

Appendix 2

Mid Devon District Council's response to Planning for the Future White Paper August 2020

Consultation Questions

Question	Response
<p data-bbox="192 400 2040 437"><i>Pillar One: Planning for Development</i></p> <p data-bbox="192 437 2040 474"><i>Proposals Summary</i></p> <ul data-bbox="192 474 2040 1114" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="192 474 2040 539">• Proposal 1: Role of land use plans should be simplified. Proposed that Local Plans should identify three types of land – Growth areas suitable for substantial development, Renewal areas suitable for development and areas that are Protected.<li data-bbox="192 539 2040 571">• Proposal 2: Development management policies established at national scale and an altered role for Local Plans<li data-bbox="192 571 2040 603">• Proposal 3: Local Plans should be subject to a single statutory ‘sustainable development’ test, replacing the tests of soundness.<li data-bbox="192 603 2040 738">• Proposal 4: A standard method for establishing housing requirement figures which ensures enough land is released in the areas where affordability is worst, to stop land supply being a barrier to enough homes being built. The housing requirement would factor in land constraints and opportunities to more effectively use land, including through densification where appropriate, to ensure that land is identified in the most appropriate areas and housing targets are met.<li data-bbox="192 738 2040 842">• Proposal 5: Areas identified as Growth areas (suitable for substantial development) would automatically be granted outline planning permission for the principle of development, while automatic approvals would also be available for pre-establishing development types in other areas suitable for building (p.34)<li data-bbox="192 842 2040 874">• Proposal 6: Decision-making should be faster and more certain, with firm deadlines, and make greater use of digital technology<li data-bbox="192 874 2040 940">• Proposal 7: LPs should be visual and map-based, standardised, based on the latest digital technology, and supported by a new template.<li data-bbox="192 940 2040 1005">• Proposal 8: Local authorities and PINS will be required through legislation to meet a statutory timetable for key stages of the process, and we will consider what sanctions there would be for those who fail to do so.<li data-bbox="192 1005 2040 1070">• Proposal 9: Neighbourhood Plans should be retained as an important means of community input, and we will support communities to make better use of digital tools<li data-bbox="192 1070 2040 1114">• Proposal 10: A stronger emphasis on build out through planning	
Q1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?	

Question	Response
Q2(a). Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area? [Yes / No]	Yes. Mid Devon District Council is the local planning authority for the district (excluding part of the district which is situated within the Dartmoor National Park).
Q2(b). If no, why not? [Don't know how to / It takes too long / It's too complicated / I don't care / Other – please specify]	
Q3. Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future? [Social media / Online news / Newspaper / By post / Other – please specify]	Not applicable.
Q4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? [Building homes for young people / building homes for the homeless / Protection of green spaces / The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change / Increasing the affordability of housing / The design of new homes and places / Supporting the high street / Supporting the local economy / More or better local infrastructure / Protection of	

Question	Response
existing heritage buildings or areas / Other – please specify]	
Q5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]	<p>Not sure.</p> <p>A simpler Local Plan system is welcomed and zoning could help to achieve this. However there is a lack of detail in the proposals making it difficult to understand how a system with three zones will work in practice. Three zones may be over simplistic and not reflect local and distinct characteristics of a district. It is unclear how protected areas might be impacted if development opportunities are expended in growth and renewal zones and housing and other development targets cannot be met.</p> <p>A removal of the ‘right to be heard’ at Local Plan examinations runs counter to maximising opportunities for community engagement and building trust in the plan making process.</p> <p>There is nothing in the consultation proposals to encourage developers to build.</p>
Q6. Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]	<p>Not sure.</p> <p>The principle of standard development management policies in National Policies to address common planning issues and to avoid duplication of work by local authorities is supported. But, there should be some flexibility to allow for development management policies to reflect local circumstances where justified and evidenced. We would question how this change would relate to Neighbourhood Plans and their ability to include policies as part of their plan making.</p>
Q7(a) – Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of ‘sustainable development’ which would include consideration of environmental	<p>Not sure.</p> <p>The principle of a single sustainability test appears to be a sensible approach. However, there is no detail provided about what the test includes, how it will work, and how local authorities will demonstrate how the test is met / complied with.</p>

Question	Response
<p>impact? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>It is assumed that legal compliance (procedural) and conformity of Local Plans with National Planning policy will still be assessed.</p> <p>The removal of the requirement for Sustainability Appraisal and a simplified process for assessing the environmental impact of plans is welcomed. This will help unencumber the plan making process.</p> <p>The White Paper does not give any detail about the test, without which it is not possible to understand what it would require.</p> <p>A slimmed down assessment of deliverability for the Local Plan is welcomed, but this should be mirrored in changes made to the deliverability tests for the purpose of housing land supply calculations (for planning decision making purposes) if this to be retained. We note the White Paper implies the new standard method and making sure that enough land is planned for would avoid a continuing requirement to be able demonstrate a five year supply of land. This latter point is welcomed, but the Council is concerned that a formulaic standard method imposed on all local authorities to reach the national annual target of 300,000 homes may result in an artificial housing figures that are not based on local need or which reflect the capacity of an area to take growth.</p> <p>A requirement to identify reserve sites in Local Plans is supported (which is an approach included in the adopted Mid Devon Local Plan Review 2013 – 2033). However, for the sake of clarity, certainty and consistency guidance should be provided about setting triggers for bringing reserve sites into the housing supply in the event that site allocations are delayed or do not come forward.</p>
<p>Q7(b) – How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal DtC?</p>	<p>The abolition of the Duty to Cooperate is not helpful without detail provided for how strategic and cross-border planning issues should be dealt with, particularly where there is a need for joined up and collaborative approaches to securing infrastructure provision for example.</p>
<p>Q8(a). Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account</p>	<p>No.</p>

Question	Response
<p>constraints) should be introduced? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>The use of a top down formulaic standard method as a means to distribute the national housebuilding target of 300,000 new homes annually is not supported since it does not take into account a detailed assessment of local housing need for each local authority area. While the White Paper proposes to introduce the consideration of constraints, which would help improve a new standard method, it is unclear how these would be weighed up with other elements of the formula without ground truthing / thorough understanding of the local authority area. There is no reference to other constraints such as important mineral deposits or areas important to the integrity of European Sites (e.g. bat habitat and flyways).</p> <p>It is queried whether the local housing market will be able to absorb the growth, given average delivery rates achieved historically, whether the housebuilding industry has the capacity (materials, labour) to step up delivery across many local authority areas simultaneously.</p> <p>The standard method would have no relationship with the need for new jobs or the ability to plan for economic growth to help create balanced communities (homes and jobs together) and to reduce commuting and reliance on unsustainable modes of transport.</p>
<p>Q8(b). Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>The extent of urban areas is not an appropriate indicator of future housing need.</p> <p>Using the extent of urban areas as an indicator of the ability to absorb growth is not based on local housing need and does not take into consideration to potential infrastructure and other constraints (e.g. topography) that may limit further growth.</p>
<p>Q9a. Do you agree that there should be automatic permission for areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent? [Yes / No / Not sure.]</p>	<p>Not sure.</p> <p>The Council agrees with the principle that permission should be given in Growth areas as identified in the Local Plan which in effect would be substantial allocations.</p>

Question	Response
<p>Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>However with the 30 month timescale, and 12 months to draft a Plan within this timetable, it is difficult to see how the level of work required upfront to provide the detail and masterplanning at the plan making stage could be undertaken, and which would provide confidence for Local Authorities and communities for automatic permission to be given.</p>
<p>Q9b. Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>Not sure.</p> <p>There is a lack of clarity as to what renewal and protected areas would contain, and what this would look like e.g. if conservation areas, heritage assets etc are excluded from renewal areas and how Permission in Principle can be provided in renewal areas given the wide range of contexts and environments in urban areas and settlements.</p>
<p>Q9c. Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>Not sure.</p> <p>It is unclear how this will relate to the Local Plan reform in which growth areas enable the identification of substantial growth.</p> <p>The Council questions the expedience of allowing new towns to be brought forward through the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime and more detail is needed in order to be able understand how this might work.</p> <p>The Council welcomes delivery vehicles or other means as tool that are available to help assist planning for new towns. However, the white paper provides no detail about how a Development Consent Order under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure would work in practice, including how this would provide greater certainty to funding for the delivery of infrastructure. The successful planning of new towns requires community buy-in, which may not be achieved if schemes are imposed nationally and are not locally derived.</p>

Question	Response
<p>Q10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>Not sure.</p> <p>The principle of digitising the planning process is supported, including where this can help make that process more transparent, accountable and inclusive for those wishing to engage with it.</p> <p>However, there is a lack of detail in the proposals to understand how this will work in practice or what support will be provided by Government to Local Authorities. There is a need for resourcing (money and skills) to deliver new technologies. However, Mid Devon is predominantly rural and many parts of the district do not currently benefit from high speed broadband. There is a need to ensure that a move to digitise the planning process does not disadvantage or leave behind parts of the community.</p> <p>Firm deadlines for applications, with no scope for extensions of time, may reduce scope for negotiation between the Local Authority and applicants for planning permission to achieve successful planning outcomes. It may lead to Local Authorities being forced to refuse planning permission, or making rushed decisions to approve permission that could lead to poor quality development.</p>
<p>Q11. Do you agree with our proposal for accessible, web-based Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>Not sure.</p> <p>In principle, the introduction of the standardised, accessible web-based Local Plans is welcomed, particularly where this can help parts of the community (e.g. younger people) become engaged in the plan making process which have previously not done so.</p> <p>However, there is a lack of detail about how the proposals will be put in place. Will this be a national resource provided to all Local Authorities, or will Local Authorities need to procure the resource and pay for it?</p> <p>Mid Devon is predominantly rural and many parts of the district do not currently benefit from high speed broadband. There is a need to ensure that a move to digitise the planning process does not disadvantage or leave behind parts of the community. It must be recognised that there will be a</p>

Question	Response
	<p>continuing need to publish plans in a printed format so that it remains accessible to those persons without access to digital technologies.</p>
<p>Q12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>It is not clear how Local Plans will be capable of being prepared in 30 months and it is suggested this is piloted with Local Authorities and reviewed before a prescribed time limit is made mandatory. The imposition of sanctions for Local Authorities not meeting 30 months (or the required time limit) should allow discretion for circumstances beyond the control of the Local Authority.</p> <p>Simplified Local Plans without development management policies will still require significant evidence up front to support the preparation of a vision, objectives and strategy for the development of an area, and the assessment of areas for growth and site options, including engagement with communities and stakeholders. It is unclear how this can be achieved</p> <p>A period of 12 months is insufficient to assess issues, identify and test alternative options and draw up a proposed Plan including engagement with stakeholders and communities, and decision making process. There is no flexibility to allow alteration to plan during its preparation.</p> <p>9 months is an unrealistic timeframe for the examination of plan, where there may be a need for modifications to be made and consultation to be held on these, and where the Planning Inspectorate may have insufficient capacity to resource examinations. 6 weeks may be an insufficient period for Councils decision making pathways to finalise and approve the Local Plan maps, key and text.</p> <p>Given there is a legal requirement to review plans every 5 years it is unclear why the timescale is not in-line with this i.e. 60 months, to allow for proper and appropriate plan making.</p> <p>Greater community engagement in shaping the preparation of plans is not likely to be possible through the proposed 30 month timeframe.</p>

Question	Response
<p>Q13a. Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>However, it is unclear what scope will remain for Neighbourhood Plans to set local policies other than site allocations, given it is proposed that development management policies would be set nationally. Clarity is needed about how Neighbourhood Plans will work alongside more standardised Local Plans.</p>
<p>Q13b. How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?</p>	<p>Financial and technical support will need to be provided and made available to Parish Councils / community groups preparing Neighbourhood Plans so that they can use digital tools.</p>
<p>Q14. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? If so, what further measures would you support? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The principle of masterplans and design codes for sites prepared for substantial development to include a variety of development types by different builders which allow more phases to come forward together is supported. This will enable SMEs and self-builders to access sites previously dominated by the largest national house builders. It will enable more choice in the houses brought to market and help increase market absorption.</p> <p>The Government's proposals should include a requirement for developers to provide Local Planning Authorities with a trajectory for the build out of their sites, and for this to be updated annually. The requirement should also include an explanation for why build out rates are not being achieved and what measures the developer will take to remedy this.</p>
<p><i>Pillar Two: Planning for beautiful and sustainable places</i> <i>Proposals Summary</i></p>	

Question	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal 11: To make design expectations more visual and predictable we will expect design guidance and codes to be prepared locally with community involvement, and ensure that codes are more binding on decisions about development. • Proposal 12: To support the transition to a planning system which is more visual and rooted in local preferences and character, we will set up a body to support the delivery of provably locally-popular design codes, and propose that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making • Proposal 13: To further embed national leadership on delivering better places, we will consider how Homes England’s strategic objectives can give greater emphasis on delivering beautiful places. • Proposal 14: We intend to introduce a fast-track for beauty through changes to national policy and legislation, to incentivise and accelerate high quality development which reflects local character and preferences. • Proposal 15: We intend to amend the NPPF to ensure that it targets those areas where a reformed planning system can most effectively play a role in mitigating and adapting to climate change and maximising environmental benefits. • Proposal 16: We intend to design a quicker, simpler framework for assessing environmental impacts and enhancement opportunities, that speeds up the process while protecting and enhancing the most valuable and important habitats and species in England. • Proposal 17: Conserving and enhancing our historic buildings and areas in the 21st century. • Proposal 18: To complement our planning reforms, we will facilitate ambitious improvements in the energy efficiency standards for buildings to help deliver our world-leading commitment to net-zero by 2015.
<p>Q15. What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area? [Not sure or indifferent / Beautiful and/or well-designed / Ugly and/or poorly-designed / There hasn’t been any / Other – please specify]</p>	
<p>Q16. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area? [Less reliance on cars / More green and open spaces / Energy efficiency of new buildings / More trees / Other – please specify]</p>	

Question	Response
<p>Q17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>Not sure.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>The principle of a national design code is supported but it must be realistic, achievable and practicable. It must also be sufficiently flexible to allow for local characteristics to be picked up through the preparation design guides and codes.</p> <p>There must be clear guidance what is expected at producing local design guides and codes and engaging with local communities, and what status these will have in terms of being used for planning decision making purposes</p> <p>It is not made clear how the preparation of design guides and codes will be resourced and what training will be provided, and that those Local Authorities without the funding and skills are not disadvantaged.</p>
<p>Q18. Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>Not sure.</p> <p>The principle of the new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each local authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making is supported. However, it is not clear what the status of the chief officer for design and place-making will be (i.e. will the post be a legal requirement), and how this post will be resourced.</p>
<p>Q19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England? [Yes /</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The giving greater emphasis to design in the strategic objectives for Homes England is supported. Homes England should also take design considerations into account in the assessment of Local</p>

Question	Response
No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]	Authority bids for grant funding, to help provide financial support to proposals for well-designed places.
Q20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]	<p>Not sure.</p> <p>The principle of fast-track for beauty is supported, including placing a requirement for masterplans and site-specific design codes to be agreed as a condition for significant development in growth areas prior to detailed proposals coming forward.</p> <p>However, insufficient information is provided for his fast track for beauty will work in practice. The fast track should not be means for securing planning approval of development which may otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms (i.e. poor access etc).</p> <p>Guidance will be needed on what will be the minimum expectation for the content of masterplans, governance arrangements for their preparation (Local Authority led?) and how they will be paid for.</p>
<p><u>Pillar Three: Planning for infrastructure and connected places</u></p> <p><u>Summary of Proposals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal 19: The CIL should be reformed to be charged as a fixed proportion of the development value above a threshold, with a mandatory nationally-set rate or rates and the current system of planning obligations abolished. • Proposal 20: The scope of the Infrastructure Levy could be extended to capture changes of use through PDR • Proposal 21: The reformed Infrastructure Levy should deliver affordable housing provision. • Proposal 22: More freedom could be given to LA's over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy • Proposal 23: As we develop our final proposals for this new planning system, we will develop a comprehensive resources and skills strategy for the planning sector to support the implementation of our reforms. In doing so, we propose this strategy will be developed including the following key elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost of planning system funded by developers and landowners • Planning fees national basis • Small proportion earmarked for Local Plans, design codes and enforcement • Regulations review • General tax to fund some planning as public benefits from good planning 	

Question	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New burdens for transitional period • New performance framework for Local Plans and enforcement • PINS to become self-financing • Skills and training for local government to lead • Reform to include significant digital and geospatial capability improvement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal 24: We will seek to strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions
<p>Q21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it? [More affordable housing / More or better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health provision) / Design of new buildings / More shops and/or employment space / Green space / Don't know / Other – please specify]</p>	
<p>Q22a. Should the Government replace the CIL and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>No.</p> <p>We recognise that a consolidated infrastructure levy at national level could help provide greater certainty to the development industry and speed up negotiations on planning applications. It could save resources and expense incurred by Local Authorities in setting a CIL charge. It might also help suppress land values in high value areas and enable Local Authorities to capture more of the land value to pay for infrastructure.</p> <p>However, a one size fits all approach is unlikely to work well for all Local Authorities, since viability will vary from place to place depending on development costs, where there may be local or site specific constraints, and where there may be specific infrastructure requirements. It could result in developers not bringing sites forward for development, or funding gaps arising.</p>

Question	Response
<p>Q22b. Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally? [Nationally at a single rate / Nationally at an area-specific rate / Locally]</p>	<p>Locally.</p> <p>Infrastructure Levy rates should be set locally and Local Authorities should continue to be able to seek S106 planning obligations without pooling restrictions</p> <p>This is since a one size fits all approach is unlikely to work well for all Local Authorities, since viability will vary from place to place depending on development costs, where there may be local or site specific constraints, and where there may be specific infrastructure requirements. It could result in developers not bringing sites forward for development, or funding gaps arising.</p> <p>Experience has shown that S106 planning applications are an effective way of ensuring developer contributions are secured that directly related to planning proposals.</p> <p>Clear guidance should be provided setting out how infrastructure rates can be set locally</p>
<p>Q22c. Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities? [Same amount overall / More value / Less value / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>More value.</p> <p>Capturing more value can support greater investment in infrastructure that can help to future proof growth areas. It can help support more comprehensive approaches to infrastructure provision in line with longer term strategies in Plans, and avoid interim and short term fixes to infrastructure deficits.</p>
<p>Q22d. Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>Not sure.</p> <p>There is a risk of Local Authorities in borrowing against the Infrastructure Levy particularly during periods of economic uncertainty. Where Local Authorities choose to borrow money against forecast levy receipts in order to forward fund infrastructure projects, loans would need to be guaranteed/underwritten (by Government) in the event that the levy receipts did not materialise.</p>

Question	Response
<p>Q23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through PDR? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>There is a need to capture planning gain from developments that will go through alternative consenting regimes, otherwise these developments may contribute to the demands and pressures place on infrastructure but would not make any contribution towards the improvement it. of that infrastructure</p>
<p>Q24a. 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 housing provision as at present? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>At least the same amount should be maintained. Preference should be for on-site provision or meeting needs where it arises.</p>
<p>Q24b. Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>Not sure.</p> <p>Preference would be in-kind payment as 'right to purchase' would create a significant burden on Local Authorities to administer.</p>
<p>Q24c. If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>To avoid overpayment to Council's and Council's needing to repay the money back.</p>

Question	Response
Q24d. In an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]	Yes. There should be a requirement placed on developers to provide affordable housing that is constructed to the same standard, or better, than that provided directly by Registered Providers e.g. space and accessibility standards.
Q25. Should LA's have few restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]	Yes. The ability for Local Authorities to spend the infrastructure levy on policy priorities is supported in principle, provided there are controls to ensure that this is not to the detriment of infrastructure required to support planned growth and development for which the levy is intended.
Q25a. If yes, should affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]	No. Critical infrastructure needed to support planned growth and development should be ring-fenced first before infrastructure levy is identified for other infrastructure and affordable housing. To ensure affordable housing is provided for.
Q26. Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010?	No.
Other matters where no specific question has been asked	The White Paper makes reference to, but does not ask specific questions on the following matters: Skills strategy – the development of a comprehensive resources and skills strategy for the planning sector is supported. This is considered essential to support the implementation of the reforms, together with Government funding for local planning authorities.

Question	Response
	<p data-bbox="730 268 2033 331">Enforcement – the strengthening of enforcement powers and sanctions is supported, to help uphold a rules-based system and to provide confidence to communities.</p> <p data-bbox="730 370 2033 402">Planning fees – planning fees should cover at least the full cost of processing each application type.</p>