
D/20/08/18 <u>DECLARATION OF MEMBERS INTERESTS & TO REMIND COUNCILLORS OF THE NEED TO KEEP UP TO DATE THEIR REGISTER OF MEMBER'S INTERESTS AND TO CONSIDER ANY REQUESTS RECEIVED FOR MEMBER'S DISPENSATION</u> Cllr Hood declared a pecuniary interest in planning application DC/20/1251/TCA.	
D/20/08/19 <u>TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 3RD AUGUST 2020 AND MATTERS ARISING</u> Members received the minutes of the Development & Planning Committee held on 3rd August 2020 and the following was agreed: <u>D/20/08/19.01 Resolved</u> That the minutes of the Development & Planning Committee held on 3rd August 2020 be adopted and signed as a true record by the Chairman of the Development & Planning Committee. There were no matters arising.	
D/20/08/20 <u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION 'AN INVITATION TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO PUT QUESTIONS/STATEMENTS OF NOT MORE THAN 3 MINUTES DURATION. NO RESOLUTIONS CAN BE MADE BUT</u>	

COUNCILLORS ARE VERY HAPPY FOR MATTERS RELATING TO THE TOWN TO BE BROUGHT TO THEIR ATTENTION

Three residents spoke to item 13 DC/20/0134/FUL – 1 no. dwelling - Land to the rear of 58 Granby Street.

The Chairman proposed that item 13 be brought forward and the following was agreed:

D/20/08/20.01 Resolved

That item 13 be brought forward.

D/20/08/21 CORRESPONDENCE

DC/20/0134/FUL – 1 no, dwelling - Land to the rear of 58 Granby Street – Response to the NTC letter by West Suffolk Planning Development

The response from West Suffolk regarding the decision of the Delegation Panel to approve the application was discussed and the following was agreed:

D/20/08/21.01 Resolved

That the District Councillors request that the planning application goes to the Planning Committee and to request that the Enforcement Officer inspects the property immediately to report on the noncompliance with the approved application and conditions.

Two members of the public left the meeting

D/20/08/22 NEWMARKET NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN COMMUNITY ACTIONS

None noted.

D/20/08/23 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Week 31

D/20/08/22/1 DC/20/1190/TPO - TPO 032 (1960) Tree Preservation Order- 3no. Silver Birch (T3 on plan within A1 on order) fell – 5 Wyndham Way Newmarket Suffolk.

D/20/08/22.01 Resolved

The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and objects to the felling of healthy trees, however in this instance, the Committee welcomed the agreement of the applicant to replace the trees and requested that the application be referred to the Tree Officer for approval. The Committee DOES NOT OBJECT to this application.

Cllr Hood declared a nonpecuniary interest in the following application and did not vote.

D/20/08/22/2 DC/20/1218/TCA - Trees in a Conservation Area Notification - (i) 1 no. Chestnut (T1 on plan) crown reduce by 4 metres and crown lift up to 3 metres (ii) 1 no. Chestnut (T2 on plan) crown lift up to 3 metres (iii) 1 no. Hazel (T3 on plan) crown thin by 20% and remove branches over summerhouse (iv) 3 no. Prunus (T4 on plan) crown reduce height by 2 metres and reduce on roadside by 2 metres and remove diseased limb over lawn – Park Lodge 10 Park Lane Newmarket.

D/20/08/22.02 Recommendation

The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management. The Committee DOES NOT OBJECT to this application.

Week 32

D/20/08/22/3 DC/20/1242/TPO - TPO181(1972) Tree Preservation Order - 1no. Horse Chestnut (T1 on plan) - Fell - 2 Seymour Close Newmarket.

D/20/08/22.03 Resolved

The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management and objects to the felling of healthy trees, however in this instance, the Committee welcomed the agreement of the applicant to replace the trees and requested that the application be referred to the Tree Officer for approval. The Committee DOES NOT OBJECT to this application.

Cllr Hood declared a pecuniary interest in the following application and left the meeting.

D/20/08/22/4 DC/20/1251/TCA - Trees in a Conservation Area Notification - 1no. Horse Chestnut (T1 on plan) - remove overhanging branches adjacent roof line to give 3 metre clearance - Clarehaven Stable 57 Bury Road Newmarket Suffolk.

D/20/08/22.04 Resolved

The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management. The Committee DOES NOT OBJECT to this application.

Cllr Hood re-joined the meeting and declared a nonpecuniary interest in the following application and did not vote.

D/20/08/24 **AMENDED AND DEFERRED PLANNING APPLICATIONS**
DC/20/0819/TPO – Prestige Place, Snailwell Road Newmarket.

It was noted that this application had already been approved.

D/20/08/24.01 Resolved

The Committee actively encourages responsible tree management. The Committee OBJECTED to this application and requested that the application be submitted to the Tree Officer for consideration and approval. If the tree is to be felled, the Committee requests that a suitable replacement be planted.

D/20/08/25 **EAST CAMBS PLANNING APPLICATIONS**
19/00518/FUM – Land Opposite 1 – 8 Dalham Road Ashley Suffolk.

Cllr Drummond left the meeting.

The Notice of Appeal by the Secretary of State against the decision of ECDC to refuse the planning application was noted and the following was agreed:

D/20/08/25.01 Resolved

That the previous objections of the Committee be re-submitted.

D/20/08/26 **TO RECEIVE RESULTS OF APPLICATIONS AS DETERMINED BY WEST SUFFOLK AND PLANS WITHDRAWN**

West Suffolk Planning Determinations received during weeks 31 & 32.

Applications	Description	Address	WS Decision	NTC Decision
DC/20/0162/FUL	Planning Application - Change of use of basement from office (B1) to Escape Room Assembly and Leisure (D2)	Godolphin House, Basement Office 2 The Avenue Newmarket	Approved	No objections
DC/20/0729/FUL	Planning Application - 7 no. commercial use units (use class B1) and associated works (demolition of existing commercial unit)	7 Laureate Paddocks Newmarket Suffolk	Approved	No objections
DC/20/0819/TPO	TPO001(2014) - Tree Preservation Order - (i) 1no. Sycamore (T006 on plan and within area G3 on order) (ii) 1no. Sorbus (T1 on plan and within area G2 on order) fell (iii) 1 no. Sycamore (tag 49) - crown raise to 5 metres over trackway	Prestige Place Snailwell Road Newmarket Suffolk	Approved	Objected
DC/20/0895/FUL	Planning Application - Alterations and additions to existing boundary treatment including brick walls to packing areas and fencing to service courtyard	Black Bear Harley Davidson Black Bear Lane Newmarket Suffolk	Approved	No objections
DC/20/0968/TPO	TPO 06 (2006) Tree Preservation Order - 1no. Cedar (T1 on plan T15 on order) Reduce all extended lateral branches by up to 2 metres	20 Meridian Gardens Newmarket	Approved	No objections
DC/20/1035/FUL	Planning Application - Full height curtain walling to middle bay above entrance doors (previously approved under DC/20/0542/FUL)	Unit 3A Newmarket Retail Park Oaks Drive Newmarket Suffolk	Approved	No objections
DC/20/06884/TCA	Trees in a Conservation Area Notification - (i) 1no. Sycamore, 2no. Maple, 1no. Cypress and 1no. Conifer (G1, T1 and T3 on plan) - Crown lift to 4 metres above ground level, laterally reduce to give 2 metres clearance from adjacent building (ii) 2no. Conifer (T2 and T4 on plan) - fel	Fairway Lodge 18A The Avenue Newmarket Suffolk	Approved	No objections

D/20/08/27 DELEGATION PANEL DECISIONS

None noted.

D/20/08/28 TO DISCUSS ANY LICENSING APPLICATIONS

None noted.

D/20/08/29 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Monday 7th September 2020 at 6.00pm via Zoom.

D/20/08/30 TO NOTE ANY ITEMS FOR NEXT MEETING

- Consultation on changes to planning regulations

Meeting closed at 6:43pm.

Signed _____ Date _____

LIST 33**14 August 2020****Applications Registered between 10.8.20 – 14.8.20****PLANNING APPLICATIONS REGISTERED**

The following applications for Planning Permission, Listed Building, Conservation Area and Advertisement Consent and relating to Tree Preservation Orders and Trees in Conservation Areas have been made to this Council. A copy of the applications and plans accompanying them may be inspected on our website www.westsuffolk.gov.uk. Representations should be made in writing, quoting the application number and emailed to planning.help@westsuffolk.gov.uk to arrive not later than 21 days from the date of this list. Note: Representations on Brownfield Permission in Principle applications and/or associated Technical Details Consent applications must arrive not later than 14 days from the date of this list.

Application No.	Proposal	Location
DC/20/1188/FUL VALID DATE: 11.08.2020 EXPIRY DATE: 06.10.2020 WARD: Newmarket North PARISH: Newmarket Town Council	Planning Application - 1no dwelling with associated landscaping and access APPLICANT: Mrs Adebinnie Abake Sawyerr AGENT: Mr James Smith CASE OFFICER: Adam Yancy	Plot North Of 10 Weston Way Newmarket Suffolk GRID REF: 563980 264704
DC/20/1268/ADV VALID DATE: 10.08.2020 EXPIRY DATE: 05.10.2020 WARD: Newmarket North PARISH: Newmarket Town Council	Application for Advertisement Consent - 1no. externally illuminated fascia sign APPLICANT: Mr Keith French AGENT: Mr Dennis Brocklesby CASE OFFICER: James Morriss	Goodwin Business Park, Ucat Willie Snaith Road Newmarket Suffolk GRID REF: 563223 264969

DC/20/1276/TPO VALID DATE: 13.08.2020 EXPIRY DATE: 08.10.2020 WARD: Newmarket North PARISH: Newmarket Town Council	TPO 004 (2012) Tree Preservation Order - 1no. Yew (T1 on plan T15 on order) reduce by up to 1.5 metres over driveway APPLICANT: Mr James Ayre AGENT: Mr Parry - Anglia Tree Contractor CASE OFFICER: Amey Yuill	1 Arborfield Drive Newmarket Suffolk CB8 7FL GRID REF: 564148 264740
DC/20/1293/TCA VALID DATE: 10.08.2020 EXPIRY DATE: 21.09.2020 WARD: Newmarket West PARISH: Newmarket Town Council	Trees in a Conservation Area Notification - (i) 1no. Cherry (C1 on plan) Fell (ii) 1no. Beech (B1 on plan) and 1no. Sycamore (S1 on plan) raise crown by up to 2 metres from property roof and wall and cut back lower limbs over neighbouring property by up to 3 metres APPLICANT: Mr Treverrow, Tattersalls AGENT: Mr Alexander Talbot CASE OFFICER: Falcon Saunders	Terrace House Queensberry Road Newmarket CB8 9BT GRID REF: 564043 263126

LIST 34**21 August 2020****Applications Registered between 17th August – 21st August 2020****PLANNING APPLICATIONS REGISTERED**

The following applications for Planning Permission, Listed Building, Conservation Area and Advertisement Consent and relating to Tree Preservation Orders and Trees in Conservation Areas have been made to this Council. A copy of the applications and plans accompanying them may be inspected on our website www.westsuffolk.gov.uk. Representations should be made in writing, quoting the application number and emailed to planning.help@westsuffolk.gov.uk to arrive not later than 21 days from the date of this list. Note: Representations on Brownfield Permission in Principle applications and/or associated Technical Details Consent applications must arrive not later than 14 days from the date of this list.

Application No.	Proposal	Location
-----------------	----------	----------

There are no planning applications to be considered for Newmarket Town Council.

LIST 35**28 August 2020****Applications Registered between 24th-28th August 2020****PLANNING APPLICATIONS REGISTERED**

The following applications for Planning Permission, Listed Building, Conservation Area and Advertisement Consent and relating to Tree Preservation Orders and Trees in Conservation Areas have been made to this Council. A copy of the applications and plans accompanying them may be inspected on our website www.westsuffolk.gov.uk. Representations should be made in writing, quoting the application number and emailed to planning.help@westsuffolk.gov.uk to arrive not later than 21 days from the date of this list. Note: Representations on Brownfield Permission in Principle applications and/or associated Technical Details Consent applications must arrive not later than 14 days from the date of this list.

Application No.	Proposal	Location
DC/20/1336/HH VALID DATE: 17.08.2020 EXPIRY DATE: 12.10.2020 WARD: Newmarket North PARISH: Newmarket Town Council	Householder Planning Application - (i) single storey front extension (ii) 1st floor extension above garage with single storey link to main dwelling APPLICANT: Mr Dzmitry Sheuchyuk AGENT: Mr Andrei Nazarov CASE OFFICER: Savannah Cobbold	80 Weston Way Newmarket CB8 7SF GRID REF: 564002 264731



Planning links for list 33-34-35 August 2020

List 33

DC/20/1188/FUL

<https://planning.westsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QDRGROPDMDH00>

DC/20/1268/ADV

<https://planning.westsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QEJPEIPDML400>

DC/20/1276/TPO

<https://planning.westsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QEN81QPD0DI00>

DC/20/1293/TCA

<https://planning.westsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QEU73PPDMN600>

List 34

There are no planning applications to be considered for Newmarket Town Council.

List 35

DC/20/1336/HH

<https://planning.westsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=QF75QMPDMQT00>

**PLANNING AND REGULATORY SERVICES
DECISIONS WEEK ENDING 14/08/2020**

**PLEASE NOTE THE DECISIONS LIST RUN FROM
MONDAY TO FRIDAY EACH WEEK**

There are no Planning decisions for Newmarket Town Council to consider.

**PLANNING AND REGULATORY SERVICES
DECISIONS WEEK ENDING 21/08/2020**

**PLEASE NOTE THE DECISIONS LIST RUN FROM
MONDAY TO FRIDAY EACH WEEK**

DC/20/0928/HH DECISION: Approve Application DECISION TYPE: Delegated ISSUED DATED: 20 Aug 2020 WARD: Newmarket East PARISH: Newmarket Town Council	Householder Planning Application - (i) single storey front extension incorporating alterations to garage (ii) single storey rear extension (iii) replacement render (iv) replacement and alterations to windows (v) replace chimney stack (following removal of existing) APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Roger Cattliff AGENT: Mr Nicholas Twitchett - Twitchett Architect	Barkway House 18 Bury Road Newmarket CB8 7BT
--	---	---

**PLANNING AND REGULATORY SERVICES
DECISIONS WEEK ENDING 28/08/2020**

**PLEASE NOTE THE DECISIONS LIST RUN FROM
MONDAY TO FRIDAY EACH WEEK**

DC/20/0848/TPO DECISION: Approve Application DECISION TYPE: Delegated ISSUED DATED: 26 Aug 2020 WARD: Newmarket North PARISH: Newmarket Town Council	TPO 032 (1960) Tree Preservation Order - 1no. Horse chestnut (T1 on plan and A1 on order). Reduce lateral crown spread of upper crown to south by up to 1.5 metres. Crown raise to 4 metres above ground level to south. APPLICANT: Welsh AGENT: Mr Tom Downer - Tmtreesolutions	14 Paget Place Newmarket Suffolk CB8 7DR
DC/20/1033/ADV DECISION: Refuse Application DECISION TYPE: Delegation Panel ISSUED DATED: 27 Aug 2020 WARD: Newmarket North PARISH: Newmarket Town Council	Application for Advertisement Consent - 1no. internally illuminated freestanding gantry sign APPLICANT: Mr Ken Jones, Iceland Foods Ltd AGENT: Mr Ray Robinson	Unit 3A Newmarket Retail Park Oaks Drive Newmarket Suffolk CB8 7SX
DC/20/1091/TPO DECISION: Approve Application DECISION TYPE: Delegated ISSUED DATED: 27 Aug 2020 WARD: Newmarket West PARISH: Newmarket Town Council	TPO 04 (2000) Tree Preservation Order- 1no. Beech (T1 on plan and order)- Overall crown reduction by up to 3 metres APPLICANT: Mrs Valerie O'Grady AGENT: Mr Richard Marjoram - D M Tree Contractors	Portland Cottage Hamilton Road Newmarket Suffolk CB8 0NQ

Townclerk

From: Admin SALC <admin@salc.org.uk>
Sent: 10 August 2020 16:40
Subject: Planning consultations
Attachments: PC10-20 Changes to the current planning system.docx; PC11-20 Planning for the future white paper.docx; PC12-20 Transparency and competition (land control).docx

Importance: High

Dear colleagues,

Last week the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government issued three consultations on reform of the planning system:

Changes to the current planning system (NALC deadline for responses 17 September)

Planning for the future - the planning white paper (NALC deadline for responses 15 October)

Transparency and competition: a call for evidence on data on land control (NALC deadline for responses 16 October)

Please find attached briefings corresponding to each consultation. Could I ask all county associations to forward these briefings on to member local (parish and town) councils in their area and encourage them to **respond to NALC on this very important issue by emailing policycomms@nalc.gov.uk**. *Please note the individual deadlines for each consultation.*

I do apologise for unhelpful timing of this consultation and the short timeframes given for responses, unfortunately this is largely beyond NALC's control.

Kind Regards,

Jessica

Jessica Lancod-Frost
Policy officer
National Association of Local Councils

t: 020 7290 0319 | e: nalc@nalc.gov.uk | w: www.nalc.gov.uk | a: 109 Great Russell St, London WC1B 3LD



Like us on Facebook



Follow us on twitter



Disclaimer: This email may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you receive this in error, please notify the sender immediately and do not use, rely upon, copy, forward or disclose its content to any other party. Any views or opinions expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the National Association of Local Councils. This email message has been swept by Norton-Antivirus Corporate Edition and Microsoft Windows Defender for the presence of computer viruses. It is however the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that it is virus free before using it and no responsibility whatsoever is accepted by the National Association of Local Councils for any loss or damage arising in any way from its use.

10 AUGUST 2020

PC10-20 | CHANGES TO THE CURRENT PLANNING SYSTEM

Summary

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government has issued a new consultation on changes to the planning system. This consultation seeks views on a range of proposed changes to the current planning system including: changes to the standard method for assessing local housing need, securing of First Homes through developer contributions, temporarily lifting the small sites threshold and extending the current Permission in Principle to major development. The main consultation document can be found [here](#).

Consultation questions

NALC will be responding to the consultation questions as follows:

1. 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?
2. 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
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. Do you agree that affordability is given an appropriate weighting within the standard method? If not, please explain why.

Do you agree that authorities should be planning having regard to their revised standard method need figure, from the publication date of the revised guidance, with the exception of:

6. 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?

7. 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?

8. 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:

9. 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?

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

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

12. Do you agree with the proposed approach to transitional arrangements set out above?

13. Do you agree with the proposed approach to different levels of discount?

14. 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?

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

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

17. Do you agree with the proposed approach to raise the small sites threshold for a time-limited period?

18. What is the appropriate level of small sites threshold? i) Up to 40 homes ii) Up to 50 homes iii) Other (please specify)

19. Do you agree with the proposed approach to the site size threshold?

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

21. Do you agree with the proposed approach to minimising threshold effects?

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

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

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

25. 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.

26. 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?

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

28. 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

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

30. What level of flat fee do you consider appropriate, and why?

31. 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.

32. 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.

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

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

35. 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?

Your evidence

Please email your responses to this consultation to policycomms@nalc.gov.uk by 17.00 on 17 September 2020. County associations are asked to forward this briefing onto all member councils in their area.

© NALC 202

10 AUGUST 2020

PC11-20 | WHITE PAPER: PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

Summary

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government has issued a new consultation on planning for the future. This consultation seeks any views on each part of a package of proposals for reform of the planning system in England to streamline and modernise the planning process, improve outcomes on design and sustainability, reform developer contributions and ensure more land is available for development where it is needed. The main consultation document can be found [here](#).

First, we will streamline the planning process with more democracy taking place more effectively at the plan-making stage, and will replace the entire corpus of plan-making law in England to achieve this:

- Simplifying the role of Local Plans, to focus on identifying land under three categories
- Growth areas suitable for substantial development, and where outline approval for development would be automatically secured for forms and types of development specified in the Plan
- Renewal areas suitable for some development, such as gentle densification; and Protected areas where – as the name suggests – development is restricted. This could halve the time it takes to secure planning permission on larger sites identified in plans. We also want to allow local planning authorities to identify sub-areas in their Growth areas for self- and custom-build homes, so that more people can build their own homes.

Local Plans should set clear rules rather than general policies for development. We will set out general development management policies nationally, with a more focused role for Local Plans in identifying site- and area-specific requirements, alongside locally produced design codes. This would scale back the detail and duplication contained in Local Plans, while encouraging a much greater focus on design quality at the local level. Plans will be significantly shorter in length (we expect a reduction in size of at least two thirds), as they will no longer contain a long list of “policies” of varying specificity – just a core set of standards and requirements for development.

Local councils should radically and profoundly re-invent the ambition, depth and breadth with which they engage with communities as they consult on Local Plans. Our reforms will democratise the planning process by putting a new emphasis on engagement at the plan-making stage. At the same time, we will streamline the opportunity for consultation at the planning application stage, because this adds delay to the process and allows a small minority of voices, some from the local area and often some not, to shape outcomes. We

want to hear the views of a wide range of people and groups through this consultation on our proposed reforms.

- Local Plans should be subject to a single statutory “sustainable development” test, and unnecessary assessments and requirements that cause delay and challenge in the current system should be abolished. This would mean replacing the existing tests of soundness, updating requirements for assessments (including on the environment and viability) and abolishing the Duty to Cooperate.
- Local Plans should be visual and map-based, standardised, based on the latest digital technology, and supported by a new standard template. Plans should be significantly shorter in length, and limited to no more than setting out site- or area-specific parameters and opportunities.
- Local authorities and the Planning Inspectorate will be required through legislation to meet a statutory timetable (of no more than 30 months in total) for key stages of the process, and there will be sanctions for those who fail to do so. • Decision-making should be faster and more certain, within firm deadlines, and should make greater use of data and digital technology.

We will seek to strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions so that as we move towards a rules-based system, communities can have confidence those rules will be upheld.

- We will develop a comprehensive resources and skills strategy for the planning sector to support the implementation of our reforms – so that, as we bring in our reforms, local planning authorities are equipped to create great communities through world-class civic engagement and proactive plan-making.

Second, we will take a radical, digital-first approach to modernise the planning process. This means moving from a process based on documents to a process driven by data. We will:

- Support local planning authorities to use digital tools to support a new civic engagement process for Local Plans and decision-making, making it easier for people to understand what is being proposed and its likely impact on them through visualisations and other digital approaches. We will make it much easier for people to feed in their views into the system through social networks and via their phones.
- Insist local plans are built on standardised, digitally consumable rules and data, enabling accessible interactive maps that show what can be built where. The data will be accessed by software used across the public sector and also by external PropTech entrepreneurs to improve transparency, decision-making and productivity in the sector.
- Standardise, and make openly and digitally accessible, other critical datasets that the planning system relies on, including planning decisions and developer contributions. Approaches for fixing the underlying data are already being tested and developed by

innovative local planning authorities and we are exploring options for how these could be scaled nationally.

- Work with tech companies and local authorities to modernise the software used for making and case-managing a planning application, improving the user-experience for those applying and reducing the errors and costs currently experienced by planning authorities. A new more modular software landscape will encourage digital innovation and will consume and provide access to underlying data. This will help automate routine processes, such as knowing whether new applications are within the rules, making decision-making faster and more certain.

- Engage with the UK PropTech sector through a PropTech Innovation Council to make the most of innovative new approaches to meet public policy objectives, help this emerging sector to boost productivity in the wider planning and housing sectors, and ensure government data and decisions support the sector's growth in the UK and internationally.

Third, to bring a new focus on design and sustainability, we will:

- Ensure the planning system supports our efforts to combat climate change and maximises environmental benefits, by ensuring the National Planning Policy Framework targets those areas where a reformed planning system can most effectively address climate change mitigation and adaptation and facilitate environmental improvements.

- Facilitate ambitious improvements in the energy efficiency standards for buildings to help deliver our world-leading commitment to net-zero by 2050.

- Ask for beauty and be far more ambitious for the places we create, expecting new development to be beautiful, and to create a 'net gain' not just 'no net harm', with a greater focus on 'placemaking' and 'the creation of beautiful places' within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Make it easier for those who want to build beautifully through the introduction of a fast-track for beauty through changes to national policy and legislation, to automatically permit proposals for high-quality developments where they reflect local character and preferences.

- Introduce a quicker, simpler framework for assessing environmental impacts and enhancement opportunities, that speeds up the process while protecting and enhancing England's unique ecosystems.

- Expect design guidance and codes – which will set the rules for the design of new development – to be prepared locally and to be based on genuine community involvement rather than meaningless consultation, so that local residents have a genuine say in the design of new development, and ensure that codes have real 'bite' by making them more binding on planning decisions.

- Establish a new body to support the delivery of design codes in every part of the country, and give permanence to the campaigning work of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission and the life of its co-chairman the late Sir Roger Scruton.
- Ensure that each local planning authority has a chief officer for design and place-making, to help ensure there is the capacity and capability locally to raise design standards and the quality of development.
- Lead by example by updating Homes England's strategic objectives to give greater emphasis to delivering beautiful places.
- Protect our historic buildings and areas while ensuring the consent framework is fit for the 21st century.

Fourth, we will improve infrastructure delivery in all parts of the country and ensure developers play their part, through reform of developer contributions. We propose:

- The Community Infrastructure Levy and the current system of planning obligations will be reformed as a nationally set, value-based flat rate charge (the 'Infrastructure Levy'). A single rate or varied rates could be set. We will aim for the new Levy to raise more revenue than under the current system of developer contributions, and deliver at least as much – if not more – on-site affordable housing as at present. This reform will enable us to sweep away months of negotiation of Section 106 agreements and the need to consider site viability. We will deliver more of the infrastructure existing and new communities require by capturing a greater share of the uplift in land value that comes with development.
- We will be more ambitious for affordable housing provided through planning gain, and we will ensure that the new Infrastructure Levy allows local planning authorities to secure more on-site housing provision.
- We will give local authorities greater powers to determine how developer contributions are used, including by expanding the scope of the Levy to cover affordable housing provision to allow local planning authorities to drive up the provision of affordable homes. We will ensure that affordable housing provision supported through developer contributions is kept at least at current levels, and that it is still delivered on-site to ensure that new development continues to support mixed communities. Local authorities will have the flexibility to use this funding to support both existing communities as well as new communities.
- We will also look to extend the scope of the consolidated Infrastructure Levy and remove exemptions from it to capture changes of use through permitted development rights, so that additional homes delivered through this route bring with them support for new infrastructure

Fifth, to ensure more land is available for the homes and development people and communities need, and to support renewal of our town and city centres, we propose:

- A new nationally determined, binding housing requirement that local planning authorities would have to deliver through their Local Plans. This would be focused on areas where affordability pressure is highest to stop land supply being a barrier to enough homes being built. We propose that this would factor in land constraints, including the Green Belt, and would be consistent with our aspirations of creating a housing market that is capable of delivering 300,000 homes annually, and one million homes over this Parliament.
- To speed up construction where development has been permitted, we propose to make it clear in the revised National Planning Policy Framework that the masterplans and design codes for sites prepared for substantial development should seek to include a variety of development types from different builders which allow more phases to come forward together. We will explore further options to support faster build out as we develop our proposals for the new planning system.
- To provide better information to local communities, to promote competition amongst developers, and to assist SMEs and new entrants to the sector, we will consult on options for improving the data held on contractual arrangements used to control land.
- To make sure publicly owned land and public investment in development supports thriving places, we will: – ensure decisions on the locations of new public buildings – such as government offices and further education colleges – support renewal and regeneration of town centres; and – explore how publicly owned land disposal can support the SME and self-build sectors.

Proposal 9:

Neighbourhood Plans should be retained as an important means of community input, and we will support communities to make better use of digital tools. Since statutory Neighbourhood Plans became part of the system in 2011, over 2,600 communities have started the process of neighbourhood planning to take advantage of the opportunity to prepare a plan for their own areas – and over 1,000 plans have been successfully passed at referendum. They have become an important tool in helping to ‘bring the democracy forward’ in planning, by allowing communities to think proactively about how they would like their areas to develop. Therefore, we think Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system, but we will want to consider whether their content should become more focused to reflect our proposals for Local Plans, as well as the opportunities which digital tools and data offer to support their development and improve accessibility for users. By making it easier to develop Neighbourhood Plans we wish to encourage their continued use and indeed to help spread their use further, particularly in towns and cities.

We are also interested in whether there is scope to extend and adapt the concept so that very small areas – such as individual streets – can set their own rules for the form of development which they are happy to see. Digital tools have significant potential to assist the process of Neighbourhood Plan production, including through new digital co-creation platforms and 3D visualisation technologies to explore proposals within the local context. We

will develop pilot projects and data standards which help neighbourhood planning groups make the most of this potential.

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

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

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?

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.]

(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.]

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.]

(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.]

(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.]

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

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

12. 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.]

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

(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?

14. 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.]
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]
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]
17. 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.]
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 / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
19. 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.]
20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
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]
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.]

(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]

(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.]

(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.]

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.]

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.]

(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.]

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.]

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.]

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

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

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?

Your evidence

Please email your responses to this consultation to policycomms@nalc.gov.uk by 17.00 on 15 October 2020. County associations are asked to forward this briefing on to all member councils in their area.

© NALC 2020

10 AUGUST 2020

PC12-20 | TRANSPARENCY AND COMPETITION: DATA AND LAND CONTROL

Summary

The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government has issued a call for evidence on data and land control. This call for evidence seeks views on proposals to require additional data from the beneficiaries of certain types of interests in land—rights of pre-emption, options and estate contracts. It also seeks views on the design of the policy and additional evidence on the impacts of the policy. The main document can be found [here](#).

Consultation questions

NALC will be responding to the consultation questions as follows:

1. The Public Interest

Do you think there is a public interest in collating and publishing additional data on contractual controls over land?

2. Rights of pre-emption and options

(a) Do you think that the definition of rights of pre-emption and land options in the Finance Act 2003, s. 4616 is a suitable basis for defining rights of pre-emption and options that will be subject to additional data requirements? Please give reasons.

(b) Is the exemption for options and rights of pre-emption for the purchase or lease of residential property for use as a domestic residence sufficient to cover: • options relating to the provision of occupational housing and • shared ownership schemes? Please give reasons.

(c) Are there any types of rights of pre-emption or options that do not fall under the scope of the definition in the Finance Act 2003, s. 46? Please give reasons

3. Estate contracts

Are the tests set out above sufficient to avoid inadvertently capturing transactions not related to the development of land? If not, please give examples.

4. Other contractual controls

(a) Are there any contractual arrangements by which control can be exercised over the purchase or sale of land, which should be included within this regime and which are not rights of pre-emption, options or estate contracts? Please give examples.

(b) If so, do you consider them (i) an interest in land (interests that are capable of being protected by way of a notice on the land register); or (ii) not an interest in land? Please give reasons.

5: Data requirements

(a) Are there any data fields that (i) should; or (ii) should not be subject to additional data requirements? Please give reasons.

(b) Are there any data fields that (i) should; or (ii) should not be placed on the land register? Please give reasons.

(c) Are there any data fields that (i) should; or (ii) should not be included in a contractual control interest dataset? Please give reasons.

(d) Are there other data fields that should be collected? Please give reasons.

(e) Do any of the data fields give rise to privacy risks? Please give reasons.

6. Contractual conditions

(a) Are there any data fields that (i) should; or (ii) should not be subject to additional data requirements? Please give reasons.

(b) Are there any data fields that (i) should; or (ii) should not be placed on the land register? Please give reasons.

(c) Are there any data fields that (i) should; or (ii) should not be included in a contractual control interest dataset? Please give reasons.

7. Legal Entity Identifiers

Should legal entities that are beneficiaries of contractual arrangements be asked to provide a Legal Entity Identifier? Please give reasons

8. Data currency

(a) Should beneficiaries be required to provide updated information on: • variation • termination, or • assignment or novation? Please give reasons.

(b) Are there other ways in which data currency could be maintained?

9. Accounting treatment

If your organisation is required to produce annual accounts, when are: (i) rights of preemption; (ii) options; and (iii) estate contracts recognised on the balance sheet? Please give reasons and state the accounting standard used.

10. Existing contractual control interests

(a) Should the requirement to supply additional data be limited to: (i) new contractual control interests only; or (ii) all extant interests? Please give reasons.

(b) How long should beneficiaries of an extant contractual control interests that is varied, assigned or novated be given to provide additional data before losing protection: (i) three months; or six months?

11. Current beneficiaries

What are the best ways of informing current beneficiaries of the need to provide additional data? Please give reasons.

12. A digital process?

Should the provision of additional data prior to the application process for an agreed notice be exclusively digital (with assisted digital support if required)? Please give reasons.

13. Certification

Should beneficiaries of contractual control interests with a duty to produce annual accounts be required to certify that all relevant interests have been noted? Please give reasons.

14. Restrictions

(a) Should beneficiaries of contractual control interests be required to obtain an agreed notice before they could apply for a restriction? Please give reasons.

(b) Should the protections of restrictions placed on an un-noted contractual control interest be (i) limited; or (ii) removed? Please give reasons.

c) If the Government accepts the Law Commission's recommendation on restrictions, should contractual control interest fall into the category of interest that cannot be capable of protection by way of a restriction? Please give reasons.

15. Alternative options

(a) Should a mandatory system be introduced whereby the beneficiary of a contractual control interest would, where it is possible to do so, be required to note their interest with HMLR? Please give reasons.

(b) If so, how should the system be enforced? Please give reasons.

16. Current practice

(a) If you are a beneficiary of a right of pre-emption, option or estate contract, please indicate how you protect your interest.

	Notice		Restriction	Other	Do not protect
	Agreed	Unilateral			
Right of pre-emption					
Option					
Estate contract					

(b) What factors influence your choice? Please give reasons.

17. Data collation and provision

(a) Are there any data fields in Annex A that contracting parties would not have readily to hand? Please list them.

(b) What is your estimate of the time needed to provide the additional data?

(c) Does your entity hold a Legal Entity Identifier?

18. Data currency

What additional work (over and above the time and cost of preparing annual accounts) would your organisation need to undertake to identify contractual control interests that needed to be updated?

19. Certification

What additional work (over and above the time and cost of preparing annual accounts) would your organisation need to undertake to certify in your organisation's annual accounts that all relevant contractual control interests had been noted on the land register where the land is registered?

20. Economic impact

What impact, if any, do you think that these proposals will have on the English land market (residential and commercial)? Please describe the effects and provide evidence.

21. Costs

What impact, if any, do you think that these proposals will have on the costs incurred by participants in the English land market (residential and commercial)? Please describe the effects and provide evidence.

22. Identifying and understanding contractual control interests

(a) Can you estimate the amount of (i) time and (ii) money that you have spent on identifying land affected by a contractual control interest?

(b) What is the source of your information?

(c) Can you estimate the amount of (i) time and (ii) money that you have spent on seeking professional advice on exactly how a contractual control interest affects a piece of land?

23. Market impact

(a) If you are a small or medium enterprise (SME) builder or developer, do contractual controls hinder your ability to assess the viability of a local market? Please give reasons.

(b) If you are an SME builder or developer, does a lack of freely accessible and understandable data act as a barrier to you entering the market? Please give reasons.

24. Trust in the planning system

(a) Do you think that a lack of accessible and understandable data on contractual controls makes it more difficult for local communities to understand the likely pattern of development? Please give reasons.

(b) If so, to what extent does it undermine trust and confidence in the planning system: (i) not much; (ii) somewhat; (ii) a great deal? Please give reasons.

25. Public Sector Equality Duty

What impact, if any, do you think that these proposals will have on people who share protected characteristics²⁰? Please describe the effects and provide evidence.

Your evidence

Please email your responses to this consultation to policycomms@nalc.gov.uk by 17.00 on 16 October 2020. County associations are asked to forward this briefing onto all member councils in their area.

