

## Appendix

### Response to Govt White Paper – Planning for the Future

1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England? *Locally-focussed, needs-based, racist.*
2. 2(a). Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area? [Yes / No]. *Yes*  
2(b). 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]. *Site notice or by post, not everyone has time for social media etc. or has access to the internet.*
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] *Other - Maintaining viability of farms as food producers*
5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] *No There is no consideration of whether adequate water supply is available. No consideration of the needs of wildlife. Destroying ancient meadows destroys whole ecosystems on which food production depends and will have long term and irreversible consequences. Building in the countryside reduces the land available to absorb rainwater with the consequences that the rivers are more swollen and thus there is more flooding further down-stream, especially as houses are being built on flood plains. No consideration of need for housing in an area as opposed to desire to live in a particular area.*
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.] *Not sure.*
7. 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? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] *Yes. Current requirements are too fragmented and top heavy. The replacement should be more structured. A rigorous definition of sustainable development must be provided.*  
7(b). How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate? *By leaving the Local Planning Authorities to use their common sense.*
8. 8(a). Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] *No. It doesn't allow for local knowledge, and can't allow for local needs. It doesn't allow for local constraints or peculiarities.*  
8(b). Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] *No. Why would a developer build low cost houses in an area where market prices are high? This is especially so if by doing so the median price is reduced and the LPA then has to grant fewer permissions. It is in a developer's interest to keep the median price high so that the LPA needs to give more consents and the follow-on from this is that developers will be “encouraged” to land-bank even more planning consents in the most lucrative areas to keep the permissions flowing.*

Since there are consents for between 800,000 and 1 million dwellings already very few additional consents are needed throughout the life of this parliament. These consents should be built out before anything else is considered.

There is nothing to ensure development uses up brownfield sites first.

9. 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.] **Yes, providing infrastructure requirements are included before consent and there are heavy financial penalties for not fully building out within a given (short) timeframe.**
- 9(b). Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **No. They are too inflexible.**
- 9(c). Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **No. New settlements are fundamentally a bad idea. Any new settlement will gradually expand and take more farms out of the food production system. As in the response to Q5 it will impact on the natural drainage and give rise to localised flooding down-stream. Houses in the middle of nowhere will require many more car journeys. The Govt needs to decide if it wants to reduce car usage or not and all depts should be working towards an agreed aim.**
10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **Yes. Some of the delays in the present system would be eliminated if there was more standardisation.**
11. Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **Yes. But they must also be accessible in areas where broadband is poor or non-existent.**
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.] **Yes. Current plans take far too long and with too much emphasis on presentation, both of which contribute to excessive costs.**
13. 13(a). Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **Yes. It gives local people who devised the plans a voice.**
- 13(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? **Neighbourhood plans already reflect community preferences but if they can just be ignored at appeal due to technicalities then communities will not put in the time (unpaid) and effort to produce them. The use of digital tools is an irrelevance, the neighbourhood planning group will use whatever tools they have available, are familiar with and are pertinent to their location.**
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.] **YES. There, should be major financial disincentives if dwellings are not occupied within a given time-frame, say 3 years, and no further planning applications considered. Additionally the number of unoccupied dwellings plus consents which have not been built out and occupied in an area should be subtracted from whatever the current housing need is deemed to be.**
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]. **There hasn't been any.**

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]. **Other. Maintenance of agricultural land and the ability of farms to sustain their function as food producers.**
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.] **No. This could result in even more boring uniformity of identikit houses. New dwellings should be in keeping with the locality but not replicas of what already exists.**
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.] **No. This would be just more bureaucracy and a waste of public money. It would also give too much subjective power to a single officer.**
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.] **No. Beauty is subjective. Homes England is just another unnecessary, publicly funded body and should be disbanded.**
20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **No, Beauty is subjective.**
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]. **Don't know.**
22. 22(a). Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **Yes, but should not be subject to negotiation.**
- 22(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]. **Nationally, as a fixed percentage of the sale price of the houses.**
- 22(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.]. **Not sure.**
- 22(d). Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **No - Local authorities should not borrow.**
23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **Yes. The infrastructure levy should apply to all additional dwellings irrespective of the form of the relevant planning consent.**

24. 24(a). Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **Not sure.**
- 24(b). Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **Not sure.**
- 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.] **Not sure.**
- 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.] **Not sure.**
25. Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.] **No, local authorities should have to spend it on infrastructure (schools, roads etc) and involve the Parish Council in identifying the priorities.**
- 25(a). If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

Proposal 24: We will seek to strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions available to local planning authorities to ensure they support the new planning system. We will introduce more powers to address intentional unauthorised development, consider higher fines, and look to ways of supporting more enforcement activity. This will include implementing our commitments from the Government's response to the consultation on unauthorised development and encampments, to strengthen national planning policy against intentional unauthorised development and ensure temporary stop notices are more effective. **Fully support this.**

We will also consider what more can be done in cases where the Environment Agency's flood risk advice on planning applications is not followed. **Give the EA the right to veto any planning application.**