



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

Changes to the current planning system

Consultation on changes to planning policy and regulations

Contents

The standard method for assessing housing numbers in strategic plans	3
Supporting small and medium-sized developers	5
Supporting SMEs	6
Extension of the Permission in Principle consent regime	6
Public Sector Equality Duty	7

The standard method for assessing housing numbers in strategic plans

Step 1 – Setting the baseline – providing stability and certainty by incorporating a blend of household projections and stock

Q1: 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?

Q2: 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.

Step 2 Adjusting for market signals – maintaining price signals using the current affordability ratio and the change in affordability over the last 10 years

Q3: 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.

Q4: 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.

Q5: Do you agree that affordability is given an appropriate weighting within the standard method? If not, please explain why.

Transition

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:

Q6: 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?

Q7: 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?

Please see question 35 for any comments relating to the Public Sector Equality Duty and the standard method.

Delivering First Homes

Percentage of affordable housing secured through developer contributions

Q8: 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:

Q9: 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?

Q10: Are any existing exemptions not required? If not, please set out which exemptions and why.

Q11: Are any other exemptions needed? If so, please provide reasons and /or evidence for your views.

Local plans and transitional arrangements

Q12: Do you agree with the proposed approach to transitional arrangements set out above?

Level of discount

Q13: Do you agree with the proposed approach to different levels of discount?

Exception sites and rural exception sites

Q14: 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?

Q15: Do you agree with the removal of the site size threshold set out in the National Planning Policy Framework?

Q16: Do you agree that the First Homes exception sites policy should not apply in designated rural areas?

Please see question 35 for any comments relating to the Public Sector Equality Duty and the delivery of First Homes.

Supporting small and medium-sized developers

Extending Small sites planning policy - developer contributions and economic recovery

For each of these questions, please provide reasons and / or evidence for your views (if possible):

Q17: Do you agree with the proposed approach to raise the small sites threshold for a time-limited period?

(see question 18 for comments on level of threshold)

Q18: What is the appropriate level of small sites threshold?

i) Up to 40 homes ii) Up to 50 homes iii) Other (please specify)

Q19: Do you agree with the proposed approach to the site size threshold?

Q20: Do you agree with linking the time-limited period to economic recovery and raising the threshold for an initial period of 18 months?

Q21: Do you agree with the proposed approach to minimising threshold effects?

Affordable housing in rural areas

Q22: Do you agree with the Government's proposed approach to setting thresholds in rural areas?

Supporting SMEs

Q23: Are there any other ways in which the Government can support SME builders to deliver new homes during the economic recovery period?

Please see question 35 for any comments relating to the Public Sector Equality Duty and the small sites proposals.

Extension of the Permission in Principle consent regime

Extending Permission in Principle to cover major development

Q24: Do you agree that the new Permission in Principle should remove the restriction on major development?

Information requirements

Q26: 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?

Q27: Should there be an additional height parameter for Permission in Principle? Please provide comments in support of your views.

Publicity arrangements

Q28: 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

If you disagree, please state your reasons.

Revised fee structure to incentive Permission in Principle by application

Q29: Do you agree with our proposal for a banded fee structure based on a flat fee per hectare, with a maximum fee cap?

Q30: What level of flat fee do you consider appropriate, and why?

Brownfield Land Registers and Permission in Principle

Q31: 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.

Additional guidance to support implementation

Q32: 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.

Regulatory Impact Assessment

Q33: What costs and benefits do you envisage the proposed scheme would cause? Where you have identified drawbacks, how might these be overcome?

Q34: To what extent do you consider landowners and developers are likely to use the proposed measure? Please provide evidence where possible.

Public Sector Equality Duty

Q35: 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?

If so, please specify the proposal and explain the impact. If there is an impact – are there any actions which the department could take to mitigate that impact?