



Policy Consultation Response Form

Housing White Paper – *Fixing The Broken Housing Market*

Response Form

Please send completed form to Jessica.Lancod-frost@nalc.gov.uk by 17.00 on Friday 28 April 2017.

Name of county association /parish council	
Question	Views & Evidence
<p>Response / Evidence To White Paper Question 1; Question 1</p> <p>Do you agree with the proposals to:</p> <p>a) Make clear in the National Planning Policy Framework that the key strategic policies that each local planning authority should maintain are those set out currently at paragraph 156 of the Framework, with an additional requirement to plan for the allocations needed to deliver the area’s housing requirement?</p> <p>b) Use regulations to allow Spatial Development Strategies to allocate strategic sites, where these strategies require unanimous agreement of the members of the combined authority?</p> <p>c) Revise the National Planning Policy Framework to tighten the definition of what evidence is required to support a ‘sound’ plan?</p>	
<p>Response / Evidence To White Paper Question 2; Question 2</p> <p>What changes do you think would support more proportionate consultation and examination procedures for different types of plan and to ensure that different levels of plans work together?</p>	

<p>Response / Evidence To White Paper Question 5;</p> <p>Question 5</p> <p>Do you agree that regulations should be amended so that all local planning authorities are able to dispose of land with the benefit of planning consent which they have granted to themselves?</p>	
<p>Response / Evidence To White Paper Question 10;</p> <p>Question 10</p> <p>Do you agree with the proposals to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to make clear that:</p> <p>a) authorities should amend Green Belt boundaries only when they can demonstrate that they have examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting their identified development requirements?</p>	
<p>Response / Evidence To White Paper Question 12;</p> <p>Question 12</p> <p>Do you agree with the proposals to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to:</p> <p>a) indicate that local planning authorities should provide neighbourhood planning groups with a housing requirement figure, where this is sought?</p> <p>b) make clear that local and neighbourhood plans (at the most appropriate level) and more detailed development plan documents (such as action area plans) are expected to set out clear design expectations; and that visual tools such as design codes can help provide a clear basis for making decisions on development proposals?;</p> <p>c) emphasise the importance of early pre-application discussions between applicants, authorities and the local community about design and the types of homes to be provided?;</p> <p>d) makes clear that design should not be used as</p>	

<p>a valid reason to object to development where it accords with clear design expectations set out in statutory plans?; and</p> <p>e) recognise the value of using a widely accepted design standard, such as Building for Life, in shaping and assessing basic design principles – and make clear that this should be reflected in plans and given weight in the planning process?</p>	
<p>Response / Evidence To White Paper Question 16; Question 16 Do you agree that:</p> <p>a) where local planning authorities wish to agree their housing land supply for a one-year period, national policy should require those authorities to maintain a 10% buffer on their 5 year housing land supply?</p>	
<p>Response / Evidence To White Paper Question 17; Question 17</p> <p>In taking forward the protection for neighbourhood plans as set out in the Written Ministerial Statement of 12 December 2016 into the revised NPPF, do you agree that it should include the following amendments:</p> <p>a) a requirement for the neighbourhood plan to meet its share of local housing need?</p>	
<p>Response / Evidence To White Paper Question 18; Question 18</p> <p>What are your views on the merits of introducing a fee for making a planning appeal?</p>	
<p>Response / Evidence To White Paper Question 31; Question 31</p> <p>Do you agree with our proposals to;</p> <p>(a) amend national policy to revise the definition of affordable housing as set out in Box 4?</p>	



Policy Consultation Response Form

Response / Evidence To Affordable Housing supplementary document and related NALC position statement; <i>Government to reverse the negative impact on the availability of affordable social housing caused by factors including the reduction in contribution to Housing Associations and the failure to make appropriate use of empty properties which could be used for housing for local people</i>	
Response / Evidence To the NPPF supplementary document and related NALC position statement; <i>a strengthening of bullet point 5, in para 17 – core planning principles of the NPPF – “recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving rural communities within it”.</i>	
Response / Evidence To the Starter Homes supplementary document	
Response / Evidence To the Rural Housing supplementary document	
Response / Evidence To the CIL supporting document and related NALC position statement: <i>The Government to ensure that planning authorities can only rely on accountable and transparent evidence of housing need which they are obliged to share with town and parish councils progressing neighbourhood plans; ensuring that a failure to do so should result in the Community Infrastructure Levy being payable as if relevant councils had an adopted neighbourhood plan.</i>	



Policy Consultation Response Form

Response / Evidence to the specific NALC questions regarding the main recommendations contained in the CiL review:

Do you agree there should be closer integration at both the local plan and neighbourhood plan-making stages? How can this be achieved??

Do you agree local authorities should work closely with both parishes and neighbourhoods over the actual spending of any neighbourhood allocation of LIT to ensure that the delivery of infrastructure is supported and best value is obtained? How can this be achieved?

Do you agree to the replacement of CiL with a hybrid system of a broad and low level infrastructure tariff and Section 106 for larger developments? Do you agree all planning authorities should have a CiL regime in place by a specified date? If so, what date should we be proposing?

If the share of CiL for parish councils with an adopted neighbourhood plan should rise from 25% to 35% would you be more likely to develop and neighbourhood plan?