

# Radcliffe on Trent Parish Council

## Response to the Planning for the Future White Paper

### 1. Planning for the Future White Paper

[www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-future](http://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-future))

#### General comments on the Planning for the future White Paper

Care is needed to prevent a loss of local control over local building.  
A local consultation is essential for planning, particularly with regard to infrastructure.  
Local communities must make decisions for their area via their Neighbourhood Plans.  
We support your proposals that a portion of the Infrastructure Levy will go to Parish or Town Councils for use in that community.  
We think that this White Paper is full of pledges but not a lot of hard facts.

#### Specific consultation questions within the Planning for the future White Paper

Question number	Question	Comment
5	Do you think that Local Plans should be simplified?	Yes, but we are not sure who decides which of the 3 categories our village falls into.  It is not clear from the White Paper.
6	Should the development management content of Local Plans and setting out general development management policies nationally be streamlined?	Yes, but not at the risk of unsuitable development happening. More thorough investigation is required.
7(a)	Should existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans be replaced with a consolidated test of “sustainable development”, which would include consideration of environmental impact?	Yes, so long as future checks on infrastructure, environment and heritage are at least as rigorous as they are currently.

Question number	Question	Comment
7(b)	How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?	<p>We are unable to comment as we do not know what the new alternative would be.</p> <p>It is essential that there is something in place to ensure joined-up thinking particularly with regard to infrastructure</p>
8(a)	Do you think that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced?	One size does not fit all. There is a need to focus on local influences
8(b)	Do you think that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated?	<p>This is too simplistic.</p> <p>A location near to local industry opportunities is essential</p> <p>Market forces and desirability will determine housing stock. It is naïve to think that this process will change that.</p>
9(a)	Should automatic outline permission be granted for those areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent?	No. It short-circuits the democratic process. Infrastructure needs to keep pace. This proposal won't take into account the significant infrastructure requirements.
9(b)	Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas?	In renewal and protected areas, we would like to see evidence of the proposed control processes and would hope that they are sufficiently robust.
9(c)	Is there a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime?	No. For very large sites, e.g. new towns, the process should not be short-circuited as mistakes would have a bigger impact.

Question number	Question	Comment
10	Do you think decision-making should be faster and more certain?	Yes. Digitising is a way to achieve this but restricting planning statements to less than 50 pages is going too far. Supporting documents should be current and with the correct level of detail.
11	Should Local Plans be web-based?	Yes
12	Should there be a 30-month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans?	No, this is not long enough for ascertaining local views, development of the plan and reflection. Stage 3 particularly, at 6 weeks, is too short, -6 months would be more appropriate for a full democratic process to take place.
13(a)	Do you believe that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system?	Yes. The opinions of the local population should be heard, taken into account and have legal status as a referendum will have taken place prior to the drafting of the plan.
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?	The scope of the Neighbourhood Plan should be wider, and it should be reviewed on a regular basis. It should be sufficiently flexible however, to allow for and unexpected opportunities. The Neighbourhood Plan should have more influence on the design of retail and commercial properties than at present.
14	Do you think there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support?	No. Building faster would have a greater, sudden impact on the local infrastructure.
17	Should design guides and codes be improved?	Yes, in principle but we do not want a return to 1960's type building where all schools and shopping precincts looked alike. Standards in design and quality must be maintained or improved.

Question number	Question	Comment
18.	Do you think 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?	In principle, yes, but we would need to review the detail before committing to this.
20.	Should there be a fast-track for beauty?	Yes, so long as quality isn't undermined. We support the <u>additional</u> inclusions. i.e. the additional income from permitted development rights.
21	When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it?	Better infrastructure linked to the Neighbourhood Plan, [transport, schools and health] – before the first homeowner moves in and also an affordable housing provision in place.
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?	Every new build, extension and conversion should attract a levy and it is important that a parish or town should receive 25% in <u>every</u> instance.
22(b)	Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally?	Wherever the rate is set It has to be an equitable system so that poorer areas do not miss out.
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?	In default of additional money coming from Government grants, we would look to increase the value delivered from the Infrastructure Levy to support initiatives for the local community
22(d)	Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area?	If property is ring-fenced it could work but otherwise no.

Question number	Question	Comment
23	Do you think that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights?	Yes. Wherever there is an increased value to a property or a change of use the levy should be applied.
24(a)	Do you think 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?	At least as much and ideally more. There is also a need for good quality rented property to support a more fluid workforce.
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, but there should be an upper limit to the in-kind payment as the Infrastructure Levy is needed to provide infrastructure.
24(c)	If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk?	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, affordable homes should be built to an equivalent standard to those purchased.
25	Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy?	At Parish Council level there should be fewer restrictions on spending in the local community so long as it follows the Neighbourhood Plan but there should be geographical restrictions, so the money has to be used in the local area only.
25(a)	If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed?	No at Parish Council level but yes at Borough Coucil.