

Forest of Dean District Council's response to consultation on the [Proposed reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework and other changes to the planning system](#).

Consultation published by MHCLG on 2 August 2024 and closes on 24 September 2024.

Chapter 3 – Planning for the homes we need

1	Question 1: Do you agree that we should reverse the December 2023 changes made to paragraph 61?	<p>FODDC want to avoid being placed in a position whereby 'Planning by Appeal' becomes prevalent as a result of changes being introduced in the NPPF. FODDC recommend that a transition period is introduced giving Councils time to adapt to the new requirements (including dealing with mitigating matters such as the Statutory Forest, flood zones and other designations such as National Landscape areas (formerly AONB) and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)) whilst not exposing the council and its residents to poor planning applications.</p> <p>Greater clarity is required regarding the mechanisms that LPAs that are particularly constrained by floodplain, National Landscapes and Green Belt etc. will "export" their needs to adjoining authorities.</p>
2	Do you agree that we should remove reference to the use of alternative approaches to assessing housing need in paragraph 61 and the glossary of the NPPF?	<p>No. FODDC does not consider the proposed standard methodology to be a true calculation or representation of the number of homes that are needed in an area. It is an overly simplistic 'one size fits all' calculation. There may be important local circumstances that justify an alternative housing need calculation. Deleting this reference would disregard these local circumstances, which may justify the use of an alternative methodology.</p> <p>FODDC want to avoid being placed in a position whereby Planning by Appeal becomes prevalent as a result of changes being introduced in the NPPF. FODDC recommend that a transition period is introduced giving Councils time to adapt to the new requirements (including dealing with mitigating matters such as the Statutory Forest, flood zones and other designations such as National Landscape areas (formerly AONB) and Special Areas of Conservation (SAC)) whilst not exposing the Council and its residents to poor planning applications.</p>
3	Do you agree that we should reverse the December 2023 changes made on the urban uplift by deleting paragraph 62?	<p>No. FODDC consider that the current proposal goes too far in increasing the additional housing burden to rural areas whilst relaxing that burden in urban areas.</p> <p>Urban areas are far more sustainable and better served by facilities and services so there should still be an urban bias. This is particularly the case in that the proposed new method actually reduces the stated need in some urban areas and has only a modest uplift in others whereas many rural authorities are seeing an uplift of 100% - which is likely to exacerbate existing strain on services in those rural areas least able to cope with the demand and where travel to such services is likely to be by the least sustainable means of transport.</p>

4	Do you agree that we should reverse the December 2023 changes made on character and density and delete paragraph 130?	<p>Promotion of design codes is welcomed given the generally very poor standard of housing that has been built in some areas because of the operation of the tilted balance over the last decade or so. This will however have a massive financial impact on already overstretched LPAs, and if introduced in a similar rushed manner to BNG (with poor guidance, lack of skills and inadequate time to prepare), it is likely to result in further such poor development.</p> <p>A design toolkit focused on aesthetics will not overcome the design flaws of poorly located development (potentially brought about as a result of 'Planning by Appeal'). If the Government is serious about the quality of the built environment, it needs to support LPAs in their efforts to ensure development is in the right place and delivered at the right time. Residential development needs to be complemented by delivery of infrastructure (transport, sewerage etc.) and by employment opportunities.</p>
5	Do you agree that the focus of design codes should move towards supporting spatial visions in local plans and areas that provide the greatest opportunities for change such as greater density, in particular the development of large new communities?	Yes, provided the skills and finances are available to do it properly.

6	<p>Do you agree that the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be amended as proposed?</p>	<p>The LPA can generally only affect the delivery of planning permissions, not the number of homes that are delivered. Thus, it is fair that LPAs are penalised if they fail to plan for sufficient housing or refuse consent that accords with its plan. However, at present the system punishes the LPA when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land is promoted as being deliverable in the Local Plan but is not delivered; • Land is delivered but not in accordance with the allocation i.e. watered down; • Applications are submitted that do not accord the Affordable Housing etc. requirements; • No applications are submitted (making it impossible to approve them); • Developers game the delivery of their site to engage the tilted balance to land bank more consents but do not build them out. <p>This is evidenced by the Local Government Association, where, in 2021, it identified that more than 1.1 million homes granted planning permission in England in the last decade are yet to be built; this being a figure which is still being reflected by different organisations as true today.</p> <p>In these circumstances the LPA gets punished for the lack of delivery by the land promoter/developer. The focus of any undersupply and the presumption of the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be predicated on the basis of sufficient land being allocated and then subsequent permissions granted/refused rather actually delivery which is beyond council control.</p> <p>Even when sites do come forward, when the LPA seeks to ensure compliance with the allocation or its adopted policies, developers know that the spectre of the 5yhl can be used to drive down standards as delivery trumps quality/compliance. There needs to be a more level playing field where the pain for lack of delivery also falls on developers e.g. the LPA could levy Council Tax on any allocated sites not brought forward or delivered within, for example, 5 years with the funding used to help release the site; Government could raise tax on sites land-banked; ensure forced sale of land that has been allocated but not brought forward etc.</p> <p>The commitment to ensuring quality rather than merely delivery is welcomed. However, it is also important to understand and manage a likely unintended consequence of introducing the proposals as currently drafted. Whilst FODDC are supportive of additional housing, especially affordable housing and social rented housing, including a presumption in favour of appropriate and sustainable development in the right circumstances, the Council is concerned that without amendment, the proposal will leave it exposed to inappropriate development in inappropriate locations through Planning Appeals. To provide the opportunity for the Council to ensure that development is appropriate, we strongly recommend that a transition period is introduced whereby LPAs are given time to plan for increased housing needs.</p> <p>With specific regard to the Forest of Dean District, it is a unique area of the country constrained by a large national statutory forest, where no development can take place as it is crown land. Furthermore, it has one of the largest populations of bats nationally, which severely constrains the potential for</p>
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>development. House prices are lower than the comparable areas of the County and has not experienced significant demand for house building. The Council recognising the importance of a plan-led system and has sought to provide up-to-date Local Plans. The past two adopted plans have allocated the appropriate amount of land to secure its housing needs, seeking build out rates of 300 to 330 per annum. However, for the reasons cited above, house builders have not delivered at this rate and as such after 18 months, both our plans have been deemed out of date as the 5-year supply was not met. The new proposal seeks to impose a 81% increase in the amount of housing the Council would be required to supply per year. If the Council, with brand new plans has demonstrated that it has been unable to deliver the much lower target rate, there is, in the opinion of the Council, a very real and high risk that rates 81% higher could not be achieved. As such, assuming we were to deliver an adopted plan which allocates the land to facilitate this higher rate in housing requirement, it's likely that it will simply follow the path of the two previous plans being out of date after 18 months. Not only will the plan therefore fail to deliver the required targets but the whole plan making process seems flawed since it is in effect doomed to fail, and development in inappropriate locations will be forced upon the Council against the wishes of its Members and electorate.</p>
7	<p>Do you agree that all local planning authorities should be required to continually demonstrate 5 years of specific, deliverable sites for decision making purposes, regardless of plan status?</p>	<p>Given that the decision as to when to apply and when to build-out housing developments rests largely with the developer, and given the cyclical nature of the housing market, there will inevitably be peaks and troughs in the delivery across the plan period. As such, it should be the delivery over that period that should be measured or else there will be the perverse incentive for an LPA to slow down early/over delivery because it will be punished later in the cycle when there are insufficient sites left to meet targets in later years.</p> <p>The 5-year supply rule was introduced as a tool to push 'recalcitrant' Local Authorities forward with plan-making. The loss of local democratic decision-making, and the immediate increase in supply could well be</p>

		<p>seen as a proportionate response to those authorities dragging their feet on plan-making. However, the massively increased housing numbers proposed by the new standard method changes the complexion of this. Local Authorities should not be subject to a punitive regime simply because of the increased ambition of central government, especially when the new metric does not start from a calculation of locality derived need or realistic capacity to deliver. To assiduously identify and test options to deliver this uplift will take time, especially in the most constrained areas (like the FOD District). Government should consider whether there is a carrot rather than just a stick to deliver its ambitions.</p> <p>The 5-year rule not only punishes the local authority but undermines a multiplicity of ambitions and other interests. Poorer sites will come forward, with impact on economic capacity, on environmental opportunity and protection of heritage. Unallocated sites will come forward that do not respond to local aspirations, despite the best endeavours of local communities, which may have striven over years to develop Neighbourhood Plans.</p> <p>Planning for a substantial uplift in numbers will require more land to be identified. A flat housing trajectory does not provide the window of opportunity for local authorities to work with the development industry to identify and plan out these sites, which often will be larger and more complex. If the Government is genuinely committed to a plan-led system and raising the quality of development, it should consider as a minimum empowering LPAs to 'backload' delivery. Such an approach would provide many other advantages – it would also give infrastructure and utility providers opportunity to factor into their forward planning, and give the development industry (planners, construction industry alike) some time to develop the skills necessary to deliver at scale.</p> <p>It is important to understand and manage a likely unintended consequence of introducing the proposals as currently drafted. Whilst FODDC are supportive of additional housing, especially social rented housing, FODDC are concerned that without amendment, the proposal will leave the council exposed to inappropriate development in inappropriate locations through Planning Appeals. To provide the opportunity for the Council to ensure that development is appropriate, we strongly recommend that a transition period is introduced whereby LPAs are given time to plan for increased housing needs.</p>
8	Do you agree with our proposal to remove wording on national planning guidance in paragraph 77 of the current NPPF?	<p>Given that the decision as to when to apply and when to build-out housing developments rests largely with the developer, and given the cyclical nature of the housing market, there will inevitably be peaks and troughs in the delivery across the plan period. As such it should be the delivery over that period that should be measured or else there will be the perverse incentive for an LPA to slow down early/over delivery because it will be punished later in the cycle when there are insufficient sites left to meet targets in later years.</p> <p>The 5-year supply rule was introduced as a tool to push 'recalcitrant' Local Authorities forward with plan-making. The loss of local democratic decision-making, and the immediate increase in supply could well be</p>

		<p>seen as a proportionate response to those authorities dragging their feet on plan-making. However, the massively increased housing numbers proposed by the new standard method changes the complexion of this. Local Authorities should not be subject to a punitive regime simply because of the increased ambition of central government, especially when the new metric does not start from realistic capacity to deliver the local housing need figure. To assiduously identify and test options to deliver this uplift will take time, especially in the most constrained areas (like the FOD District). Government should consider whether there is a carrot rather than just a stick to deliver its ambitions.</p> <p>The 5 year rule also not only punishes the local authority, but undermines a multiplicity of ambitions and other interests. Poorer sites will come forward, with impact on economic capacity, on environmental opportunity and protection of heritage. Sites will come forward despite the best endeavours of local communities, which may have striven over years to develop Neighbourhood Plans.</p>
9	<p>Do you agree that all local planning authorities should be required to add a 5% buffer to their 5-year housing land supply calculations?</p>	<p>In summary, no. If a LPA is required to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, that should be enough. Otherwise, they are effectively required to demonstrate a 5.25-year housing land supply.</p> <p>Whilst the 5% buffer will bring clarity and certainty, the Council has some concerns.</p> <p>There is a concern with regard to using the Housing Delivery Test based on delivery. The LPA can generally only affect the delivery of planning permissions. Thus, it is entirely fair that a LPA should be penalised if it fails to plan for sufficient housing, or refuses consent that accords with its plan. However, at present the system punishes the LPA when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land is promoted as being deliverable in the LP and then not brought forward; • Land is brought forward but not in accordance with the allocation ie watered down; • Applications are submitted that do not accord the Affordable Housing etc requirements; • No applications are submitted (making it impossible to approve them); • Developers game the delivery of their site so as to engage the tilted balance to land bank more consents but do not build them out. <p>This is evidenced by the Local Government Association, where, in 2021, it identified that more than 1.1 million homes granted planning permission in England in the last decade are yet to be built; this being a figure which is still being reflected by different organisations as true today.</p> <p>In these circumstances the LPA gets punished for the lack of delivery by the land promoter/developer. The focus of the HDT should be predicated on the basis of sufficient land being allocated and then subsequent permissions granted/refused, rather actual delivery which is beyond Council control.</p> <p>There would also be a concern regarding the retention of the 20% buffer. Should the increased needs figures for rural areas remain from when would the Housing Delivery Test apply? It is recognised that the</p>

		<p>new proposed housing requirement would represent an 81% increase in the amount of housing the Forest of Dean would be required to supply per year. The concern is that this level of increased delivery will take time to be realised, with developers needing to appraise sites, then for sites to go through the planning process and finally to actually be built out. Even if all parties were willing to provide increased delivery, the actual process could likely take up to 4 years before the increased delivery begins to become apparent. This excludes delivering larger development sites, which according to research undertaken by Lichfields¹, typically takes up to 7.7 years from validating the first planning application to completing the first dwelling. Given the above development lag, the Council considers it is unrealistic to expect such growth to occur within four years and that increased requirement for the Housing Delivery Test should take account of this, with a phased integration of the revised delivery targets from years 3 or 4 after their implementation.</p>
10	If yes, do you agree that 5% is an appropriate buffer, or should it be a different figure?	We do not agree with the addition of a 5% buffer.
11	Do you agree with the removal of policy on Annual Position Statements?	<p>Removing the option for local planning authorities to 'fix' their 5-year housing land supply through Annual Position Statements will enable a continuation of the current situation, where 5-year housing land supply positions are debated at planning appeals (sometimes several times within the same year). Annual Position Statements at least allow LPAs to try to fix their 5-year housing land supply positions, enabling them to concentrate on plan making and determining planning applications, rather than having to resource planning appeals.</p> <p>However, if in reality few local authorities have taken up this opportunity, it would seem sensible to remove the requirement.</p>
12	Do you agree that the NPPF should be amended to further support effective co-operation on cross boundary and strategic planning matters?	<p>The LPA welcome the commitment to engage with local leaders to develop this strategy and await the details of that engagement before commenting further. However, with the redistribution of housing from urban to rural areas, housing being redirected to the periphery of functional economic areas, and simply the significant increase in the housing having to be delivered, risks cross-boundary co-operation being disingenuous i.e. not seeking to address true cross-boundary issues but only being done to secure a means to an end to manage housing numbers.</p> <p>The proposed introduction of paragraph 27 is supported in principle, however it should be recognised that the investment plans of infrastructure providers do not always align with local plan timescales and priorities. It may be more appropriate for the text to require alignment with local plan infrastructure evidence rather than local plan policies themselves.</p>

¹ [Start to Finish How quickly do large-scale housing sites deliver? Third Edition \(Lichfields, March 2024\)](#)

13	Should the tests of soundness be amended to better assess the soundness of strategic scale plans or proposals?	Yes. At present the system works against strategic thinking e.g. delivery of new settlements, because the time taken to get them out of the ground in terms of infrastructure can be up to a decade. These are practical delays as opposed to planning delays. Because of the problems in getting spades in the ground on larger sites, there is an incentive on LPA's to allocate smaller, less sustainable sites (as they deliver quicker) and to avoid the larger sites as the potential delays associated with those larger sites may trigger the tilted balance and release ad hoc sporadic development onto LPA areas that try to plan strategically. A mechanism is needed to account for this in the 5-year housing land supply figures.
14	Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?	It is recognised that planning delays in some areas can account for delays in house building. This, however, is not the whole picture. If Government focusses solely on planning delays their strategy will fail. Even setting aside land-banking and gaming the system by developers, Government also needs to address issues associated with the lack of capacity in the building industry, the lack of drinking water supplies, the lack of sewage infrastructure to serve the new houses, the lack of grid connections, sites locked up in nutrient neutrality areas, developments mired in HRA assessments, developments where the lack of Habitat Banks means planning permission is stalled etc. These all sit outside the ability of the LPA to control but directly affect delivery and will prevent delivery of the houses no matter how many permissions are granted.
Chapter 4 – A new Standard Method for assessing housing needs		
15	Do you agree that Planning Practice Guidance should be amended to specify that the appropriate baseline for the standard method is housing stock rather than the latest household projections?	<p>No. Whilst not perfect, the current use of the households projections factored in variables which would affect projected households likely to form in an area, and as such would appear to provide a more appropriate baseline for setting future need, as it reflects more accurately what is likely to happen.</p> <p>FODDC is concerned that, without amendment, the proposal will leave the council exposed to inappropriate development in inappropriate locations through planning appeals. To provide the opportunity for the Council to ensure that development is appropriate, we strongly recommend that a transition period is introduced whereby LPAs are given time to plan for increased housing needs.</p>
16	Do you agree that using the workplace-based median house price to median earnings ratio, averaged over the most recent 3 year period for which data is available to adjust the standard method's baseline, is appropriate?	<p>There is concern about the over-reliance the proposed 'standard methodology' has on housing affordability and the assumption that an increase in supply, in accordance with the measure of affordability that is currently applied, will lower prices and make homes more affordable. The affordability of housing is calculated by comparing the median cost of a home in an area with the median wage in the area. However, it is widely publicised that housing has been getting increasingly unaffordable across the whole country for decades but the reasons for this are numerous and complex, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wages have not kept pace with house price rises. - Developers' absorption rates means they 'drip-feed' new homes into the market to ensure house prices remain high to maximise profits.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Land banking (i.e. land being used as a financial asset to increase share prices rather than to deliver housing). - Both low interest rates and the increased ability of people being able to get a mortgage have fuelled an increase in house prices. - Housing market areas can often overlap and with the acceptance of more remote and home working we are increasingly seeing more people working in urban areas seeking to live in rural areas. <p>The underlying assumption that that an increase in supply in accordance with the measure of affordability that is proposed will lower prices and make homes more affordable, is considered incorrect as the pricing in any given area is more likely to reflect what the market will bear, and increasing the requirement in any case may not lead builders to deliver more. The industry has a finite capacity, whilst the model ensures that returns (profits) are maintained partly by regulating (limiting) supply. This is likely to remain. There is, therefore, concern that the use of housing affordability adjustment does not provide an accurate representation of the number of homes needed.</p> <p>The proposed calculation is based upon the relationship between median house prices & median work-based incomes. It is considered that this can skew the affordability issue of an area, particularly in a rural area. Without proper controls in place over what is built within the market sector, it considered that developers will only continue to build larger executive type homes rather than building what communities actually need, which will continue to inflate the median house price, thus continually perpetuating the affordability crisis that exists.</p> <p>Using a 3-year average which will help smooth out yearly spikes – this is considered acceptable.</p> <p>For predominately rural areas such as the Forest of Dean, it is recognised that much of the working community will commute to more urban areas where there are more jobs, which are better paid. This would help explain in part why ‘Predominantly Rural’ areas saw an increase of 70.2% in number of new additional homes required compared to an increase of just 6.4% in ‘Predominantly Urban’ areas, In order to properly reflect the affordability issues of such areas, it is considered that it would be more appropriate to use annual earnings by local authority residency rather than worked based income.</p>
17	Do you agree that affordability is given an appropriate weighting within the proposed standard method?	No. It is given too much weighting, as it is bias towards housing delivery in unsustainable rural locations. The Rural Services Network has undertaken analysis of the proposed changes to the numbers of homes needed

		<p>in each local authority area compared to the existing national planning policies. This reveals significant changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Predominantly Rural areas: An increase of 70.2%, equating to 35,215 additional houses (from 50,191 to 85,406), or 6.0 houses per 1,000 dwelling stock. - Predominantly Urban areas: An increase of 6.4%, equating to 14,267 additional houses (from 221,827 to 236,094), or 0.9 houses per 1,000 dwelling stock. <p>The large increase in the number of homes needed in rural authorities is because these are typically where housing affordability issues are worst, and consequently where housing needs are calculated to be highest. However, rural areas typically have limited services, facilities, employment opportunities and public transport provision. The proposed changes will bake-in car dependency and increased CO2 emissions, social isolation, increased pressure on already strained local services, and less opportunities for people to live active and healthy lifestyles.</p> <p>In summary, the weighting appears to be inflated from the current method multiplier of 0.25% (to 0.6). and is considered to likely give over weighting to the affordability adjustment. Due to high house price ratios in rural areas, this has dramatically increased the housing requirement figures, without any consideration of if this is deliverable with regard to whether there is actual market demand for this increased provision. The previous multiplier of .25% is considered more appropriate.</p>
18	Do you consider the standard method should factor in evidence on rental affordability? If so, do you have any suggestions for how this could be incorporated into the model?	<p>If housing affordability is used, the standard methodology should also take consideration of rental affordability. This would give a more accurate representation of the affordability of housing in an area across the whole housing sector.</p> <p>FODDC is concerned that, without amendment, the proposal will leave the council exposed to inappropriate development in inappropriate locations through planning appeals. To provide the opportunity for the Council to ensure that development is appropriate, we strongly recommend that a transition period is introduced whereby LPAs are given time to plan for increased housing needs.</p>
19	Do you have any additional comments on the proposed method for assessing housing needs?	<p>In order to properly reflect the affordability issues of such areas, it is considered that it would be more appropriate to use annual earnings by local authority residency rather than worked based income.</p> <p>FODDC is concerned that, without amendment, the proposal will leave the council exposed to inappropriate development in inappropriate locations through planning appeals. To provide the opportunity for the Council to ensure that development is appropriate, we strongly recommend that a transition period is introduced whereby LPAs are given time to plan for increased housing needs.</p>
Chapter 5 – Brownfield, grey belt and the Green Belt		

20	Do you agree that we should make the proposed change set out in paragraph 124c, as a first step towards brownfield passports?	<p>FODDC agrees with the principle of developing brownfield land first. However, no definition of 'a settlement' is provided for the application of this policy, so the policy may apply to hamlets and small villages with limited access to services, employment provision or public transport connections.</p> <p>The practical application of this in rural areas may enable housing developments in inaccessible and otherwise unsuitable areas. This would increase car-dependency; transport CO2 emissions; may create isolated communities that are unable to walk and cycle, which goes undermines the principle of delivering healthy communities; and it may add pressure to the delivery of local services (e.g. bin collections having to travel further afield).</p>
21	Do you agree with the proposed change to paragraph 154g of the current NPPF to better support the development of PDL in the Green Belt?	<p>The FODD does not include any Green Belt land.</p> <p>However, for other authorities that do have Green Belt designations within their boundaries, the proposed change would encourage the use of previously developed land without compromising the openness of designated areas of Green Belt.</p>
22	Do you have any views on expanding the definition of PDL, while ensuring that the development and maintenance of glasshouses for horticultural production is maintained?	<p>The expanded definition would include hardstanding and glasshouses, which are currently agricultural (greenfield) land.</p> <p>An unintended practical application of this in rural areas may enable housing developments in inaccessible and otherwise unsuitable areas. This would increase car-dependency; transport CO2 emissions; may create isolated communities that are unable to walk and cycle, which goes undermines the principle of delivering healthy communities; and it may add pressure to the delivery of local services (e.g. bin collections having to travel further afield).</p>
23	Do you agree with our proposed definition of grey belt land? If not, what changes would you recommend?	No comment - The FODD does not include any Green Belt land.
24	Are any additional measures needed to ensure that high performing Green Belt land is not degraded to meet grey belt criteria?	No comment - The FODD does not include any Green Belt land.
25	Do you agree that additional guidance to assist in identifying land which makes a limited contribution of Green Belt purposes would be helpful? If so, is this best contained in the NPPF itself or in planning practice guidance?	No comment - The FODD does not include any Green Belt land.

26	Do you have any views on whether our proposed guidance sets out appropriate considerations for determining whether land makes a limited contribution to Green Belt purposes?	No comment - The FODD does not include any Green Belt land.
27	Do you have any views on the role that Local Nature Recovery Strategies could play in identifying areas of Green Belt which can be enhanced?	The FODD does not include any Green Belt land. However, the concept of Green Belt designation is already widely misunderstood by the public as it is considered a landscape designation rather than an urban restraint designation. Whilst the principle of supporting nature recovery is strongly welcomed, great care would need to be applied in introducing a cross reference to nature recovery etc if the confusion is not to be made worse.
28	Do you agree that our proposals support the release of land in the right places, with previously developed and grey belt land identified first, while allowing local planning authorities to prioritise the most sustainable development locations?	No comment - The FODD does not include any Green Belt land.
29	Do you agree with our proposal to make clear that the release of land should not fundamentally undermine the function of the Green Belt across the area of the plan as a whole?	No comment - The FODD does not include any Green Belt land.
30	Do you agree with our approach to allowing development on Green Belt land through decision making? If not, what changes would you recommend?	No comment - The FODD does not include any Green Belt land.
31	Do you have any comments on our proposals to allow the release of grey belt land to meet commercial and other development needs through plan-making and decision-making, including the triggers for release?	No comment - The FODD does not include any Green Belt land.
32	Do you have views on whether the approach to the release of Green Belt through plan and decision-making should apply to traveller sites, including the sequential test for land release and the definition of PDL?	No comment - The FODD does not include any Green Belt land.

33	Do you have views on how the assessment of need for traveller sites should be approached, in order to determine whether a local planning authority should undertake a Green Belt review?	No comment - The FODD does not include any Green Belt land.
34	Do you agree with our proposed approach to the affordable housing tenure mix?	Yes.
35	Should the 50 per cent target apply to all Green Belt areas (including previously developed land in the Green Belt), or should the Government or local planning authorities be able to set lower targets in low land value areas?	Yes. Although, it must be noted that whilst the intention of seeking that schemes involving the provision of housing in the Green Belt should provide at least 50% affordable housing is laudable, the caveat that this will be subject to viability is likely to dilute the outcome, with developers able to reduce such requirements on viability grounds. These sites will in effect just become the new greenfield sites. If the government credibly wants to see the 50% affordable housing delivered, then the viability caveat needs to be removed, so that effect of providing the 50% affordable housing is borne by the landowner/developer.
36	Do you agree with the proposed approach to securing benefits for nature and public access to green space where Green Belt release occurs?	Yes.
37	Do you agree that Government should set indicative benchmark land values for land released from or developed in the Green Belt, to inform local planning authority policy development?	<p>In regard to option A, careful consideration of how the government would set indicative values would be required. There is a concern that these could be set on a regional or sub-regional basis. In Gloucestershire, there is a huge difference across the county from the Cotswolds (one of the highest value areas in the country) to the Forest of Dean (one of the lowest value areas in both house prices and land values). If an indicative land value was set based on a county average this would mean that it could result in relatively high land value for the poorer local authority areas in the county, and a comparatively lower land value in the wealthier local authority areas of the county. Also, it's uncertain whether this would help where the developer identifies lots of other potential costs and the land value is not reason for the viability issues.</p> <p>In regard to option B, this is difficult as the sale of the land usually occurs after planning permission has been obtained. Therefore, it's difficult to see how this will be taken into account at the planning stage when viability would be negotiated upon.</p> <p>In regard to option C, the use of overage clauses (as proposed here), can be time consuming and often difficult as build costs will be based on what developers purport to have incurred and this is difficult to challenge.</p>

		The council would prefer to see a combination of all three, that the government sets out the indicative land value. Then, where development proposals comply with benchmark land value requirements, and a viability negotiation to reduce policy delivery occurs, the developers are required to inform the Council of the purchase of the land and the price paid and if the price paid is more than the indicative land value then a monetary contribution (either the same or 50%) of the difference between the indicative land value and price paid for the land is paid to the Council for use for affordable housing.
38	How and at what level should Government set benchmark land values?	Levels should be set further to an annual review and based on existing use value plus a modest uplift.
39	To support the delivery of the golden rules, the Government is exploring a reduction in the scope of viability negotiation by setting out that such negotiation should not occur when land will transact above the benchmark land value. Do you have any views on this approach?	FODDC agrees with this sentiment, which should be applied to all cases where viability is an issue, not just Green Belt sites. However, this is difficult, as the sale of the land usually occurs after planning permission has been obtained, so cannot be taken into account at the planning stage when viability would be negotiated upon. Also, no requirement in the NPPF or PPG for developers to provide the council with either the land sale contract or the options agreement.
40	It is proposed that where development is policy compliant, additional contributions for affordable housing should not be sought. Do you have any views on this approach?	What is meant by “policy compliant” and “additional contributions for affordable housing”? Does this mean that if the local authority has a policy requirement for 30% affordable housing, it cannot require the additional 20% to achieve 50%? Further clarification required. 155a. states ...”in the case of schemes involving the provision of housing, at least 50% affordable housing , with an appropriate proportion being Social Rent, subject to viability;” The wording, at least, would imply more could be provided.
41	Do you agree that where viability negotiations do occur, and contributions below the level set in policy are agreed, development should be subject to late-stage viability reviews, to assess whether further contributions are required? What support would local planning authorities require to use these effectively?	This would be a useful check on those developers who look to the planning system to subsidise them for paying over the odds for the land. However, this will require additional resource in LPAs to manage. FODDC, refer back to an earlier response provided to Q37: With regard to option C, the use of overage clauses (as proposed here), can be time consuming and often difficult, as build costs will be based on what developers purport to have incurred and this can be difficult to challenge. The council would prefer to see a combination of all three, that the government sets out the indicative land value. Then where development proposals comply with benchmark land value requirements, and a viability negotiation to reduce policy delivery occurs, then the developer are required to inform the

		council of the purchase of the land and the price paid and if the price paid is more than the indicative land value then a monetary contribution (either the same or 50%) of the difference between the indicative land value and price paid for the land is paid to the Council for use for affordable housing. The council would be concerned who would fund the costs of engaging a consultant to undertake such review which could cost up to £15k. Also concerns over the small pool of relevant consultants available to local authorities to undertake such work. If progressed would welcome standardised wording for inclusion in S106 agreements.
42	Do you have a view on how golden rules might apply to non-residential development, including commercial development, travellers sites and types of development already considered 'not inappropriate' in the Green Belt?	No comment.
43	Do you have a view on whether the golden rules should apply only to 'new' Green Belt release, which occurs following these changes to the NPPF? Are there other transitional arrangements we should consider, including, for example, draft plans at the regulation 19 stage?	No comment.
44	Do you have any comments on the proposed wording for the NPPF (Annex 4)?	No comment.
45	Do you have any comments on the proposed approach set out in paragraphs 31 and 32?	Actions that achieve a realignment of land value expectations and remove 'hope value' expectations in the UK are welcomed as these are a significant barrier to delivery of Affordable Housing.
46	Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?	Yes. Local Green Spaces are subject to Green Belt policy, but are by definition small islands of land, often in an urban or semi-urban content. It is essential that under-delivery of housing does not imperil these green oases. The Council suggests that the NPPF is explicit in excluding LGS from Grey belt.
Chapter 6 – Delivering affordable, well-designed homes and places		
47	Do you agree with setting the expectation that local planning authorities should consider the particular	The NPPF promotes both the provision of social rented and affordable rented housing, as suitable accommodation to meet the needs of households requiring affordable housing for rent. It is felt that both

	needs of those who require Social Rent when undertaking needs assessments and setting policies on affordable housing requirements?	<p>affordable and social rented housing should be given equal priority. Low value areas like the Forest of Dean, due to poorer viability, seeks affordable rented housing in the first instance because tenants who need such accommodation (and may be in receipt of benefits) will have their rent covered whether it is social or affordable rented housing. Secondly it allows the council to seek more affordable housing for rent from S106 sites to help address housing need as well as government objectives such as increased building standards and reduced carbon emissions.</p> <p>If the government has concerns regarding the affordability of affordable rented homes for tenants, then it should remove this type of accommodation from the definition of affordable housing in the NPPF, otherwise both affordable and social rented housing should be given equal priority. Alternatively, the Government could consider introducing that affordable rented properties are capped at the relevant LHA rates.</p>
48	Do you agree with removing the requirement to deliver 10% of housing on major sites as affordable home ownership?	Yes. It was not a requirement but an expectation which developers would often circumnavigate on viability grounds. Yes, it should be removed; in high value areas, far more is viable. Government should ideally set a requirement that 10% of housing on major sites should be provided as affordable housing if it is genuinely going to address the affordable housing crisis.
49	Do you agree with removing the minimum 25% First Homes requirement?	Yes. LPAs know their area best and what is required/possible.
50	Do you have any other comments on retaining the option to deliver First Homes, including through exception sites?	It is acceptable as an option, but all options should remain, with the LPA deciding the optimum.
51	Do you agree with introducing a policy to promote developments that have a mix of tenures and types?	Yes, a national policy that seeks developments to provide a mix of types that broadly accords with the identified mix in the LHNA would be useful. Too many developments provide large 4 bed executive homes rather than providing any smaller 2 bed homes which aligns with the housing requirement.
52	What would be the most appropriate way to promote high percentage Social Rent/affordable housing developments?	<p>The question asks how best to promote sites which feature high percentage of Social Rent/affordable housing...</p> <p>In regards to measures contained with the NPPF, other than either taking a tilted balance approach towards approval of schemes which contains high percentage of Social Rent/affordable housing (high percentage would need to be defined with a minimum figure), or identifying that such schemes should not be refused on the grounds of not creating mix and balanced communities, the Council is uncertain what else the NPPF could include - other than a general statement that it supports developments which feature a high percentage of Social Rent/affordable housing.</p>

		<p>Alternatively, the Government could ensure that land values are capped at existing plus a modest e.g. 10% uplift as opposed to “reasonable expectations”, which can mean hundredfold increases in values for no community benefit.</p> <p>Homes England could also restructure grant funding to provide more grant per plot for Social Rent.</p>
53	<p>What safeguards would be required to ensure that there are not unintended consequences? For example, is there a maximum site size where development of this nature is appropriate?</p>	<p>Given the range of households in need of affordable housing, it would appear that the concerns are based on the stereotyping of people needing affordable housing. 100% affordable housing schemes often compensate for the loss of anticipated affordable housing delivery from S106 sites due to viability. Such sites will be mixed with a certain percentage of affordable homeownership housing helping to maintaining a balance between homeownership and rented accommodation.</p> <p>It is difficult to set a limit on maximum size as a large scheme in an urban setting may not be appropriate for a smaller rural area. It is best left for RP’s and local authorities to decide the relevant scheme size and any appropriate local lettings plans that maybe required.</p>
54	<p>What measures should we consider to better support and increase rural affordable housing?</p>	<p>The introduction of cross-subsidy market housing has created a market in Rural Exception Site (RES) land, with planning agents and landowners seeking to bring forward sites on 50/50 tenure split of market and affordable housing which has fuelled greater expectations from land-owners in regards land values for rural exception sites. The allocation of sites as RES could be attempted, as well as removing the allowing of market housing on Rural Exception Sites?</p> <p>It is recognised that many sites suitable for providing affordable housing in rural locations will be small in nature, potentially around the 12–15-unit mark. With many RPs merging and becoming larger, the Council is finding that such RPs are now seeking a larger number of units from development opportunities, generally around 35+. This means that small rural sites for up to 20 units (which are more likely to occur in rural locations) are of no interest to them. It is considered that no changes to the NPPF will alter this position.</p> <p>However, the government could consider the allocation of strategic partnership funding to help increase rural affordable housing. Whilst it is noted that Homes England has a rural housing target for the current funding programme, it is noted that this is not being achieved. As such, similar to the requirement for local authorities to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare, strategic partnership funding should require that RP’s provide 10% of their proposed strategic partnership development on rural sites of less than one hectare.</p>
55	<p>Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraph 63 of the existing NPPF?</p>	<p>Yes, that is welcomed.</p>

56	Do you agree with these changes?	<p>In principle, although safeguards will be needed to ensure it is not abused by “a group originally set up for a purpose other than housebuilding” merely as a device to get around policy.</p> <p>Like rural exception sites, community-led exception sites should be based on identified housing need to ensure that such sites are of a size appropriate to addressing the housing need in that specific parish or town.</p>
57	Do you have views on whether the definition of ‘affordable housing for rent’ in the Framework glossary should be amended? If so, what changes would you recommend?	<p>No. Whilst the ethos of the proposal is appreciated, the current definition helps ensure that the affordable homes are managed by a fit and recognised organisation which can be held accountable by the regulator for social housing so that residents can have access to swift and fair redress.</p> <p>With regard to the definition of the Affordable housing for rent, the NPPF defines it as follows:</p> <p>Affordable housing for rent: meets all of the following conditions: (a) the rent is set in accordance with the Government’s rent policy for Social Rent or Affordable Rent, or is at least 20% below local market rents (including service charges where applicable); (b) the landlord is a registered provider, except where it is included as part of a Build to Rent scheme (in which case the landlord need not be a registered provider); and (c) it includes provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision. For Build to Rent schemes affordable housing for rent is expected to be the normal form of affordable housing provision (and, in this context, is known as Affordable Private Rent).</p> <p>The Forest of Dean District Council have been approached by rent-to-buy providers (whose product requires the occupier to buy the property after 5 years otherwise they’re evicted from the property), who, armed with Counsel Advice, consider that such housing meets the definition of Affordable housing on the basis that the rent they charge is an affordable rent, and that if the occupier purchases the property, they are given a 10% deposit. Alternatively, if they do not elect to purchase the property, the local authority is given 7.5% of the sale value as a cash sum, so money is recycled.</p> <p>The Forest of Dean District Council considers that such housing goes against the ethos of affordable housing for rent which should be provided in perpetuity subject to any statutory Right to Buy/Acquire that the tenant wishes to exercise at their discretion. The Council considers that the definition of affordable housing for rent should be strengthened as follows or something similar:</p> <p>(c) it includes provisions to remain as either Social Rent or Affordable Rent housing in perpetuity subject to any statutory Right to Buy/Acquire that the tenant exercises, which the receipt from such sales will be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision.</p>

		<p>Alternatively, add a point (d) that it excludes housing which is let at either Social Rent or Affordable Rent but requires the automatic sale of the property after a period of time.</p> <p>The proposed changes and consultation focuses heavily on the provision of social rented and what appears to be an underlying concern on the affordability of affordable rented housing.</p> <p>The NPPF promotes both the provision of social rented and affordable rented housing, as suitable accommodation to meet the needs of households requiring affordable housing for rent. It is felt that both affordable and social rented housing should be given equal priority. Low value areas like the Forest of Dean, due to poorer viability, seeks affordable rented housing in the first instance, because tenants who need such accommodation (and may be in receipt of benefits) will have their rent covered whether it is social or affordable rented housing. Secondly it allows the council to seek more affordable housing for rent from S106 sites to help to address housing need as well as government objectives such increased building standards and reduced carbon emissions.</p> <p>If the government has concerns regarding the affordability of affordable rented homes for tenants, then it should remove this type of accommodation from the definition of affordable housing in the NPPF, otherwise both affordable and social rented housing should be given equal priority. Alternatively, the Government could consider introducing that affordable rented properties are capped at the relevant LHA rates to help address any concerns regarding the affordability of affordable rented housing.</p>
58	Do you have views on why insufficient small sites are being allocated, and on ways in which the small site policy in the NPPF should be strengthened?	<p>Issues – land availability/land price expectations/costs per unit as lack of economies of scale/resources.</p> <p>Solutions – benchmark land values for land prices/removal of ‘hope value’ on land/premium grant support for small site social rent housing.</p> <p>Setting one size fits all targets is not appropriate as this does not take account of local circumstances.</p> <p>In rural areas, set incentives for Rural Exception Sites. Increase Homes England grant allocation specific to Social Rent affordable housing on Rural Exception Sites. Set clear benchmark land values for land prices for Rural Exception Sites.</p> <p>Small sites often arise because of other factors e.g. the closure of a business etc. and as such are difficult to plan for. Smaller sites do, however, deliver faster and more reliably than those controlled by the major housebuilders - presumably because smaller enterprises need to secure cash flow and so cannot sit on permissions for as long as the national developers. Perhaps Government could introduce a provision whereby owners of larger sites had to include a percentage for smaller developers or they could be forced to flip them on in whole or part if they were not delivering.</p>

59	Do you agree with the proposals to retain references to well-designed buildings and places, but remove references to 'beauty' and 'beautiful' and to amend paragraph 138 of the existing Framework?	Yes - it added nothing and reference to well-designed encompasses matters beyond the physical appearance.
60	Do you agree with proposed changes to policy for upwards extensions?	It has never been clear why allowing an upward extension helps to solve the housing crisis unless it is to create a further house. The fixation on one type of upward extension alludes to an urban bias in that mansards are very rarely used in more rural areas and would be at odds with local vernacular traditions. Rather than such a prescriptive approach the general push to increase density should also include the option to go upwards where appropriate. All new housing should be designed to accommodate upward extension with minimal disruption to the structure. In order to achieve this the roof needs to be designed using attic trusses, the roof should be insulated at the slope and not at ceiling level and the layout to be suitable for the addition of an additional flight of stairs to serve the roof extension without major alterations and loss of existing usable space.
61	Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?	No – other than the capacity of “design” professionals in LPAs has been severely curtailed over the last decade and as such will need substantial investment if it is to deliver.
Chapter 7 – Building infrastructure to grow the economy		
62	Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraphs 86 b) and 87 of the existing NPPF?	The principle is fine subject to suitable safeguards being in place to protect safeguarded areas and those where such development would not be suitable e.g. floodplain.
63	Are there other sectors you think need particular support via these changes? What are they and why?	No.
64	Would you support the prescription of data centres, gigafactories, and/or laboratories as types of business and commercial development which could be capable (on request) of being directed into the NSIP consenting regime?	NSIP is a very time-consuming process and in many areas would be welcomed by the LPA and secure PP far faster than the NSIP regime. Maybe mandatory PPA to retain control and fees at the local level but secure speedy outcomes would be a better way of delivering such infrastructure?
65	If the direction power is extended to these developments, should it be limited by scale, and what would be an appropriate scale if so?	NSIP is a very time-consuming process and in many areas would be welcomed by the LPA and secure PP far faster than the NSIP regime. Maybe mandatory PPA to retain control and fees at the local level but secure speedy outcomes would be a better way of delivering such infrastructure?
66	Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?	No.

Chapter 8 – Delivering community needs		
67	Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraph 100 of the existing NPPF?	It provides clarity.
68	Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraph 99 of the existing NPPF?	It provides clarity.
69	Do you agree with the changes proposed to paragraphs 114 and 115 of the existing NPPF?	This will hopefully help to stop highways dominated proposals and engender more creative solutions.
70	How could national planning policy better support local authorities in (a) promoting healthy communities and (b) tackling childhood obesity?	Without a review of the Use Classes Order to break down class E into its former constituent parts and remove the many PDR that allow changes from one use to another without permission, any control over the High Street generally, or in this context preventing inappropriate takeaway etc, uses near schools etc., is entirely illusory.
71	Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?	No
Chapter 9 – Supporting green energy and the environment		
72	Do you agree that large onshore wind projects should be reintegrated into the NSIP regime?	Yes
73	Do you agree with the proposed changes to the NPPF to give greater support to renewable and low carbon energy?	<p>Yes, though there is still tension between the legal duties to protect and enhance with LB /CA, conserve and enhance (AONB) and the “great weight” to be applied to these objectives when weighed against the measures needed to address the climate emergency - which do not enjoy the same legal status. The law needs to better balance these objectives if revisions to the NPPF are to have meaning.</p> <p>There also needs to be recognition that asking LPAs to allocate sites for such development may well significantly increase the complexity and length of time taken to produce a Local Plan. Not only do councils need to understand the demands and constraints on where such facilities can go (which the district has no knowledge and expertise in), but it is likely that significant local opposition to any policies will occur, adding further delay to the process of plan making.</p>
74	Some habitats, such as those containing peat soils, might be considered unsuitable for renewable energy development due to their role in carbon sequestration. Should there be additional	There is potential to consider compensatory mechanisms, however this will require further resource both by the LPA and external agents in order to assess and determine. With the additional pressures exerted on LPA ecologists as a result of BNG and other ecological constraints within the district, this will again cause additional delays to the planning application process.

	protections for such habitats and/or compensatory mechanisms put in place?	
75	Do you agree that the threshold at which onshore wind projects are deemed to be Nationally Significant and therefore consented under the NSIP regime should be changed from 50 megawatts (MW) to 100MW?	No comments, though it would be better that the LPA could secure a fee for more of these types of applications.
76	Do you agree that the threshold at which solar projects are deemed to be Nationally Significant and therefore consented under the NSIP regime should be changed from 50MW to 150MW?	No comments, though it would be better that the LPA could secure a fee for more of these types of applications.
77	If you think that alternative thresholds should apply to onshore wind and/or solar, what would these be?	No comment.
78	In what specific, deliverable ways could national planning policy do more to address climate change mitigation and adaptation?	National guidance on best practice for retrofit and design of new places.
79	What is your view of the current state of technological readiness and availability of tools for accurate carbon accounting in plan-making and planning decisions, and what are the challenges to increasing its use?	The current skill set and capacity within teams is severely lacking and so an increase in an adequate and competent resource (the officers and the budget to secure them) is required.
80	Are any changes needed to policy for managing flood risk to improve its effectiveness?	It generally seems quite effective.
81	Do you have any other comments on actions that can be taken through planning to address climate change?	No.
82	Do you agree with removal of this text from the footnote?	Provided that it remains clear that food production is an important material consideration this is considered acceptable.
83	Are there other ways in which we can ensure that development supports and does not compromise food production?	No comment.

84	Do you agree that we should improve the current water infrastructure provisions in the Planning Act 2008, and do you have specific suggestions for how best to do this?	Measures to upgrade sewage infrastructure are welcomed. As with housebuilding, there are however only a finite number of suppliers and so the capacity of the industry to undertake the investment required is more likely to limit the required investment needed to delivered the proposed rate of new housing.
85	Are there other areas of the water infrastructure provisions that could be improved? If so, can you explain what those are, including your proposed changes?	No.
86	Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?	No.
Chapter 10 – Changes to local plan intervention criteria		
87	Do you agree that we should replace the existing intervention policy criteria with the revised criteria set out in this consultation?	No comment.
88	Alternatively, would you support us withdrawing the criteria and relying on the existing legal tests to underpin future use of intervention powers?	No comment.
Chapter 11 – Changes to planning application fees and cost recovery for local authorities related to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects		
89	Do you agree with the proposal to increase householder application fees to meet cost recovery?	Yes. Council Taxpayers contribute to there being a planning system, but applicants should pay for their own development proposals.
90	If no, do you support increasing the fee by a smaller amount (at a level less than full cost recovery) and if so, what should the fee increase be? For example, a 50% increase to the householder fee would increase the application fee from £258 to £387. If Yes, please explain in the text box what you consider an appropriate fee increase would be.	No comment.
91	If we proceed to increase householder fees to meet cost recovery, we have estimated that to meet cost-recovery, the householder application fee	Yes.

	should be increased to £528. Do you agree with this estimate?	
92	Are there any applications for which the current fee is inadequate? Please explain your reasons and provide evidence on what you consider the correct fee should be.	No.
93	Are there any application types for which fees are not currently charged but which should require a fee? Please explain your reasons and provide evidence on what you consider the correct fee should be	The above types cover most cases but perhaps any applications that are not currently charged for could have a “reduced fee” rather than a full or no fee.
94	Do you consider that each local planning authority should be able to set its own (non-profit making) planning application fee?	No comment.
95	What would be your preferred model for localisation of planning fees?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full Localisation – Placing a mandatory duty on all local planning authorities to set their own fee. 2. Local Variation – Maintain a nationally-set default fee and giving local planning authorities the option to set all or some fees locally. 3. Neither 4. Don't Know <p>Answer – 2. Local Variation</p>
96	Do you consider that planning fees should be increased, beyond cost recovery, for planning applications services, to fund wider planning services?	LPA are cash starved and under capacity. It would be essential that any additional revenue generated is ring fenced to Planning.
97	What wider planning services, if any, other than planning applications (development management) services, do you consider could be paid for by planning fees?	No comment.
98	Do you consider that cost recovery for relevant services provided by local authorities in relation to	Yes, as at present it is a very significant time and cost burden.

	applications for development consent orders under the Planning Act 2008, payable by applicants, should be introduced?	
99	If yes, please explain any particular issues that the Government may want to consider, in particular which local planning authorities should be able to recover costs and the relevant services which they should be able to recover costs for, and whether host authorities should be able to waive fees where planning performance agreements are made.	No comment.
100	What limitations, if any, should be set in regulations or through guidance in relation to local authorities' ability to recover costs?	Cost recovery and, where applicable, cost of paying for additional staff to service the application/backfill.
101	Please provide any further information on the impacts of full or partial cost recovery are likely to be for local planning authorities and applicants. We would particularly welcome evidence of the costs associated with work undertaken by local authorities in relation to applications for development consent.	We estimate approx. 30k plus one full time officer for a year.
102	Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?	Consideration should be given to the costs in resources to a council in providing the evidence to demonstrate the fee they may wish to set. When a system of LPAs setting their own fees was last proposed, the councils had to calculate, through the collation of evidence, the cost of determining each application type. There are a vast number of application types, and many tasks to perform by different staff to deliver each application decision. Collating this information would be a huge non-productive use of officer resources.
Chapter 12 – The future of planning policy and plan making		
103	Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements? Are there any alternatives you think we should consider?	It is important to understand and manage a likely unintended consequence of introducing the proposals as currently drafted. Whilst FODDC is supportive of additional housing, especially social rented housing, the Council is concerned that without amendment, the proposal will leave it exposed to inappropriate development in inappropriate locations through Planning Appeals. To provide the opportunity for the

		Council to ensure that development is appropriate, we strongly recommend that a transition period is introduced whereby LPAs are given time to plan for increased housing needs.
104	Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements?	No. It is important to understand and manage a likely unintended consequence of introducing the proposals as currently drafted. Whilst FODDC is supportive of additional housing, especially social rented housing, the Council is concerned that without amendment, the proposal will leave it exposed to inappropriate development in inappropriate locations through Planning Appeals. To provide the opportunity for the Council to ensure that development is appropriate, we strongly recommend that a transition period is introduced whereby LPAs are given time to plan for increased housing needs.
105	Do you have any other suggestions relating to the proposals in this chapter?	It is important to understand and manage a likely unintended consequence of introducing the proposals as currently drafted. Whilst FODDC is supportive of additional housing, especially social rented housing, the Council is concerned that without amendment, the proposal will leave it exposed to inappropriate development in inappropriate locations through Planning Appeals. To provide the opportunity for the Council to ensure that development is appropriate, we strongly recommend that a transition period is introduced whereby LPAs are given time to plan for increased housing needs.
Chapter 13 – Public Sector Equality Duty		
106	Do you have any views on the impacts of the above proposals for you, or the group or business you represent and on anyone with a relevant protected characteristic? If so, please explain who, which groups, including those with protected characteristics, or which businesses may be impacted and how. Is there anything that could be done to mitigate any impact identified?	It is important to understand and manage a likely unintended consequence of introducing the proposals as currently drafted. Whilst FODDC is supportive of additional housing, especially social rented housing, the Council is concerned that without amendment, the proposal will leave it exposed to inappropriate development in inappropriate locations through Planning Appeals. To provide the opportunity for the Council to ensure that development is appropriate, we strongly recommend that a transition period is introduced whereby LPAs are given time to plan for increased housing needs.