

# Questions on Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes to the planning system

- 1) Do you have any views on how statutory National Development Management Policies could be introduced in the most effective manner, should a future decision be made to progress these?

**We support National Development Management Policies being statutory.**

- 2) Do you agree with the new format and structure of the draft Framework which comprises separate plan-making policies and national decision-making policies? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

- 3) Do you agree with the proposed set of annexes to be incorporated into the draft Framework? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

- 4) Do you agree with incorporating Planning Policy for Traveller Sites within the draft Framework? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

- 5) Do you agree with the proposed approach to simplifying the terminology in the Framework where weight is intended to be applied? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree

- 6) Do you agree with the role, purpose and content of spatial development strategies set out in policy PM1? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partially agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Welcome move back to high level guidance, however should be an opportunity to allocate sites.**

- 7) Do you agree that alterations should be made to spatial development strategies at least every 5 years to reflect any changes to housing requirements for the local planning authorities in the strategy area? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly disagree.**

- a) If not, do you think there should be a different approach, for example, that alterations should only be made to spatial development strategies every five years where there are significant changes to housing need in the strategy area?

**High level review needed every 5 years but may not result in need for changes.**

- 8) If spatial development strategies are not altered every five years, should related policy on the requirements used in five year housing land supply and housing delivery test policies, set out in Annex D of the draft Framework, be updated to allow housing requirement figures from spatial development strategies to continue to be applied after 5 years, so long as there has not been a significant change in that area's local housing need? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.
- 9) Do you agree with the role, purpose and content of local plans set out in policy PM2? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.
- 10) Do you think that local plans should cover a period of at least 15 years from the point of adoption of the plan? Yes/No

**No**

- a) If not, do you think they should cover a period of at least 10 years, or a different period of time. Please explain why.

**Yes, to provide flexibility and avoid stepped trajectories. Evidence needs to be very up to date at the time of examination, but would need updating within 10 years. Amend to 10/15 years from submission, to give the local authority more certainty.**

- 11) Do you agree with the principles set out in policy PM6(1c), including its provisions for preventing duplication of national decision-making policies? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.
- 12) Do you agree with the approach to initiating plan-making in PM7? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly disagree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree

**30 month time frame too tight, given approval lead in times and need for genuine consultation.**

- 12) Do you agree with the approach to the preparation of plan evidence set out in policy PM8? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Need to be clear when evidence doesn't need to be updated, to provide reassurance for LPAs.**

- 13) Do you agree with the approach to identifying land for development in PM9? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

- 15) Do you agree with the policies on maintaining and demonstrating cross-boundary cooperation set out in policy PM10 and policy PM11? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

- 16) Do you agree that policy PM12 increases certainty at plan-making stage regarding the contributions expected from development proposals? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

- 17) Do you agree that plans should set out the circumstances in which review mechanisms will be used, or should national policy set clearer expectations? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Should generally be set by national policy. However, will be local circumstances in some instances.**

- 18) Do you agree with policy PM13 on setting local standards, including the proposal to commence s.43 of the Deregulation Act 2015? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

- 19) Do you agree that the tests of soundness set out in policies PM14 and PM15 will allow for a proportionate assessment of spatial development strategies, local plans and minerals and waste plans at examination? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) If not, please explain how this could be improved to ensure a proportionate assessment, making it clear which type of plan you are commenting on?

20) Do you have any specific comments on the content of the plan-making chapter which are not already captured by the other questions in this section?

21) Do you agree with the principles set out in policy DM1? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Neither agree nor disagree**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

22) Do you agree with the policy DM2 on information requirements for planning applications? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Policy DM2 is relatively good. However, it should not override Local Lists, which can be useful for LPA. The national and local requirements should have equal weight.**

23) Do you have any views on whether such a policy could be better implemented through regulations?

24) Do you agree with the principles set out in DM3? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Broadly agree. However, DM3:1.C only references positive responses; it should reference all responses, positive or negative.**

**DM3:1.D pressure should not be put upon LPA's to issue decisions in the absence of stat consultee responses.**

25) Do you agree that policy DM5 would prevent unnecessary negotiation of developer contributions, whilst also providing sufficient flexibility for development to proceed? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

26) Do you have any further comments on the likely impact of policy DM5: Development viability?

27) Do you have any views on how the process of modifying planning obligations under S106A, where needed once a section 106 agreement has been entered into, could be improved?

28) Do you have any views on how the process of modifying planning obligations could be improved in advance of any legislative change, noting the government's commitment to boosting the supply of affordable housing.

29) Do you agree with the approach for planning conditions and obligations set out in policy DM6, especially the use of model conditions and obligations? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly disagree. LPA's should, in particular, be able to use their own legal agreements.**

30) Do you agree that policy DM7 clarifies the relationship between planning decisions and other regulatory regimes? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

31) Do you agree with the new intentional unauthorised development policy in policy DM8? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Rightly or wrongly, applications should be determined on their own merits, not on whether or not it is retrospective. Increased fees for retrospective applications would be a good means to deter applications being made retrospectively.**

32) Are there any specific types of harm arising from intentional unauthorised development, and any specific impacts from the proposed policy, which we should consider?

a) If so, are there any particular additions or mitigations which we should consider?

33) Do you agree with the new Article 4 direction policy in policy DM10? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

34) Do you agree with the proposed approach to setting a spatial strategy in development plans? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

35) Do you agree with the proposed definition of settlements in the glossary? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

36) Do you agree with the revised approach to the presumption in favour of sustainable development? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

37) Do you agree to the proposed approach to development within settlements? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Approach should recognise that settlements could be washed over by Green Belt, such that Green Belt policies would apply.**

38) Do you agree to the proposed approach to development outside settlements? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Policy should recognise that some stations are isolated and development would not be appropriate.**

39) Do you have any views on the specific categories of development which the policy would allow to take place outside settlements, and the associated criteria? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons.

**Policy should recognise that some stations are isolated and development would not be appropriate.**

40) Do you agree with the proposed approach to development around stations, including that it applies only to housing and mixed-use development capable of meeting the density requirements in chapter 12? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, including any evidence that this policy would lead to adverse impacts on Gypsies and Travellers and other groups with protected characteristics.

41) Do you agree that neighbourhood plans should contain allocations to meet their identified housing requirement in order to qualify for this policy? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree or disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) If not, please provide your reasons

42) Do you agree with the approach to planning for climate change in policy CC1? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Policy CC1 sets out a clear and comprehensive list of priorities for development plans to take a proactive approach to mitigating climate change and supporting the transition to net zero.**

**Part a) recognises the importance of establishing sustainable development patterns through the spatial strategy. This is to be informed by an assessment of baseline carbon emissions and potential effect of development options. This is supported and the Council notes that the Government's intention (set out in its response to consultation on the NPPF published in February 2025) is to provide planning practice guidance to assist local authorities in considering carbon emissions within the plan-making process, and to support developers in using carbon accounting to reduce carbon emissions as part of their development proposals. We welcome this commitment and would stress the importance of providing this guidance at an early opportunity.**

43) Do you agree with the approach to mitigating climate change through planning decisions in policy CC2? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree. The draft policy is comprehensive.**

a) If not, what additional measures could be taken to ensure climate change mitigation is given appropriate consideration?

44) Do you agree with the approach to climate change adaptation through planning decisions in policy CC3? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly disagree.**

a) What additional measures could be taken to ensure climate change adaptation is given appropriate consideration?

**Category E references wildfires. Very few LPA's would have any experience of, what in practice, 'suitable mitigation measures' are. Clarification or consultee assistance would be required.**

45) Does the policy on wildfire adaptation clearly explain when such risks should be considered and how these risks should be mitigated? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons

**Policy drafting is appropriate to the increasing risk of wildfires.**

46) How should wildfire adaptation measures be integrated with wider principles for good design, and what additional guidance would be helpful?

**Ideally yes, however, it is about risk management which will depend on the locality and nature of surrounding land uses. Some national guidance about the incorporation of features/measures to mitigate and adapt to fire risk in development design would be useful that could help inform local designed guidance and codes.**

47) Do you have any other comments on actions that could be taken through national planning policy to address climate change?

48) Do you agree the requirements for spatial development strategies and local plans in policy HO1 and policy HO2 are appropriate? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

49) Is further guidance required on assessing the needs of different groups, including older people, disabled people, and those who require social and affordable housing? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) If so, what elements should this guidance cover?

50) Do you agree with the approach to incorporating relevant policies of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites within this chapter? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

51) Is further guidance needed on how authorities should assess the need for traveller sites and set requirement figures? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) If so, what are the key principles this guidance should establish?

52) Do you agree the new Annex D to the draft Framework is sufficiently clear on how local planning authorities should set the appropriate buffer for their local plan 5-year housing land supply? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

53) Do you agree the new Annex D to the draft Framework is sufficiently clear on the wider procedural elements of 5-year housing land supply, the Housing Delivery Test and how they relate to decision-making? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

54) Do you agree the requirements to establish a 5 year supply of deliverable traveller sites and monitor delivery are sufficiently clear? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly disagree.**

55) Do you agree the plan-making requirements, for both local plans and spatial development strategies, in relation to large scale residential and mixed-use development are sufficiently clear? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

56) Do you agree our proposed changes to the definition of designated rural areas will better support rural social and affordable housing? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

57) Do you agree with our proposals to ask authorities to set out the proportion of new housing that should be delivered to M4(2) and M4(3) standards? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

58) Do you agree 40% of new housing delivered to M4(2) standards over the plan period is the right minimum proportion? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, and would you support an alternative minimum percentage requirement?

59) Do you agree the proposals to support the needs of different groups, through requiring authorities to identify sites or set requirements for parts of allocated sites are proportionate? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

60) Do you agree with our proposals to ask authorities to set out requirements for a broader mix of tenures to be provided on sites of 150 homes or more? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons and indicate if an alternative site size threshold would be preferable?

61) Do you agree with proposals for authorities to allocate land to accommodate 10% of the housing requirement on sites of between 1 and 2.5 hectares? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons

**The ability to do this will depend on the availability of sites being promoted, which may or may not include sites of this size. The Councils supply of land will include sites below the threshold for allocation (which for Gedling Borough Council is 50 dwellings). It would not be practical to allocate sites over one hectare. As such, the reference should be changed from land being allocated to accommodate 10% of the housing requirement on sites of a particular size, to the housing supply incorporating 10% of sites of a particular size.**

62) Are any changes to policy HO7 needed in order to ensure that substantial weight is given to meeting relevant needs?

63) Do you agree that proposals to add military affordable housing to the definition of affordable housing, and allow military housing to be delivered as part of affordable housing requirements, will successfully enable the provision of military homes? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

64) Do you agree flexibility relating to the size of market homes provided will better enable developments providing affordable housing? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

65) Would requiring a minimum proportion of social rent, unless otherwise specified in development plans, support the delivery of greater number of social rent homes? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Within H08 there is no reference to 'pepper potting' the affordable homes, which could lead to a large grouping, which should be avoided.**

a) If so, what would be an appropriate minimum proportion and development size threshold taking into account development viability?

66) Are changes to planning policy needed to ensure that affordable temporary accommodation, such as stepping stone housing, is appropriately supported, including flexibilities around space standards?

a) If so, what changes would be beneficial?

67) Do you agree that applicants should have discretion to deliver social and affordable housing requirements via cash payments in lieu of on-site delivery on medium sites? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly agree.**

a) If so, would it be desirable to limit the circumstances in which cash contributions in lieu of on-site delivery can be provided – for example, should it not be permitted on land released from the Green Belt where the Golden Rules apply? Please explain your answer.

**Payment in lieu should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances, what does 'robust' mean in H08.1.b?**

- b) If you do not believe applicants should have blanket discretion to discharge social and affordable housing requirements through commuted sums, do you think cash contributions in lieu of on-site delivery should be permitted in certain circumstances – for example where it could be evidenced that onsite delivery would prevent a scheme from being delivered? Please explain your answer
- 68) What risks and benefits would you expect this policy to have? Please explain your answer. The government is particularly interested in views on the potential impact on SME housing delivery, overall housing delivery, land values, build out rates, overall social and affordable housing delivery, and Registered Providers (including SME providers).
- 69) What guidance or wider changes would be needed to enable Local Planning Authorities to spend commuted sums more effectively and more quickly? Please explain your answer.
- 70) Would further guidance be helpful in supporting authorities to calculate the appropriate value of cash contributions in lieu?
- a) If so, what elements and principles should this guidance set out? Please explain your answer. For example, guidance could make clear that contributions in lieu should be an amount which is the equivalent value of providing affordable housing on site, based on a comparison of the Gross Development Value of the proposed scheme with the Gross Development Value of the scheme assuming affordable housing was provided onsite.
- 71) Do you support proposals to enable off site delivery where affordable housing delivery can be optimised to produce better outcomes in terms of quality or quantity? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.
- 72) Do you agree the with the criteria set out regarding the locations of specialist housing for older people? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.
- 73) Do you agree with the criteria set out regarding the locations of community-based specialist accommodation, including changes to the glossary? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.
- 74) Do you agree with the criteria set out regarding the locations of purpose-built student accommodation and large-scale shared living accommodation, including changes to the glossary? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.
- 75) Do you agree the proposals provide adequate additional support for rural exception sites? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please provide your reasons, including what other changes may be needed to increase their uptake?
- 76) Do you agree with proposals to remove First Homes exception sites as a discrete form of exception site? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Strongly agree. The greatest need appears to be for affordable or social rental properties and not First Homes.**

- 77) Do you agree proposals for a benchmark land value for rural exception sites will help to bring forward more rural affordable homes? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

- a) If so, which approach and value as set out in the narrative for policy HO10 of the consultation document is the most beneficial for government to set out?

- 78) Do you agree the proposals to set out requirements for traveller sites at policy HO12 adequately capture relevant aspects from Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, whilst ensuring fair treatment for traveller sites in the planning system? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

- 79) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

- 80) Do you agree the proposals in policy HO13 will help to ensure development proposals are built out in a reasonable period? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

- 81) Do you agree the requirements to take a flexible approach to the consenting framework for large scale residential and mixed-use development is sufficient to ensure the opportunities of large scale development are supported? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

- 82) Are any more specific approaches or definitions needed to support the delivery of very large (super strategic) sites, including new towns? *Yes, no*

- a) Please provide your reasons.

- 83) Do you agree with the proposed changes to the Housing Delivery Test rule book? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

- 84) Do you agree that more emphasis should be placed on relevant national strategies and the need for flexibility in planning for economic growth, as drafted in policy E1? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Strongly agree that more emphasis should be placed on relevant national strategies which should assist in identification of strategic priorities for long term economic growth and more integration in terms of economic, land use and transport planning from the strategic to local level.**

**Strongly agree about the need for more flexibility as set out in E1 given the proviso set out in the draft policy - unless there is a clear and justified rationale for being specific about acceptable uses at the plan-making stage.**

**Gedling Borough normally applies flexibility to the types of employment that may be accommodated on employment sites within the relevant use classes to permit office, research, light industrial and storage / distribution. However, certain uses such as B2 General Industrial may need to be more strictly controlled given their nature and which are often unsuitable close to residential areas. The support for priority sectors and priority places in the NPPF consultation may also require “themed” high quality sites in the right locations to be restricted to the use classes falling within these key sectors to prevent their dilution by non-key sectors for example car show rooms to ensure they remain available and are developed to maximise economic growth. This could be achieved through appropriate local plan wording and/or use of planning conditions.**

**85) Do you agree with the approach to meeting the need for business land and premises in policy E2? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.***

**Partly agree. A supportive policy. ‘Substantial weight’ is perhaps a little too strong. Reference to availability to infrastructure is supported and would help to identify sites suitable for renewable energy.**

**a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.**

**86) Do you agree with the proposed new decision-making policy supporting freight and logistics development in policy E3? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.***

**Partly agree.**

**a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.**

**The draft should contain more detailed criteria for their location:**

- Should have good access to the motorway/strategic road network or dual carriageway standard**
- Where possible / feasible link to the rail network**
- Be reasonably proximal to urban areas and potential labour supply**

**87) Do you agree with the approach to rural business development in policy E4? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.***

**Strongly agree.**

**a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.**

**The additional detail on acceptable rural diversification is helpful.**

**Priority should be given to conversions and new build should not be accommodated in unsustainable locations.**

**88) Do you agree with the proposed changes to policy for planning for town centres? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.***

**Strongly agree.**

**a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.**

It is considered that the thrust of the changes strengthens the town centre first approach. The emphasis on inclusion of policies reflecting a strategy and vision signal a move towards a more place making approach for town centres and this is welcomed. We agree with and support the use of Design Guides, Design Codes and masterplans as planning tools to implement the strategy and vision. Dropping the requirement to look a minimum of 10 years ahead when allocating sites so as to cover the entire plan period provides added flexibility. The specific reference to the use of Article 4 to restrict PD rights in order to support vitality and viability is especially welcome. However, it is worth stressing that uses falling within the same use class for e.g. Use Class E can change to a use that also falls within the same Use Class E as it does not constitute permitted development.

89) Do you agree with the approach to development in town centres in policy TC2? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.** There is less demand for retail in town centres and alternative uses should be encouraged. Encouraging more diverse uses is key to town centre vitality. Residential uses in or close to town centres is highly sustainable and should increase footfall in centres. More consideration should be given to complementary measures such as fiscal incentives to encourage more use of upper floors.

a) If not, please explain how you would achieve this aim differently?

90) What impacts, if any, have you observed on the operation of planning policy for town centres since the introduction of Use class E?

**The high street has as a result become more diverse.**

91) Do you believe the sequential test in policy TC3 should be retained? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Agree with the retention of the sequential test. Point 3 is little ambiguous. Point 5 would need clearer as to what 'small scale' and it was a 'rural office/development.**

**Impacts / implications of Use Class E. Recent experience has included proposals for relatively modest Class E uses such as gyms seeking to locate in out of centre locations especially in established industrial estates rather than in a local centre. The potential proliferation of class E uses in out of centre locations such as industrial estates can also change the nature of such locations over time potentially becoming more of a leisure / retail destination than traditional employment area. A particular concern is the potential for large office buildings in out of centre location to become a significant scale retail outlet without the need for planning permission with potential to undermine the priority given to town centres.**

**Should the sequential test in TC3 be retained - agree, the sequential retail test should be retained as a policy tool; it is considered an important policy as the sequential test states a clear preference for town centre locations at the heart of the local community. Reliance on proposed TR 4 is not considered an adequate alternative as developers would only need to demonstrate that their site is located in a place that reduces the need to travel and offers a choice of transport modes making it easier for developers to bring forward out of centre sites.**

92) Do you agree with the approach to town centre impact assessments in policy TC4? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Feel that threshold of 2,500sqm is too high and should be reduced.**

- 93) Do you agree that the updated policies provide clearer and stronger support for the rollout of 5G and gigabit broadband? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

- 94) Do you agree the requirements for minimising visual impact and reusing existing structures are practical for applicants and local planning authorities? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Strongly agree.**

- 95) Do you agree the supporting information requirements are proportionate and sufficient without creating unnecessary burdens? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**This should be included within the national requirements list.**

- 96) Do you agree with the approach to planning for energy and water infrastructure in policy W1? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree, what alternative approach would you suggest?

**Reflects current good practice in drawing up Infrastructure Delivery Plans and formalises it as policy.**

- 97) Do you agree with the amendments to current Framework policy on planning for renewable and low-carbon energy development and electricity network infrastructure in policy W2? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Generally, agree that this would add more certainty for the provision of renewable and low carbon energy development.**

- 98) Do you agree with the proposed approach to supporting development for renewable and low carbon development and electricity network infrastructure in policy W3? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree, and any changes you would make to improve the policy.

**On point 3 re decommissioning, this is typically done via a condition.**

**99) Do you agree with the proposed approach to supporting development for water infrastructure in policy W4?** *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

**a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.**

**100) Do you agree with the proposed prohibition on identifying new coal sites in policy M1, and to the removal of coal from the list of minerals of national and local importance?** *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.**

**101) Do you agree with how policy M1 sets out how the development plan should consider oil and gas?** *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.**

**102) Do you agree with the proposed addition of critical and growth minerals to the glossary definition of 'minerals of national and local importance'?** *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.**

**103) Do you agree criteria b of policy M2 strikes the right balance between preventing minerals sterilisation and facilitating non minerals development?** *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.**

**104) Do you agree policy M3 appropriately reflects the importance of critical and growth minerals?** *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.**

**105) Do you agree with the exclusion of development involving onshore oil and gas extraction from policy M3?** *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**106) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.**

**107) Do you agree policy M4 sufficiently addresses the impacts of mineral development, noting that other national decision-making policies will also apply?** *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**108) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.**

**109) Do you agree with approach to coal, oil and gas in policy M5?** *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.**

**110) Are there any other exceptional circumstances in which coal extraction should be permitted?**  
**Yes/No**

**111) If yes, please outline the exceptional circumstances in which you think coal extraction should be permitted.**

112) Do you agree policy M6 strikes the right balance between preventing the sterilisation of minerals reserves and minerals-related activities, and facilitating non-minerals development? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

113) Does policy M6 provide sufficient clarity on the role of Minerals Consultation Areas? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

114) Do you agree policy L1 provides clear guidance on how Local Plans should be prepared to promote the efficient use of land? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly disagree.**

115) If not, what further guidance is needed?

**This should be left to Design Codes and local design policies to address. It is not practical to allocate small sites in local plans, although these will contribute to supply in any event.**

116) Do you agree policy L2 provides clear guidance on how development proposals should be assessed to ensure efficient use of land? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**This should be left to Design Codes and local design policies to address. References to upward extensions and mansard roofs are more likely to be appropriate in London rather than elsewhere in the County.**

117) Do you agree policy L2 identifies appropriate typologies of development to support intensification? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly disagree.**

a) If not, what typologies should be added or removed and why?

**This should be left to Design Codes and local design policies to address. References to upward extensions and mansard roofs are more likely to be appropriate in London rather than elsewhere in the County.**

118) Do you agree the high-level design principles provided in policy L2(d) appropriate for national policy? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

119) Do you agree policy L2 (d)(i) achieves its intent to enable appropriate development that may differ from the existing street scene, particularly in cases such as corner plot redevelopment and upwards extensions. *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

This should be left to Design Codes and local design policies to address. References to upward extensions and mansard roofs are more likely to be appropriate in London rather than elsewhere in the County.

120) Do you agree with the proposed safeguards in policy L2 that allow development in residential curtilages? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Support the emphasis on delivering new homes; however, this should not be at the expense of good design. The advice seems quite London centric.**

121) Do you agree policy L3 provides clear guidance on achieving appropriate densities for residential and mixed-use schemes? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) If not, please explain how guidance could be clearer?

122) Do you agree with the minimum density requirements set out within policy L3? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**The identified density around train stations is supported in urban areas but there are also a number of rural stations where such high densities would be inappropriate.**

b) Could these minimum density requirements lead to adverse impacts on Gypsies and Travellers and other groups with protected characteristics? Please provide your reasons, including any evidence

**Neither agree nor disagree**

123) Do you agree that using dwellings per hectare is an appropriate metric for setting minimum density requirements? Additionally, is our definition of 'net developable area' within the NPPF suitable for this policy? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

124) Do you agree with the proposed definition of a 'well-connected' station used to help set higher minimum density standards in targeted growth locations? In particular, are the parameters we're using for the number of Travel to Work Areas and service frequency appropriate for defining a 'well-connected' station? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons and preferred alternatives.

**As above, it does not to account implications for more rural sites. It's unclear how the average train service will be calculated e.g. 24 hour etc.**

125) Are there other types of location (such as urban core, or other types of public transport node) where minimum density standards should be set nationally? *Yes/No. No*

a) If so, how should these locations be defined in a clear and unambiguous way and what should these density standards be?

126) Should we define a specific range of residential densities for land around stations classified as 'well-connected'?

**It should have greater flexibility for rural stations, where densities would be lower.**

127) If so, what should that range be, and which locations should it apply to?

128) Do you agree policy L4 provides clear high-level guidance on good design for residential extensions? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

129) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Partly disagree. It is too broad, it doesn't mention parking, proportions, materials, design detail etc. Reference should be made to encourage LPA's to use design codes to expand on this.**

130) Do you agree that policy GB1 provides appropriate criteria for establishing new Green Belts? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

131) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

132) Do you agree policy GB2 gives sufficient detail on the expected roles spatial development strategies and local plans play in assessing Green belt land? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

133) Do you agree with proposals to better enable development opportunities around suitable stations to be brought forward? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

134) Do you agree the expectations set out in policy GB5 are appropriate and deliverable in Local Plans? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

135) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

136) Do you agree policies GB6 and GB7 set out appropriate tests for considering development on Green Belt land? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Reference could be made to electricity network infrastructure in part 3. GB7 H; do not feel that access to railway station should override green belt policies.**

137) Do you agree policy GB7(1h) successfully targets appropriate development types and locations in the Green Belt, including that it applies only to housing and mixed-use development capable of meeting the density requirements in chapter 12? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

138) Please provide your reasons, including any evidence that this policy would lead to adverse impacts on Gypsies and Travellers.

139) Do you agree that site-specific viability assessment should be permitted on development proposals subject to the Golden Rules in these three circumstances? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**The golden rules should not be watered down to allow fewer contributions. Viability is typically tested at allocation stage.**

140) With regards to previously developed land, are there further changes to policy or guidance that could be made to help ensure site-specific viability assessments are used only for genuinely previously developed land, and not predominantly greenfield sites?

**The current definition of PDL is clear and does not include green field sites.**

141) Do you agree with setting an affordable housing 'floor' for schemes subject to the Golden Rules accompanied by a viability assessment subject to the terms set out? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly disagree.**

142) Please explain your answer, including your view on the appropriate approach to setting a 'floor', and the right level for this?

**As above, viability should not be taken into account.**

143) Do you agree with local planning authorities testing viability at the plan-making stage using a standardised Benchmark Land Values scenario of 10 times Existing Use Value for greenfield, Green Belt land? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please explain your answer.

144) Do you have any other comments on the use of nationally standardised Benchmark Land Values for local planning authorities to test viability at the plan-making stage?

145) Do you agree that proposed changes to the grey belt definition will improve the operability of the grey belt definition, without undermining the general protections given to other footnote 7 areas? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**They should be retained as per the original NPPF**

146) Do you agree that policy DP1 provides sufficient clarity on how development plans should deliver high quality design and placemaking outcomes? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

147) Do you agree with the approach to design tools set out in policy DP2? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

148) Do you agree policy DP3 clearly set out principles for development proposals to respond to their context and create well-designed places? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Strongly agree and particularly like point 2 which is explicit in terms of a refusal and referencing design codes etc.**

149) Do you agree with the proposed approach to using design review and other design processes in policy DP4? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) If not, what else would help secure better design and placemaking outcomes?

**Partly agree. However, smaller authorities may not have a formal design review and may need to rely on adopted design codes.**

150) Do you agree that policy TR1 will provide an effective basis for taking a vision-led approach and supporting sustainable transport through plan-making? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

151) Do you agree that policy TR2 strikes an appropriate balance between supporting maximum parking standards where they can deliver planning benefits, and requiring a degree of flexibility and consideration of business requirements in setting those standards? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

152) Do you agree with the changes proposed in policy TR3(1a), including the reference to proposals which could generate a significant amount of movement, and the proposed use of the Connectivity Tool? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Neither agree nor disagree.**

153) Do you agree that proposed policy TR4 provides a sufficient basis for the effective integration of transport considerations in creating well-designed places? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

154) Do you agree with policy TR5 as a basis for supporting the provision and retention of roadside facilities where there is an identified need? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Neither agree nor disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

155) Do you agree that the amended wording proposed in policy TR6 provides a clearer basis for considering when transport assessments and travel plans will be required, and for considering impacts on the transport network? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Neither agree nor disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

156) Do you agree the proposed text in policy TR7 provide an effective basis for assessing proposals for marine ports, airports and general aviation facilities? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Neither agree nor disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

157) Do you agree with the additional policy on maintaining and improving rights of way proposed in policy TR8? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Neither agree nor disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

158) Do you agree with the approach to planning for healthy communities in policy HC1, including the expectation that the development plan set local standards for different types of recreational land, drawing upon relevant national standards? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

159) Do you agree that Local Green Space should be 'close' to the community it serves? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

160) Do you agree that the proposed policies at HC3 and HC4 will support the provision of community facilities and public service infrastructure serving new development? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Neither agree nor disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

161) Do you have any views on whether further clarity is required to improve the application of this policy, including the term 'fast food outlets', and the types of uses to which it applies?

**Greater clarity on what is restaurant/take-away or fast food outlet. What is a reasonable walking distance?.**

162) Do you agree with the proposed approach to retaining key community facilities and public service infrastructure in policy HC6? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Partly agree, however, looking at alternative community facilities should also be considered.**

- 163) Do you agree with the approach taken to recreational facilities in policy HC7, including the addition of 'and/or' with reference to quantity and quality of replacement provision? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Agree. However, there should be a distinction between a public and private enterprise.**

- 164) Do you agree with the clarification that Local Green Space should not fall into areas regarded as grey belt or where Green Belt policy on previously developed land apply? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**This could leave Local Green Space open to development which is not inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which could include affordable housing, which should be avoided.**

- 165) Do you agree with policy P1 as a basis for identifying and addressing relevant risks when preparing plans? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Strongly agree provides a comprehensive and clear list of key considerations. Support inclusion of new policy on identifying land which may be needed for public safety and protection.**

- 166) Are any additional tools or guidance needed to enable better decision-making on contaminated land?

- 167) Do you agree with the criteria set out in proposed policy P3 as a basis for securing acceptable living conditions and managing pollution? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Neither agree nor disagree.**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

- 168) Do you agree policy P4 makes sufficiently clear how decision-makers should apply the agent of change principle? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Neither agree nor disagree**

- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

169) Do you agree policy P5 provides sufficient basis for addressing possible malicious threats and other hazards when considering development proposals? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**The policy is extremely broad and is open to interpretation e.g. the fear of crime, possible malicious threat.**

170) Do you agree that substantial weight should be given to the benefits of development for defence and public protection purposes? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

171) Do you agree with the proposed changes set out in policy F3 to improve how Coastal Change Management Areas are identified and taken into account in development plans? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

172) Do you agree with the proposed clarifications to the sequential test set out in policy F5? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Strongly agree the changes provide more clarity on the application of the sequential test in particular the reference to the area of search being the catchment area and also helpfully draw together in one place guidance set out in the National Planning Guidance.**

**What is the 'anticipated catchment'?**

**For F4, it should be clarified whether or not all applications in the flood zone need an FRA, including householder, which we feel should not require an FRA.**

173) Do you agree with the proposed approach to the exception test set out in policy F6? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree

**Strongly agree the clear separation of policy relating to areas at risk of flooding from the rivers and sea is a significant improvement and inclusion of guidance from the National Planning Guidance into one place is very helpful.**

174) Do you agree with the proposed requirement in policy F8 for sustainable drainage systems to be designed in accordance with the National Standards? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**The application of national standards on SDS should provide more certainty for developers and a consistent approach nationally. However, the Lead Local Flood Authority will only respond to applications of 10 or more dwellings. LPA's do not have the knowledge to advice on SUD's on minor applications, without external assistance.**

175) Do you agree with the proposed new policy to avoid the enclosure of watercourses, and encourage the de-culverting and re-naturalisation of river channels? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**Culverts can often be a significant factor in flooding events through blockages and in situations where their capacity flow is exceeded. The uncovering of culverts where practical can provide for a more nature based solution to flood risk and result in enhanced biodiversity.**

176) Do you agree with the proposed changes to policy for managing development in areas affected by coastal change? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

177) The National Coastal Erosion Risk Map sets out where areas may be vulnerable to coastal change based on different scenarios. Do you have views on how these scenarios should be applied to ensure a proportionate approach in applying this policy?

178) Do you agree with the proposed new additions to Table 2: Flood Risk Vulnerability Classifications? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

a) Should any other forms of development should be added? Please give your reasoning and clearly identify which proposed or additional uses you are referring to.

179) Do you agree that the proposed approach to planning for the natural environment in policy N1, including the proposed approach to biodiversity net gain, strikes the right balance between consistency, viability, deliverability, and supporting nature recovery? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly agree**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

**I am generally supportive of approach proposed in policy N1. I agree that it's important to have a consistent approach to delivering BNG across the country, but I believe that LPAs should also still be able to demand more than 10% as part of bespoke compensation for loss of irreplaceable habitat and I think this should be clearly stated.**

**This policy states that "Development plans should only set local standards for biodiversity net gain which are in excess of the statutory net gain requirement where this is for specific site allocations, and is fully justified and deliverable". I am concerned that, particularly with the new grey-belt classification, there may be development sites that come forward outside the site allocations in the local plan for which BNG in excess of the statutory requirement might be justifiable and deliverable. I feel there should be scope for setting additional requirements for these sites.**

180) In what circumstances would it be reasonable to seek more than 10% biodiversity net gain on sites being allocated in the development plan, especially where this could support meeting biodiversity net gain obligations on other neighbouring sites in a particular area?

**Where on-site irreplaceable habitat or designated sites (whether statutory or non-statutory designations) will be directly impacted by the development.**

Where off-site irreplaceable habitat, designated sites (whether statutory or non-statutory designations) or priority habitats will be indirectly impacted by the development, for example by pollution from increased traffic or through increased footfall or predation by pet cats, as this impact is not captured by the metric.

181) Do you agree policy N2 sets sufficiently clear expectations for how development proposals should consider and enhance the existing natural characteristics of sites proposed for development? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

I generally feel that the measures set out within this policy are clear and appropriate. I feel that consideration should also be given to potential impacts on priority species, habitats and designated sites in the surrounding area. For example, potential impacts from pollution, increased footfall or predation by pet cats.

182) Do you agree the policy in Policy N4 provides a sufficiently clear basis for considering development proposals affecting protected landscapes and reflecting the statutory duties which apply to them? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, including how policy can be improved to ensure compliance.

I feel this policy provides clear guidance on the very limited circumstances in which development should be permitted within protected landscapes and the requirements for development to avoid and mitigate its impact on these areas where it does take place.

183) Do you agree policy N6 provides clarity on the treatment of internationally, nationally and locally recognised site within the planning system? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

I feel this policy provides clear and appropriate guidance.

184) Are there any further issues for planning policy that we need to consider as we take forward the implementation of Environmental Delivery Plans?

Uncertainties regarding the content of EDPs, the rollout program for different protected species and sites, where compensation will be delivered and whether EDPs will be mandatory or optional causes difficulty in setting planning policy that will interact well with these EDPs, to achieve the desired outcomes of streamlining the development process, while protecting and enhancing biodiversity and the nature environment within our borough.

185) Do you agree the government should implement the additional regard duties under Section 102 of the Levelling-Up and Regeneration Act? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Strongly agree.**

a) Please provide your reasons.

These designated heritage assets are of national and international importance and are considered in a very similar way in the decision making process to Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings. It seems only that they are a newer form of designation that they are not covered by the same level of consideration. This opportunity to remove this inconsistency should be taken. BUT the list does not include Registered Battle Fields and this seems to be an omission that should also be rectified.

186) Do you have any evidence as to the impact of implementing the additional regard duties for development?

No.

187) Do you agree with the approach to plan-making for the historic environment, including the specific requirements for World Heritage Sites and Conservation Areas, set out in policies H1 – H3? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

Partly disagree.

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

HE1 asserts that development plans should identify heritage at risk. While heritage at risk surveys are very important, and that is not in dispute, it would make more sense that the development plan be 'informed by' heritage at risk surveys. For development plans to specifically identify heritage at risk comes with a danger of 'freezing' the heritage at risk register for a period of time, whereas it should remain more dynamic, given how fast a heritage asset could come onto and then back off the at-risk register. Policy Makers should also recognise the Conservation specialist resources are required to maintain an up to date heritage at risk register.

As above, the importance of local lists is also upheld, but the production of such a list is resource heavy. It is not suggested that this reference be removed from the NPPF, but that Policy Makers should be realistic about the resources required to have these heritage records available to meaningfully support the development plan.

HE3 Historic Environment Records - Agree that there should be maintenance and access to the HER, including up to date evidence about the historic environment, but many HERS are currently not available in a full or up to date version without a financial charge. There are very few datasets that are required for planning decision making but that are also a charged-for resource, and this inevitably creates financial concerns for the Decision Maker.

188) Do you agree with the approach to assessing the effects of development on heritage assets set out in policy H5? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

Partly disagree.

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

Agree it is important to recognise there can be three types of impact - positive, none or harm. The issue as ever arises with trying to break down the level of harm. HE5 2c asserts that the level of harm should be identified, and still notes the term 'substantial harm' but lacks any meaningful explanation on how to identify the degree of harm. It is also noted that the term 'less than substantial harm' has been removed, but how else would you describe harm that is not 'substantial'? This will, no doubt, continue to be a source of conflict in decision making, appeals and case law.

HE5.5 notes that for archaeology appropriate desk based assessment and/or field evaluation should be employed – it would be helpful to stress that this will often need to be carried out prior to determination.

189) Do you agree with the approach to considering impacts on designated heritage assets in policy HE6, including the change from "great weight" to "substantial weight", and in particular the interactions between this and the statutory duties? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Partly disagree.**

a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

There is no dispute that the term 'substantial weight' is extremely similar to 'special regard' (Listed Buildings) and 'special attention' (Conservation Areas). However, that is not necessarily enough to make the NPPF align with the statutory duties as the statutory duty is to have special regard to preserving interest, and case law has demonstrated that preserve means to do cause no harm, however, the NPPF says there should be substantial weight to the 'asset's conservation', and the glossary defines conservation as 'sustaining significance', but does 'sustaining significance' actually equate to avoiding harm? It is appreciated HE4.1b states that development proposals should 'avoid harm', and that the chapter should be read as a whole, but nevertheless 'sustaining significance' is not quite the same as avoiding harm. Sustaining significance implies a more balanced approach where there could be some harm and some benefit so overall it might sustain significance, but that is not quite the same nuance as the statutory duty simply to cause no harm. I do not necessarily object to a more nuanced approach, but believe the draft NPPF doesn't quite align with the statutory duty here.

HE6 part 3 says where there is harm this should be weighed against public benefits, but does not mention that where there is harm this should be given substantial weight in the planning balance. This is important as case law has established that harm to Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings is not just a material consideration like any other, but should be given special regard/special attention in the decision making process, as the statutory duty requires.

HE6.3 and HE6.4 talk about 'public benefits', 'important public benefits' and 'substantial public benefits' suggesting there are three categories of public benefits – is that a deliberate distinction?

HE6.4b talks about a marketing exercise, but with no indication about how long this should be for. Inevitably this probably does need to be determined on a case by case basis, but this will also no doubt create uncertainty on how to decide applications and appeals where the length of marketing is in contention.

b) Do you agree with the new policies in relation to world heritage, conservation areas and archaeological assets in policies HE8 – HE10? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*

**Agree.**

c) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

190) Do you have any other comments on the revisions to the heritage chapter?

HE10 Archaeology doesn't state that some archaeological investigation, indeed most, is probably going to need to be undertaken prior to determination, rather than as a condition. Recognition of this would help support the Decision Maker where this is deemed necessary.

- 191) Do you agree with the transitional arrangements approach to decision-making? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.
- 192) Do you have any further thoughts on the policies outlined in this consultation?
- 193) Do you agree with the list of Written Ministerial Statements set out in Annex A to the draft Framework whose planning content would be superseded by the policies proposed in this consultation? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.
- 194) Do you consider the planning regime, including reforms being delivered through the Planning and Infrastructure Act, provide sufficient flexibility for energy generation projects co-located with data centres to be consented under either the NSIP or TCPA regime? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please give reasons.
- 195) Would raising the Planning Act 2008 energy generation thresholds for renewable projects that are co-located with data centres in England (for the reason outlined above) be beneficial? *Yes/No*
- a) If so, what do you believe would be the appropriate threshold? Please provide your reasons.
- 196) Do you have any views on how we should define 'co-located energy infrastructure'? Please provide your reasons.
- 197) Do you think the renewable energy generation thresholds under Section 15 of the Planning Act 2008 for other use types of projects should be increased, or should this be limited to projects co-located with data centres? *Yes/No*
- a) Please provide your reasons.
- 198) What benefits or risks do you foresee from making this change? Please provide your reasons.
- 199) Would you support the use of growth testing for strategic, multi-phase schemes? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- 200) Would you support the optional use of growth testing for regeneration schemes? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- 201) Do you agree greater specificity, including single figures, which local planning authorities could choose to diverge from where there is evidence for doing so, would improve speed and certainty? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please explain your answer. If you agree, the government welcomes views on the appropriate figure – for example, whether 17.5% would be an appropriate reflection of the industry standard for most market-led development.
- 202) Are there any site types, tenures, or development models to which alternative, lower figures to 15-20% of Gross Development Value might reasonably apply?
- a) Please explain your answer. The government is particularly interested in views on whether clarifying an appropriate profit of 6% on Gross Development Value for affordable housing tenures would make viability assessments more transparent and speed up decision-making.

- 203) Are there further ways the government can bring greater specificity and certainty over profit expectations across landowners, site promoters and developers such that the system provides for the level of profit necessary for development to proceed, reducing the need for subjective expectations?
- a) Please explain your answer.
- 204) Existing Viability Planning Practice Guidance refers to developer return in terms a percentage of gross development value. In what ways might the continued use of gross development value be usefully standardised?
- 205) Do you agree there circumstances in which metrics other than profit on gross development value would support more or faster housing delivery, or help to maximise compliance with plan policy? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please explain your answer.
- 206) Are there types of development on which metrics other than profit on gross development value should be routinely accepted as a measure of return e.g. strategic sites large multi-phased schemes, or build to rent schemes?
- a) Please explain your answer.
- 207) Do you agree that guidance should be updated to reflect the fact a premium may not be required in all circumstances? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) In what circumstances might a premium, or the usual premium, not be required?
- b) What impact (if any) would you foresee if this change were made?
- 208) Do you agree that extant consents should not be assumed to be sufficient proof of alternative use value, unless other provisions relating to set out in plans are met? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please explain your answer.
- 209) If extant consents were not to be assumed as sufficient proof of alternative use value, should this be at the discretion of the decision-maker, or should another metric (e.g. period of time since consent granted) be used? *Decision maker discretion / Another metric / Neither*
- a) If another metric, please set out your preferred approach and rationale.
- 210) What further steps should the government take to ensure non-policy compliant schemes are not used to inform the determination of benchmark land values in the viability assessments that underpin plan-making?
- 211) Do you agree that the residual land value of the development proposal should be cross-checked with the residual land values of comparable schemes; to help set the viability assessment in context. *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please explain your answer.
- 212) Do you agree that a 2.5 hectare threshold is appropriate? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.

- 213) Do you agree that a unit threshold of between 10 and 49 units is appropriate? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.
- 214) Do you foresee risks or operability issues anticipated with the proposed definition of medium development? *Yes/No.*
- 215) If so, please explain your answer and provide views on potential mitigations.
- 216) Do you have any views on whether the current small development exemption should be extended to cover a wider range of sites – indicatively to sites of fewer than 50 dwellings, or fewer than 120 bedspaces in purpose-built student accommodation?
- a) Please provide your reasons.
- 217) If the exemption were to be extended, do you have any views on whether the development of 120 purpose-built student accommodation bedspaces is an appropriate equivalent to a development of 50 dwellings for the purposes of the levy exemption?
- a) Please provide your reasons.
- 218) If the exemption were to be extended, do you have any views on whether the exemption should be based solely on the existing metrics (dwellings/bedspaces) or whether there should also be an area threshold.
- 219) If you do have views on possible changes to the small developments levy exemption, please specify the potential impact of the possible change of the levy exemption on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.
- 220) What do you consider to be the potential economic, competitive, and behavioural impacts of possible changes to the levy exemption? Please provide any evidence or examples to support your response.
- 221) Do you agree with the proposal to extend the Permission in Principle application route to medium development? *Strongly agree, partly agree, neither agree nor disagree, partly disagree, strongly disagree.*
- a) Please provide your reasons, particularly if you disagree.
- 222) Do you have views about whether there should be changes to the regulatory procedures for these applications, including whether there should be a requirement for a short planning statement?
- 223) Do you have any views on the impacts of the above proposals for you, or the group or business you represent and on anyone with a relevant protected characteristic?
- a) If so, please explain who, which groups, including those with protected characteristics, or which businesses may be impacted and how.
- 224) Is there anything that could be done to mitigate any impact identified?