

White Paper: Planning for the Future

Consultation response from:

Horsted Keynes Community Land Trust Feasibility Group

2. Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area? **Yes**

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? **Other - Email alerts, as the current system**

4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? **Increasing affordable housing, Building homes for young people, Other - Community Led Housing**

5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals? **No – We are not convinced that these proposed changes to the planning system will do anything to speed up the delivery of much-needed affordable homes**

6. Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally? **No – We believe the government should focus its attention on solving the problems with housing delivery and increasing the supply of affordable housing, rather than unnecessary radical changes to the planning system. Some improvements to the system would be welcome, particularly where they support Community Led Housing and Community Land Trusts. The government needs to find a way to capture a far greater proportion of the uplift in land values when permissions are granted and investing this in affordable and social housing.**

8(a). Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced? **No – We believe that housing targets should reflect actual locally assessed need with proper consideration given to local constraints, not arbitrary figures calculated by a flawed algorithm.**

8(b). Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated? **No – We consider that it would be far more effective to increase the supply of affordable housing rather than just increasing the supply of market house and hoping that this will improve affordability. Where we live, in Mid Sussex, prices will always be unaffordable and no amount of increasing the general supply will help because it will simply attract migration from other areas. What we need is affordable housing for local people.**

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? **No**

9(b). Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for *Renewal* and *Protected* areas? **No - We accept that protected areas should still be protected and this makes support for Community Led Housing more important than ever**

because with the appropriate restrictions on market housing, some genuinely affordable housing is still required to enable communities to thrive.

10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain? No – We note that there is currently planning permission for over a million homes that developers are not building so it would seem to us that it is housing delivery that is more of a problem than planning approval times. However, we do think that applications for 100% affordable homes and Community Led Housing schemes should be prioritised and fast tracked.

11. Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans? No – We do not think the current system is a barrier. We can generally access and understand all the information we need electronically. Continuous improvement as technology develops is welcome but there is no need for a major overhaul. There is little to be gained from this and there must be other priorities. There is also a risk that proposals for web-based plans could actually result in them being less accessible, especially for the older population or those on low incomes.

13(a). Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system? Yes – We want to see Neighbourhood Plans retained but we think more weight should be given to them not less. They have proved to be a very successful way of delivering housing with local support but it is very disheartening for communities, that have invested significant time and energy into producing Neighbourhood Plans, to find little or no apparent weight is given to them in some planning decisions and appeals. If communities are going to continue to be motivated to engage in Neighbourhood Plans in the future, they are going to need to feel that they are involved in the big decisions affecting their areas, including what developments are needed and where they should go, not just pattern book type selection from design guides. Having “made” a proper plan for their area, which includes the key decisions, communities must have confidence that planners and inspectors will respect those decisions when future applications and appeals are considered.

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, we certainly agree that, once planning permission has been granted, build out rates need to be speeded up. We think there should be strong financial incentives for developers to get on and complete developments once they have been started and not wait for market absorption or market prices to rise before building out the following phases. Clearly this is a big part of the problem with permissions already granted for over a million homes that are not being built. We suggest that local authorities should be empowered to significantly increase CIL levels on every dwelling that is not built within a defined timescale from when the permission is granted, with the CIL payments being made by the developer soon after permission is granted, so that developers need to complete properties in order to recover their costs. If all the dwellings are not built after say 5 years the developer should be required to make a further CIL payment (equal or higher than the first) for every dwelling that has not been completed. If dwellings are not completed within say 10 years local authorities should be empowered to compulsory purchase the land at the previous use value before permission was granted.

16. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area? Less reliance on cars

21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it? **More affordable housing**

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? **More value**

22(d). Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area? **Yes**

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**

25. Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy?

25(a). If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed? **Yes**