



7th September 2020

To Members of Council

You are hereby summoned to a virtual MEETING OF CONSULTATIONS AND HIGHWAYS **to be held on** Monday, 14th September 2020 at 7.30pm, **to conduct the following business.**

Helen Bojaniwska
Town Clerk

The meeting will be held via the Zoom meeting platform: <https://www.zoom.us/join>

To attend the meeting please use ID **864 1654 9988** – password **45782904**.

For more information about attending Council meeting via Zoom please refer to the guidance on our website at: <https://www.stroudtown.gov.uk/uploads/taking-part-in-an-stc-zoom-meeting-april-2020.pdf>

AGENDA

1. To receive apologies
2. To receive declarations of interest or requests for dispensations
3. To approve the minutes of the meeting of 10th August 2020 previously circulated
4. To receive questions from members of the public
5. To receive the Assistant Clerk's Report (for information only)
6. To comment on planning applications as listed
7. To note planning decisions from the Stroud District Council
8. To note Local Transport Plan (LTP) Review - Public Consultation – LTP Themed Policy & Transport Mode Response
9. To consider supporting the campaign to reopen Stroudwater station
10. To note information about Pavement Licences
11. To consider NALC request for response from councils to three consultations
 - PC10-20 Changes to the current planning system
 - PC11-20 White paper: Planning for the future
 - PC12-20 Transparency and competition: Data and land control
12. To consider a licence application for the Trinity Rooms, Field Road - ref: 20/00486/LAPRNW
13. To consider consultation on pavement parking <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/managing-pavement-parking>

Members are reminded that the Council has a general duty to consider the following matters in the exercise of any of its functions: Equal Opportunities (age, race, gender, sexual

orientation, faith, marital status and disability); Crime and Disorder (Section 17); Health and Safety; and Human Rights.

Campaign to reopen Stroudwater station

Dear all

Stonehouse Town Council and Railfuture are campaigning for the reopening of Stroudwater Station on the site of the old Bristol Road station in Stonehouse in order to provide a direct sustainable transport link to Bristol. We applied to the Restoring our Railways Ideas Fund, and although we weren't successful in that round of bidding, the bid was judged as having potential and we were advised to apply to their New Stations Fund.

We are building up support whilst waiting for more information. There are 2 things you can do to help.

Please support and promote us on social media:

Facebook: Stroudwater station

Twitter: @StroudwaterSta

Website (under development): www.stroudwaterstation.co.uk

Our main aim at the minute is to get it into the Local Transport Plan. GCC have delayed finalising the plan until a Government Document on Decarbonising Transport is produced later this year. The government have just started a consultation on the document. The Campaign for Better Transport has put together a brilliant website to help navigate the government's consultation document. It would be great if you could respond to the consultation and mention Stroudwater station in response to the question on local projects.

Cllr Carol Kambites

Stonehouse Town Council

Clerks Report – Consultation & Highways Committee

14th September 2020

Appeal

Site: 20 Mill Farm Drive Paganhill Stroud Gloucestershire
Development: Erection of dwelling
Appeal Start Date: 6th August 2020

An appeal has been made to the Secretary of State relating to the site quoted above following the refusal of planning permission by this council.

Application for pavement licence at Curio

The Pavement Licence has been issued. Pavement licences are a temporary provision and will expire on 31 September 2021.

Following the consultation the decision is:

- Grant the licence for some or all of the part of the highway specified in the application.
- The licence is granted for an area extending 3 metres from the façade of the Curio Lounge and not 4 metres as applied for.

The reason for the decision is:

The Council received 3 consultation responses to the application. In particular comment was made from Stroud Town Council requesting that in order to maintain highway width for other users, a 3 metre extension should be permitted rather than the 4 metres applied for. The Environmental Protection Section stated that there has not been complaint about the existing chairs and pavement area which currently operates to 23.00 each evening.

Taking account of the consultation comments the Pavement Licence has been granted for an area extending to 3 metres maximum from the façade of the Curio Lounge in order to allow room for pedestrians to socially distance and for emergency vehicles to have access if necessary.

Due to the fact that the Curio Lounge has a premises licence that already covers an area 2 metres from the façade, it was agreed to permit the extra 1 metre covered by the Pavement Licence to have the same end time of 23.00 which is later than the time normally permitted in Stroud District Council's standard Pavement Licence conditions.

Decisions Made By Local Planning Authority

Application	Status	STC Comments
Land At M5 Junction 13 West Of Stonehouse Eastington S.19/1418/OUT Comprises a 5000-capacity football stadium and other ancillary uses (use Class D2); one full-sized grass pitch and one full-sized all-weather pitch and a goal practice area (use class D2); car parking for cars and coaches and highway improvements to A419 including a signalised site junction and combined cycle/footway. All matters reserved save for access.	Permission	Support
Callowell House Callowell S.19/2724/LBC Renovation and reconfiguration of existing house with proposed rear porch extension and timber cladding to existing rear addition	Consent	Neutral
Callowell House Callowell S.19/2723/HHOLD Renovation and reconfiguration of existing house with proposed rear porch extension and timber cladding to existing rear addition	Permission	Neutral
Waitrose London Road S.20/0142/TPO 15 x Alder - remove overhang to wall creating damp and falling limbs 1 x Horse chestnut - crown raise to 5.5 m	Consent	Neutral
Walden Park Road S.20/0044/HHOLD Proposed two storey extension, single storey side extension & porch	Permission	Neutral
4 Windsor Place Painswick Road S.20/0122/FUL Erection of a garage with solar panels on roof	Refusal	Neutral
16 Slad Road S.20/0163/FUL Erection of 2 X 4 metre high column with automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) camera (retrospective)	Permission	Neutral
125 Cainscross Road S.20/0250/HHOLD Proposed single storey extension, roof dormer and new gable to the rear	Withdrawn	Neutral
Land At 95 Stratford Road S.20/0226/FUL Proposed two bedroom dwelling	Refusal	Object
Land At Fircroft Spring Lane S.20/0281/FUL Proposed bungalow with new vehicular access & parking	Refusal	Neutral
Dirleton House Cainscross Road S.20/0155/ADV Replacement signage	Consent	-
Flat 7 Swan House Swan Lane S.20/0063/FUL Retrospective - Installation of skylight.	Permission	Neutral
Campden Springfield Road Uplands S.20/0191/HHOLD Single storey rear extension	Permission	Neutral
Units 6 To 9 Salmon Springs Trading Estate Painswick Road S.20/0465/LBC Interior refurbishment of existing office	Consent	Neutral
8 Summer Close S.20/0356/HHOLD Front extension, side extension and external stair lift and path	Permission	Neutral

8 Upper Dorrington Terrace Field Road S.20/0467/HHOLD Single storey rear extension and rebuild garden steps	Permission	Neutral
The Briars Mill Farm Drive Paganhill S.20/0502/HHOLD Construction of single storey rear extension (demolition of conservatory)	Permission	Neutral
The Culls Wick Street S.20/0539/FUL Conversion of existing stable block into ancillary accommodation and an art studio.	Permission	Neutral
27 Middle Street S.20/0442/TCA T1&T2: 2x Yew (small) - fell, T3: 1 x Silver birch (single stem) - Crown reduce by 3m from tips of branches, T4: 1x Silver birch (multi-stemmed) - Crown reduce by 3m from tips of branches	Consent	Neutral
Flat 5 The Castle Castle Street S.20/0553/TCA (1) 3 Lime trees at the front- Remove epicormic growths on their main stems up to the first main branches, prune to clear the building by at least 2.0m, remove significant deadwood throughout their crowns and prune to clear the overhead wire. (2) Yews overhanging the front wall. Crown raise on the road side to approximately 5.5m. (3) Golden Macrocarpa over hanging Spring Lane. Trim back as hard as practicable without spoiling on the lane side. (5)Catalpa. Reduce its spread over the lawn to leave it with a radial crown spread of not more than 5.0m and shape leaving the overall height untouched.	Consent	Neutral
Hillside House Middle Hill S.20/0700/LBC Demolish existing outbuilding & replace with 2 storey extension.	Refusal	Neutral
4 King Street S.20/0625/ADV Replacement of 1no. existing external ATM sign with 1no. new external ATM sign.	Consent	Neutral
Flat 5 The Old Mill Bowbridge Lock S.20/0630/LBC Lime plastering to gable ends. Insulating and plastering roof slopes.	Consent	Support
Trinity House Trinity Road S.20/0611/HHOLD Conversion of existing brick outhouse to a family annex	Permission	Support
The Culls Wick Street S.20/0540/LBC Conversion of existing stable block into ancillary accommodation	Consent	Support
54 London Road S.20/0459/FUL Increase window openings to rear.	Permission	Support
Stroud Valley Scouting Centre Hollow Lane S.20/0391/TCA Sycamore (T1) - prune overhanging branches, Lime (T2) - prune overhanging branches	Consent	Support
The Brunel Goods Shed Station Road S.20/0622/LBC Extension of terrace. Raised walkway to provide access to the six shipping container cantilevering above	Consent	Support
The Brunel Goods Shed Station Road S.20/0621/FUL Proposal of nine shipping container studios. Raised walkway to provide access to the six cantilevering above. Extension of terrace. Proposed Railway Wagon.	Permission	Support
The Office Lodgemore Mills Lodgemore Lane S.20/0640/LBC Refurbishment of Board Room	Consent	Neutral

29 Lansdown S.20/0624/FUL Change of use for upper and lower ground floor (from A2 to C3) and two storey extension to create two apartments. External works to front site boundary.	Permission	Neutral
9 Folly Lane S.20/0691/HHOLD Proposed Extensions and alterations to existing house together with new garage (re-submission of S.19/2217/HHOLD)	Refusal	Neutral
McDonalds Restaurants Ltd Merrywalks S.20/0695/ADV Installation of 4 no. digital freestanding signs and 1 no. 15" digital booth screen	Consent	Neutral
14 Burford Drive S.20/0400/HHOLD Two-storey extension, porch and associated works. Retrospective consent for a gazebo and landscaping (revised plans received 17/04/2020 - retrospective pergola and alterations to the landscaping omitted)	Permission	Object
57 London Road S.20/0683/FUL External alterations to shop front	Permission	Neutral
28 Lansdown S.20/0792/FUL Conversion of lower ground floor to separate apartment. Two storey rear extension and external insulation and render/timber cladding to rear walls.	Withdrawn	Neutral
The Bungalow Carlton Gardens London Road S.20/0772/HHOLD Single story front extension.	Permission	Neutral
15 Summer Street S.20/0337/HHOLD Rear single storey extension, dormer window and new entrance with parking	Permission	Neutral
17 Horns Road S.20/0846/HHOLD Two storey and single storey rear extension	Permission	Neutral
The Magic Bean Company Bath Street S.20/0826/FUL Conversion to dwelling	Withdrawn	Object
Hammonds Cottage Wick Street S.20/0935/HHOLD Conversion of existing garage into an ancillary annexe	Permission	Neutral
St Roses School Beeches Green S.20/0923/FUL Erection of a single storey 'link' between two existing buildings, including associated hard and soft landscaping	Permission	Support
9 Summer Close S.20/1028/HHOLD Extend bedroom on the first floor with external access and steps to the side garden.	Permission	Neutral
Hillside House Middle Hill S.20/1125/HHOLD Demolish existing outbuilding (attached) and replace with new two storey side extension	Permission	Neutral
Hillside House Middle Hill S.20/1126/LBC Demolish existing outbuilding (attached) and replace with new two storey side extension	Consent	Neutral
37 Belmont Road S.20/1215/HHOLD Single storey extension	Permission	Neutral
57 High Street S.20/1177/LBC Erection of 4x signs.	Consent	Neutral

100 Bisley Road S.20/1196/HHOLD Proposed loft conversion	Withdrawn	Neutral
7B Lansdown S.20/1230/FUL New first floor window on rear elevation.	Permission	Neutral
63 Swifts Hill View S.20/1257/HHOLD Proposed side and rear extensions.	Permission	Neutral
Morning Haze Spring Lane S.20/1192/HHOLD Erection of single storey extension to provide additional living space (demolition of part outbuilding and conservatory)	Permission	Neutral
154 Slad Road S.20/1309/HHOLD Proposed replacement rear single-storey extension and rear dormer window	Permission	Neutral
Flat 6 Castle Court Castle Street S.20/1267/HHOLD Erection of wooden bike storage shed.	Permission	Support
12 The Hill Merrywalks S.20/1329/TPO Fell Weeping ash tree (T1) due to losing two large limbs and in a car park which is used for functions	Consent	Neutral
38 - 41 London Road S.20/1279/LBC Refurbishment of existing offices (retrospective)	Consent	Neutral
2 Belmont Road S.20/1408/HHOLD Addition of a rear flat roof dormer	Withdrawn	Neutral
D M Foundries Stafford Mill London Road Thrupp S.20/1412/TCA T1/T2/T3/T4/T5 all alders - sectional fell	Consent	Neutral
13 Lansdown S.20/1429/TCA Reduce lime tree (T1) by 3m height and 2m width of crown. Reduce around BT cables. Fell Fig tree (T2) due to cracking the retaining wall and having a building report done on the site.	Consent	Neutral
15 Maple Drive S.20/1463/HHOLD Proposed replacement porch	Permission	Neutral
Fromebanks Dr Newtons Way S.20/1493/TCA Removal of Ash trees	Consent	Neutral

STROUD DISTRICT COUNCIL - Licensing Act 2003

Page 1 of 1

List for Parish Councils and Responsible Authorities and Chair of Licensing Committee

Applications for New Premises Licences, Club Premises Certificates, Applications for Major Variations to Premises Licences and Club Premises Certificates, Applications for Review of a Licence or Certificate

Applications Received between 24/08/2020 and 28/08/2020

Stroud Trinity Ward

Date Received: Application Ref: Application Type:

25/08/2020 20/00486/LAPRNW **Premises Licence - New App**

Address: Trinity Rooms, Field Road, Stroud, Gloucestershire, GL5 2HZ,

Local Transport Plan (LTP) Review - Public Consultation – LTP Themed Policy & Transport Mode Responses

Thank you for taking the opportunity to comment on the draft LTP for consultation. The LTP review process commenced in the summer of 2018. A draft LTP for consultation was made available between: January 16th - March 26th, 2020. We reached 23,000 stakeholders through events, face to face meetings and online. GCC received and considered a large number of written responses, the LTP Consultation Report available on www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ltp-review, will set out in detail the feedback received.

The consultation analysis has picked up on the document itself; the length of the LTP and the ability to navigate and clearly understand how the LTP vision and objectives translate into LTP policy, expected outcomes and investment priorities. We are intending to review the structure of the LTP to shorten and provide clarity in line with our sustainability assessment. And we will produce an LTP Summary document to provide an overview of the transport strategy for Gloucestershire. We will publish these documents on our website www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ltp-review following adoption of the LTP early in 2021.

Please note that this is an officer level response, we are still in the process of reviewing the LTP, following consultation feedback and that the final revised LTP will be approved by Scrutiny, Cabinet and County Council.

LTP Themed Policy & Transport Mode Responses – based on a wide range of stakeholders feedback received	
Advisory Freight Route Map	The revised Advisory Freight Route map introduces a route corridor weighting, based on HGV traffic flows, without altering the primary route corridors. This will in effect show such routes as the A429 as having the appropriate weighting compared to freight routes of national significance.
Bikeability Training	Bikeability is today's national cycle training programme. It's about gaining practical skills and understanding how to cycle safely on today's roads, for both children and adults. Further information on the Gloucestershire Bikeability programme is available - https://www.thinktravel.info/bike/bikeability-training/ . Bikeability training for young people promoted through local schools, provides road craft for young cyclists.
Bikes on Trains/Buses	GCC are supportive of multi-modal travel and we will continue to reflect local views in our ongoing working relationship with train operating companies and bus operating companies.
Carbon Reduction for Transport Emissions	Overarching policy references further supporting work for a carbon reduction pathway to provide clarity on the delivery mechanism to achieve the LTP target PI-14 Reduce per capita transport carbon emissions (zero tonnes per capita by 2050) and support our emerging Climate Change Strategy.

Community Highway Offer	<p>Very often in life a 'one-size fits all' approach just doesn't work, and our highways are no different. Gloucestershire has a diverse landscape from parishes of just a few hundred people, to large urban centres with more than a hundred thousand calling them home. To get the best deal for each community, Gloucestershire County Council has come up with a new way of working; the basic offer (highway maintenance) and additional community offer. Parishes have access to additional highway services through the community offer 'Highway Your Way' (www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/extra/highways-yourway), such as local vegetation clearance.</p>
Cycle Infrastructure	<p>The LTP discussed provision for cycling in 3 categories, ambition (cycle desire lines), Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan or LCWIP (local) and LTP Schemes Priorities (strategic). LCWIP will provide the detail on access to main strategic routes, further detail can be found on - https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/lcwip. The Local Transport Plan's role is to set out the high level long-term strategy for transport for Gloucestershire. Initiatives and schemes are included on the basis of compliance with delivering the LTP outcomes, and do not reflect a funding commitment by GCC, instead delivery of LTP scheme priorities will be subject to the availability of funding opportunities. LTP scheme priorities provide the basis for future funding bids, as opportunities arise, and discussions with third parties where funding may be provided such as by government, statutory bodies, developers, transport operators or the private sector. Section 4.0 Funding in the LTP Delivery chapter, sets out the full range of current funding sources in more detail and provides the indicative funding source for schemes.</p>
EV-Charge Points	<p>As part of our commitment to reducing the impact of transport on climate change, our vision is to improve accessibility across Gloucestershire through low carbon modes. For journeys that are unavoidable by motorised transport, we are committed to encouraging a switch to Ultra Low Emission Vehicles (ULEVs) and strive to facilitate this through enabling access to a charging infrastructure network. Along with implementing the actions in the strategy, GCC will begin to apply the methods set out in the ULEV strategy to identify locations prioritise investment in ULEV charging infrastructure and produce an implementation plan. Prioritisation and implementation of ULEV charging infrastructure will require community engagement to further inform identification of locations due to the likely usage and to help encourage people to make a switch by talking through benefits of ULEV use. GCC is committed to reducing the impact of transport on climate change by improving accessibility across Gloucestershire through low carbon modes. We will therefore continue to monitor mode share data to achieve our wider transport objectives to achieve modal shift towards sustainable modes. Parish interest in supporting EVCP will be forwarded to the EV Strategy policy and delivery team for EV-charge points going forward. Nationally, government have forecast that 80% of EV-vehicles will be charged from home, leaving a gap of 20% of publicly available EVCP to be delivered commercially and by local authorities. GCC are currently developing an EV Strategy for the county, based on best practice.</p>
Freight Route Planning – online platform	<p>GCC are investigating an alternative freight route planner that will be up to date and compliant with all HGV weight restrictions, this platform would be an alternative to Freight Gateway, which has been taken off line.</p>

Funding	The Local Transport Plan's role is to set out the long-term strategy for transport for Gloucestershire. Initiatives and schemes are included on the basis of compliance with delivering the LTP outcomes, and do not reflect a funding commitment by GCC, instead delivery of LTP scheme priorities will be subject to the availability of funding opportunities. LTP scheme priorities provide the basis for future funding bids, as opportunities arise, and discussions with third parties where funding may be provided such as by government, statutory bodies, developers, transport operators or the private sector. Section 4.0 Funding in the LTP Delivery chapter, sets out the full range of current funding sources in more detail and provides the indicative funding source for schemes.
GlosTalk – mobile real time bus passenger information App	GlosTalk is a mobile phone App designed to assist any one who needs to access bus information within Gloucestershire. It provides clear, reliable and accurate information about bus services, in both text and audible format. GlosTalk is design to delivery seamless travel choices within the Gloucestershire while on the move - https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/transport/public-transport-information/what-is-glostalk/
Highway Funding	Highway pinch points are funded centrally through ad-hoc government funding bidding opportunities, to which all local highway authorities bid into. Highway maintenance is funded through government ongoing local highway maintenance allocation, this excludes highways under the control of Highways England, such as motorway and certain A-Roads. Gloucestershire is subject to policy and guidance for highway maintenance and this can be found in the highway asset management plan through this link - www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/highways/plans-policies-procedures-manuals/highways-policy-and-guidance-documents/
Horse Riders	Overall, GCC are more open minded to horse riders using off-road cycle ways where it can be accommodated and it is practicable, safe and legal to do so. Gloucestershire Local Access Forum (GLAF) holds the statutory power in relation to improvements to access and offers strategic advice and comment to GCC and Natural England. There will be an opportunity for equestrian user groups to feed into the ROWIP through Gloucestershire's Local Access Forum. Equestrian usage is represented in the emerging review of the LTP. Horse riders are referenced in the LTP policy updates, having taken into consideration all vulnerable users, context reports and audits. However, pedestrians and cyclists make up a significantly higher number of trips in Gloucestershire and providing adequate infrastructure for these groups should remain of higher priority. LCWIP has identified MCT&TG and other equestrian groups as key stakeholders for the inter-urban and rural workshop at the appropriate time in the future. Highways Major Projects are positively engaging with MCT&TG and other equestrian user groups in highways consultations now and going forward.
Local Highway Issues	GCC will forward concerns regarding local highway matters onto Local Highway Manager for your area.
Lorry Watch	GCC has come up with a new way of working, through the community offer 'Highway Your Way' (www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/extra/highways-yourway), which includes advice on community based Lorry Watch. GCC are investigating a replacement freight journey planning application with a facility to report Lorry Watch issues online.

LTP Scheme Priorities	GCC's focus, for new schemes, concentrates on active and sustainable transport to promote mode shift. There are a total of 157 LTP schemes and of those added in this review; 22 Active Travel & Health & Wellbeing, 7 Sustainable Transport, 2 Network Capacity Optimisation. New and existing highway scheme commitments are historic schemes or schemes that mitigate adopted Local Plans.
LTP Scheme Prioritisation Process	Schemes in the current LTP Review have moved away from categorisation by short, medium and long-term, as this is largely determined by funding. However, the revised LTP distinguishes between schemes within the 2031 plan horizon and those in the 2041 plan Horizon, thus differentiating long and medium term schemes. It also states which schemes have secured funding and are therefore deliverable in the short term. The document also applies a 'scale of impact' indicator to provide objective classifications for the schemes; Strategic, Major, Local. The transport schemes included in the LTP have been selected from a variety of sources, including the transport mitigations developed as part of a District lead Local Plan, local studies, schemes that have arisen during pre-engagement consultation with the Districts, Vision 2050 and other sources of evidence or suggestions made to the Council. The minimum threshold for schemes to be included was an estimated total scheme value of more than £200k. The scheme prioritisation process described in the Delivery chapter sets out the two stage process by which schemes are assessed; Stage 1 Assessment - including listing in Local Plans, a high level judgement on likely deliverability, public acceptability, value for money and long term impacts or committed in the LTP, and Stage 2 Assessment - including reducing carbon emissions, local environmental protection, socio-distributional impacts, strategic and economic case. The two stage assessment criteria is not based on the scale of impact.
LTP Summary Document	We are intending to produce an LTP Summary document to provide an overview of the transport strategy for Gloucestershire. We will publish the LTP Summary on our website www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/ltp-review following adoption of the plan later in 2021.
LTP Vision / More Ambitious	The LTP Vision 'A resilient transport network that enable sustainable economic growth by providing travel choices for all, making Gloucestershire a better place to live, work and visit', uses sustainable in the broadest sense, to include environmental and social sustainability. We believe that to enable a shift away from the private motor vehicle, it will require providing real travel choices and access to a variety of mobility options and innovative new mobility solutions. GCC has recently declared a Climate Emergency, like a number of other authorities, we are currently developing an emerging Climate Change Strategy and further supporting work on a carbon reduction pathway to provide the mechanism to achieve our LTP target (PI-14 - Reduce per capital transport carbon emissions - zero tonnes per capita by 2050). These measures will support the LTP Vision now and inform a review of the vision for the next review, when we are more informed.
Major Highway Schemes	GCC provide a web link for progress on all major highway schemes in Gloucestershire - https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/highways/major-projects/ - the project currently in development are; A38 Canal Bridges, A419 Cainscross Road Bridge, A419 Stonehouse Improvements, Cycling and Walking Social Distancing scheme, LED Streetlighting, Lydbrook Bridge, Prison Copse Wall, Northleach and West Cheltenham Transport Improvement Schemes - UK Cyber Business Park (A40/Arle Ct)).

MfGS	The review of the Manual for Gloucestershire Streets (MfGS) will provide further guidance on parking and electric vehicle charge points for new development.
New Normal	In response to the covid-19 pandemic, GCC have prioritised pedestrian and cycle local schemes in respond to a new normal for greater active travel. Going forward, we will need to consider the long-term affects of lockdown on travel habits.
New Station/Railway Halts	Increasing the mode share of journeys made by train is a key ambition of the LTP, the plan identifies a number of interventions that will be needed to fulfil this ambition. This does include considerations on access points to the rail network. However, it has to be considered, that new stations on the rail network have an impact on the running of services in terms of performance, reliability and journey times. Capacity is restricted by factors such as signalling, line speed and junctions. Another key consideration is the mix of freight, local and inter-city services using a route. This is particularly relevant on the Gloucester to Bristol line. GCC continues to look at the most suitable location for a new station south of Gloucester in conjunction with a range of partners. Given the limited capacity between Gloucester and Bristol the location for a new station(s) will need to be able help meet the long term strategic growth over the next thirty years. Third party proposals for an additional new station south of Gloucester will need to be accompanied by a robust business case.
Public Transport Improvements/ Integration / Rural Connectivity	GCC recognises the need to improve rural connectivity through a variety of interventions. The LTP seeks to strengthen the overall mobility offer in rural areas, including conventional bus services on key routes, demand responsive bus services and wider mobility solutions such as car sharing of car clubs. The identification of Local Interchange Hubs will be a central component of this rural mobility strategy, where these mobility solutions come together, and passengers can change form one to the other. Interchange hubs also provide an opportunity to encourage increased levels of physical activity amongst transport users by linking to key cycle routes.
Public Transport Improvements/Access to Services	The Community Health & Wellbeing policy recognises access to health services. The alignment of transport and health strategies, play a key role in securing health objectives through improving access to income, employment, housing, education, services, amenities, facilities and social networks crucial to maintain a healthy vibrant and cohesive community. GCC work alongside Public Health to help narrow the gap in terms of access to health care services by public transport. Along with our partners in Public Health, we continue to monitor access to health services and make data available publically through Inform Gloucestershire. We recognise that access to services, such as health requires a new model of rural connectivity based on a hub and spoke model, with transport interchange hubs servicing potentially community transport and other demand responsive transport, by smaller buses, and core bus corridors in the future. The Total Transport portal will provide a platform for effectively booking community transport and fill to widen the community transport offer.
Public Transport Improvements/Bus Stops	GCC are working directly with Parish and Town Councils to address the local issues of safe access to bus stops for vulnerable users.
Public Transport Improvements/Lack of Bus Services or Frequency	Achieving a shift from private car use to more sustainable modes of transport, such as public transport/bus services is a key ambition of the LTP which can only be achieved, if the service offer proved by buses is both, attractive and convenient. GCC is working closely with bus operators to achieve this ambition and the LTP has identified Bus Network Standards that set out where subsidy and investment will be targeted. Tier 1 in the high frequency services do not receive subsidy, this is targeted where most needed in Tier 2 & Tier 3 that serve

	<p>the inter-urban and rural areas of the county that require it most to deliver rural services. GCC recognises that it requires a new model of rural connectivity based on a hub and spoke model, with transport interchange hubs servicing potentially community transport and other demand responsive transport, by smaller buses, and core bus corridor in the future. The Total Transport portal will provide a platform for effectively booking community transport and widen the community transport offer.</p>
Public Transport/SMART Ticketing / Rail & Bus Integration	<p>LTP policy recognises the need for integrated ticketing and integration between modes. Contactless payments on buses will greatly facilitate this and Gloucestershire will strive for 100%. GCC is supportive of both contactless payment options and integrated bus ticketing to promote better integration of all transport modes. GCC officers will continue to work collaboratively with transport operators to achieve a step change in the quality and relevance of the public transport offer. Currently, the rail regulatory system does not lend itself to ticketing integration, but there are examples of Plus Bus when booking rail tickets, however this is not yet available to book in reverse.</p>
Rail Fares & Ticketing	<p>Rail fare structure is a national issues, several governments have attempted to institute change in these areas since privatisation. While some positive changes have been delivered for passengers, including new ticketing technologies and an improved process of buying tickets, the overall system remains largely as it was. As a result, the same passenger frustrations remain and the case for reform is still strong. A House of Commons briefing paper, 'Rail fares, ticketing & prospects for reform' (April 2019). GCC will support future national rail fare and ticketing reform.</p>
Rail Service Capacity	<p>GCC will continue to engage with the rail industry to ensure that Gloucestershire benefits from rail services that facilitate local access and longer distance connectivity to London, Bristol, Birmingham, Cardiff and Worcester.</p>
Roadworks	<p>GCC constantly tries to minimise the impact necessary road work have on the daily journeys of Gloucestershire's residents, workers and visitors. In order to plan your journey and coordinate more effectively all Streetworks, and to enable road users to plan their journeys in advance, central government have introduced a UK mapping application platform, the roadwork.org map is hosted on the GCC website for use, providing real-time data on roadworks in Gloucestershire and nationwide https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/highways/roads/roadworks/ The map is updated frequently to show planned works across the county by Gloucestershire Highways, partner agencies, contractors and Utility companies (water, gas, electric, telecommunications & fibre optic). Regular local roadworks updates can be emailed directly to you, by subscribing to Your Highways.</p>
Speed Limits	<p>GCC will support communities to deliver local speed campaigns through the local policing teams. Of direct contact with your local neighbourhood police team, Community.Speedwatch@Gloucestershire.pnn.police.uk, on issues of speeding traffic in your area. LTP policy stipulates that GCC will introduce speed limits in accordance with the current national guidelines and prioritise them based on available evidence, including 20mph zones.</p>

Sustainable Growth	GCC will work with local planning authorities and developers to develop a clear spatial strategy for Gloucestershire based on our long term sustainable transport and growth ambitions, which will deliver large scale development, designed and developed in a sustainable manner, ensuring that sustainable transport principles are embedded into the planning, design and future development of these strategic sites as a core fundamental feature from the outset. This will deliver a step change in sustainable land use planning, ensuring that all new development is located in places with high levels of sustainable transport accessibility and services, and reduces car dependency. GCC will support development that enables sustainable travel choices and will require that developers of new medium/large development sites submit site master plans and making sure that transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes and contribute to making high quality places, in accordance with Gloucestershire's emerging Spatial Strategy, emerging Climate Change Strategy, Carbon Reduction Targets, NPPF and MfGS. Further clarification of policy post consultation has been.
Targets	LTP targets are in line with national performance indicators; these will be reviewed periodically, at each LTP Review. Annual monitoring of LTP performance indicators is published in the LTP Implementation Report available https://www.gloucestershire.gov.uk/transport/gloucestershires-local-transport-plan-2015-2031/local-transport-plan-monitoring/
Thinktravel – sustainable travel programme	Thinktravel -sustainable travel programme was initially funded through Local Sustainable Transport Funding (LSTF), and successfully influenced the travel behaviour change in a number of areas, workplaces, schools and communities. The legacy of Thinktravel is a strong sustainable transport brand and a small Thinktravel Team that continue to work with employers, schools and communities to support mode shift and influence sustainable travel behaviour change. The Thinktravel webpage supports Traveline, but it also has a number of legacy resources useful for communities, such as the Thinktravel CIC Toolkit. The Thinktravel Total Transport portal will provide a platform for effectively booking community transport and widen the community transport offer.
Transport Interchange Hubs / Rail Interchange	The LTP proposes the implementation of Transport Interchange Hubs is a corner stone of GCC's ambitions to promote sustainable modes of transport. The emerging draft LTP identifies two types of Transport Interchange Hubs: Strategic Interchange Hubs and Local Interchange Hubs. Strategic Transport Interchange Hubs are defined as located on, or have the potential to attract, very high frequency transport corridors, 'core super routes' and having significant parking for cars and bikes, following the Park and Ride concept. Local Interchange Hubs are defined as; in key locations in/near rural towns or on urban residential roads (but may not have dedicated parking), situated on dedicated cycle routes or near private car parking where sufficient demand and commercial viability exist. All railway stations should be enabled to fulfil interchange hub functions for maximum integration with all modes and onward connectivity. Interchange hubs can provide the connectivity with inter-urban and rural communities, link demand responsive services such as community transport with public transport and active travel opportunities for improved connectivity to a wider transport user group. Interchange Hubs will also provide an opportunity to encourage increased levels of physical activity amongst transport users by providing cycle hub facilities.

Please see attached for information.

Given the rapid turnaround required it is unlikely that there will be an opportunity to put any of these applications on a Consultations and Highways Committee.

I suggest that Sheral circulates by email any applications that come in for a quick response.

regards

Helen Bojaniwska PSLCC

Subject: FW: Pavement Licences

Dear Town and Parish Councils

The Business and Planning Act came into force in July 2020 and introduces a new pavement licence as part of the Government's Covid 19 Recovery Plan. This licence can be applied for by food and drink businesses such as pubs, restaurants and cafes. A pavement licence will allow such businesses to put removable furniture, such as tables and chairs, on the pavement adjacent to their premises. The application fee for pavement licences is £100 and there is a consultation process which will take 2 weeks. Applications may be refused if the furniture will cause obstruction or nuisance. This is a temporary measure that will end on 31 September 2020.

Stroud District Council is now set up to accept applications for pavement licences. More information is our website <https://www.stroud.gov.uk/business/licensing-permits/pavement-licences> .

These applications have a very short consultation of only 7 days and then the Council must make a decision within the next 7 days. The applicant will put a notice at the site and we will put a notice on our website. We will also send the application to various consultees which will include the relevant Town or Parish Council. Please note that the timescales are set down by the legislation and if we do not make a decision within these timescales the application will automatically be deemed as granted.

Please contact me by email if you have any queries

Regards

Rachel Andrew
Principal Licensing Officer

10 AUGUST 2020

PC10-20 | CHANGES TO THE CURRENT PLANNING SYSTEM

Summary

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

Consultation questions

NALC will be responding to the consultation questions as follows:

1. Do you agree that planning practice guidance should be amended to specify that the appropriate baseline for the standard method is whichever is the higher of the level of 0.5% of housing stock in each local authority area OR the latest household projections averaged over a 10-year period?
2. In the stock element of the baseline, do you agree that 0.5% of existing stock for the standard method is appropriate? If not, please explain why
3. Do you agree that using the workplace-based median house price to median earnings ratio from the most recent year for which data is available to adjust the standard method's baseline is appropriate? If not, please explain why.
4. Do you agree that incorporating an adjustment for the change of affordability over 10 years is a positive way to look at whether affordability has improved? If not, please explain why.
5. Do you agree that affordability is given an appropriate weighting within the standard method? If not, please explain why.

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

6. Authorities which are already at the second stage of the strategic plan consultation process (Regulation 19), which should be given 6 months to submit their plan to the Planning Inspectorate for examination?

7. Authorities close to publishing their second stage consultation (Regulation 19), which should be given 3 months from the publication date of the revised guidance to publish their Regulation 19 plan, and a further 6 months to submit their plan to the Planning Inspectorate?

If not, please explain why. Are there particular circumstances which need to be catered for?

8. The Government is proposing policy compliant planning applications will deliver a minimum of 25% of onsite affordable housing as First Homes, and a minimum of 25% of offsite contributions towards First Homes where appropriate. Which do you think is the most appropriate option for the remaining 75% of affordable housing secured through developer contributions? Please provide reasons and / or evidence for your views (if possible):

- i) Prioritising the replacement of affordable home ownership tenures, and delivering rental tenures in the ratio set out in the local plan policy.
- ii) Negotiation between a local authority and developer.
- iii) Other (please specify)

With regards to current exemptions from delivery of affordable home ownership products:

9. Should the existing exemptions from the requirement for affordable home ownership products (e.g. for build to rent) also apply to apply to this First Homes requirement?

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

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

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

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

14. Do you agree with the approach of allowing a small proportion of market housing on First Homes exception sites, in order to ensure site viability?

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

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

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

18. What is the appropriate level of small sites threshold? i) Up to 40 homes ii) Up to 50 homes iii) Other (please specify)
19. Do you agree with the proposed approach to the site size threshold?
20. Do you agree with linking the time-limited period to economic recovery and raising the threshold for an initial period of 18 months?
21. Do you agree with the proposed approach to minimising threshold effects?
22. Do you agree with the Government's proposed approach to setting thresholds in rural areas?
23. Are there any other ways in which the Government can support SME builders to deliver new homes during the economic recovery period?
24. Do you agree that the new Permission in Principle should remove the restriction on major development?
25. Should the new Permission in Principle for major development set any limit on the amount of commercial development (providing housing still occupies the majority of the floorspace of the overall scheme)? Please provide any comments in support of your views.
26. Do you agree with our proposal that information requirements for Permission in Principle by application for major development should broadly remain unchanged? If you disagree, what changes would you suggest and why?
27. Should there be an additional height parameter for Permission in Principle? Please provide comments in support of your views.
28. Do you agree that publicity arrangements for Permission in Principle by application should be extended for large developments? If so, should local planning authorities be:
- i) required to publish a notice in a local newspaper?
 - ii) subject to a general requirement to publicise the application or
 - iii) both?
 - iv) Disagree
29. Do you agree with our proposal for a banded fee structure based on a flat fee per hectare, with a maximum fee cap?
30. What level of flat fee do you consider appropriate, and why?
31. Do you agree that any brownfield site that is granted Permission in Principle through the application process should be included in Part 2 of the Brownfield Land Register? If you disagree, please state why.

32. What guidance would help support applicants and local planning authorities to make decisions about Permission in Principle? Where possible, please set out any areas of guidance you consider are currently lacking and would assist stakeholders.

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

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

35. In light of the proposals set out in this consultation, are there any direct or indirect impacts in terms of eliminating unlawful discrimination, advancing equality of opportunity and fostering good relations on people who share characteristics protected under the Public Sector Equality Duty?

Your evidence

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

© NALC 202

10 AUGUST 2020

PC11-20 | WHITE PAPER: PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

Summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Proposal 9:

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

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

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

Consultation questions

NALC will be responding to the consultation questions as follows:

1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?
2. Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area? [Yes / No]

(a). If no, why not? [Don't know how to / It takes too long / It's too complicated / I don't care / Other – please specify]
3. Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future? [Social media / Online news / Newspaper / By post / Other – please specify]
4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? [Building homes for young people / building homes for the homeless / Protection of green spaces / The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change / Increasing the affordability of housing / The design of new homes and places / Supporting the high street / Supporting the local economy / More or better local infrastructure / Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas / Other – please specify]
5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
6. Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

7. Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of “sustainable development”, which would include consideration of environmental impact? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

(b). How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?
8. (a) Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

(b). Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
9. (a). Do you agree that there should be automatic outline permission for areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

(b). Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

(c). Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
11. Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
13. (a) Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

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

14. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
15. What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area? [Not sure or indifferent / Beautiful and/or well-designed / Ugly and/or poorly-designed / There hasn't been any / Other – please specify]
16. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area? [Less reliance on cars / More green and open spaces / Energy efficiency of new buildings / More trees / Other – please specify]
17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
18. Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]
21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it? [More affordable housing / More or better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health provision) / Design of new buildings / More shops and/or employment space / Green space/ Don't know / Other – please specify]
22. (a) Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

(b) Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally? [Nationally at a single rate / Nationally at an area-specific rate / Locally]

(c) Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities? [Same amount overall / More value / Less value / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

(d) Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

24. (a). Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

(b). Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

24 (c). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

24 (d). If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]

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

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

26. Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?

Your evidence

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

© NALC 2020

10 AUGUST 2020

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

Summary

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

Consultation questions

NALC will be responding to the consultation questions as follows:

1. The Public Interest

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

2. Rights of pre-emption and options

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

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

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

3. Estate contracts

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

4. Other contractual controls

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

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

5: Data requirements

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

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

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

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

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

6. Contractual conditions

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

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

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

7. Legal Entity Identifiers

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

8. Data currency

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

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

9. Accounting treatment

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

10. Existing contractual control interests

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

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

11. Current beneficiaries

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

12. A digital process?

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

13. Certification

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

14. Restrictions

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

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

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

15. Alternative options

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

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

16. Current practice

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

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

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

17. Data collation and provision

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

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

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

18. Data currency

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

19. Certification

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

20. Economic impact

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

21. Costs

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

22. Identifying and understanding contractual control interests

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

(b) What is the source of your information?

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

23. Market impact

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

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

24. Trust in the planning system

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

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

25. Public Sector Equality Duty

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

Your evidence

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

14th Sept 2020

Item 6

APPLICATIONS			
Planning Application No.	Location	Details	Ward/notes
S.20/1651/LBC	12 London Road	The installation of a front light well and larger window to an existing basement, with an access stair from ground to basement level	Central
S.20/1650/HHOLD	12 London Road	The installation of a front light well and larger window to an existing basement, with an access stair from ground to basement level.	Cental
S.20/1583/FUL	Land Adjacent To Northside, Mill Farm Drive, Paganhill	Proposed 3x dwellings	Pag/Farm
S.20/1560/LBC	3 - 7 Rowcroft	Refurbish the existing sign on the front of the building, replace with new trading name and branding	Central
S.20/1606/HHOLD	4 Milton Grove	Proposed two storey rear extension, single storey side extension plus decking area at rear	Slade
S.20/1469/HHOLD	Hemlock Well House, Castle Street	Erection of a frameless glass ballustrade on existing decked roof terrace	Trinity
S.20/1470/LBC	Hemlock Well House, Castle Street	Erection of a frameless glass ballustrade on existing decked roof terrace	Trinity
S.20/1745/TCA	89 Bisley Road	Trees in a Conservation Area Description: Holly (T1) fell. Pear (T2) fell.	Slade
S.20/1680/FUL	Lot 4 Land At, Woodside	Retrospective application for a wooden packing shed (size 4.09m x 2.5m) onto agricultural land situated within the cotswold AONB. For storage of equipment & produce processing.	Valley
S.20/1693/HHOLD	Rockleigh, Park Road	Proposed enlarged terrace	Trinity
S.20/1196/HHOLD	100 Bisley Road	Revised consultation - Proposed loft conversion	Application now closed.
S.20/1668/HHOLD	Togo Lodge, Lansdown	Proposed parking bay	Valley
S.20/1782/FUL	5 - 7 Chapel Street	Installation of a Portakabin building to be used as an office space for a period of 156 weeks.	Slade
S.20/1807/HHOLD	34 Marling Crescent, Paganhill	Replace garage and conservatory with side and rear extension. Dormer window to rear roof space and roof lights to front with balcony to flat roof.	Farm/Pag
S.20/1747/HHOLD	50 Marling Crescent, Paganhill	Proposed alterations, extentions, garage conversion and the dropping of kerbs.	Farm/Pag
S.20/1715/FUL	The Lodge, 2 Bath Street	Conversion to a 3 bed dwelling house. Insertion of velux windows and replacement of external joinery. Render finish to exterior.	Central
Arrived since agenda went out:			
S.20/1743/FUL	Land At 102, Slad Road	Resubmission of S.20/0170/FUL - Erection of dwelling	Valley

S.20/1833/TCA	The Lindens, Lower Street	Lime (T1) remove 2 stems leaning towards the road, keeping the rear stem in line with the 5 existing lime trees	Trinity
S.20/1827/HHOLD	Abercairn, Belle Vue Road	Proposed first floor rear extension	Valley
S.20/1623/FUL	Land Associated With Gospel Hall, Lansdown	Erection of 3 bedroom dwelling	Valley

Delegated applications

These applications will not be discussed unless a ward Cllr calls in or there are significant objections from members of the public.

S.20/1716/HHOLD	8 Maple Drive	Rear single storey extension and front porch	Pag/Farm
-----------------	---------------	--	----------