

**SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS TOWN COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE**

MINUTES of an online Meeting held on Tuesday 9th September 2020
at 7.30p.m.

Present:

Councillor I Roberts as Chairman
Councillor A John as Vice Chairman

Councillor P Ferry
Councillor Burman
Councillor Birch

Councillor M Sismey
Councillor Eley
Councillor O'Brien

In attendance: Town Clerk Assistant

P179 Chairman Opened Meeting

The Chairman opened the meeting and proposed that a new item be discussed on the agenda "Bellway Homes Environmental Impact Assessment of Willow Grove Meadow" to be discussed after items 8 and 9.

Proposal: Councillor Roberts

Seconded: Councillor John

Vote: **Carried**

P180 Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were **RECEIVED**.

P181 Dispensation Considerations

None received.

P182 Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest received.

P183 Confirmation of Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 25th August 2020 were agreed and signed as a true record of the meeting.

Proposed: Councillor Roberts

Seconded: Councillor John

Vote: **Carried**

P184 Public Questions

No members of the public were present.

EK

P185 Current Planning Applications

20/00884/FUL 2 Starboard View

Construction of 3 Front Dormers

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTION** to this planning application.

20/05177/TPO 124 Celeborn Street

Removal of 2 lowest branches that overhang the drive, back to the trunk -

Reason: damage to vehicles

It was agreed that the Planning Committee has **NO OBJECTION** to this planning application

P186 Changes To The Current Planning System – PC10-20

Changes to the current planning system were noted and discussed with comments for submission agreed. (attached as Appendix 1)

P187 Planning for The Future – White Paper – PC11-20

Changes to the current planning system were noted and discussed with comments for submission agreed. (attached as Appendix 2)

P188 Bellway Homes Environmental Impact Assessment of Willow Grove Meadow

There was no time left to discuss at this meeting and therefore it was proposed that an additional meeting to do so would take place on 16th September 2020 at 7.30pm.

Proposed: Councillor Roberts

Seconded: Councillor John

Vote: **Carried**

P189 Report to Council

No items to report.

P190 Media Coverage

No items to report.

P191 Next Meeting

The next meeting agreed as 16th 2020 September

There being no further business to discuss, the Chairman closed the meeting at 10pm.

Signed

Chairman of the Meeting

Date: 16th September 2020

South Woodham Ferrers Town Council's Response to
Changes to Current Planning System
National Council of Local Councils PC10-20

1. 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?

SWFTC does not agree with this statement and believes that it should be the lower figure.

2. 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

SWFTC agrees with this statement.

3. 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.

SWFTC agrees with this statement.

4. 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.

SWFTC agrees with this statement.

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

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:

SWFTC agrees with this statement.

6. 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?

SWFTC agrees with this statement.

7. 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?

SWFTC agrees with this statement.

8. 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)

SWFTC agrees with point ii) of this statement.

With regards to current exemptions from delivery of affordable home ownership products:

9. 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?

SWFTC does not agree with this statement.

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

SWFTC agrees that none of the existing exemptions are not required.

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

SWFTC believes that no further exemptions are needed.

12. Do you agree with the proposed approach to transitional arrangements set out above?

SWFTC agrees with the proposed approach.

13. Do you agree with the proposed approach to different levels of discount?

SWFTC agrees with the proposed approach.

14. 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?

SWFTC agrees with this approach.

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

SWFTC agrees with the removal of the site size threshold.

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

SWFTC does not agree with this statement.

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

SWFTC agrees with the proposed approach.

18. What is the appropriate level of small sites threshold? i) Up to 40 homes ii) Up to 50 homes iii) Other (please specify)

SWFTC believes that item i) is the appropriate level.

19. Do you agree with the proposed approach to the site size threshold?

SWFTC agrees with the proposed approach.

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

SWFTC agrees with the linking of the time-limited period to economic recovery however raising the threshold to 24 months.

21. Do you agree with the proposed approach to minimising threshold effects?

SWFTC does agree to the proposed approach.

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

SWFTC does agree to the proposed approach.

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

SWFTC does believe that there are other ways to help SME builders with perhaps reducing V.A.T.

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

SWFTC does not agree with this statement.

25. Should the new Permission in Principle for major development set any limit on the amount of commercial development (providing housing still occupies the majority of the floorspace of the overall scheme)? Please provide any comments in support of your views.

SWFTC does agree with this statement in principle however do not believe that permission should be given to major developments.

26. 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?

SWFTC does not agree with this statement since there should be limits.

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

SWFTC believes that appropriate height limits should be in place.

28. 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

SWFTC believes that publicity arrangements should be extended for large developments and agreeing with point iii).

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

SWFTC agrees with this statement.

30. What level of flat fee do you consider appropriate, and why?

SWFTC believes a flat fee of £4000 is appropriate.

31. 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.

SWFTC agrees with this statement.

32. 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.

SWFTC has no comment.

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

SWFTC has no comment.

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

SWFTC has no comment.

35. 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?

SWFTC has no comment.



South Woodham Ferrers Town Council's Response

PC11-20 | WHITE PAPER: PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

Consultation questions with SWFTC Response

South Woodham Ferrers Town Council response to the consultation questions are as follows:

1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?
Slow, unaccountable and predetermined.
2. Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area? *Yes*

(a) If no, why not? Don't know how to / It takes too long / It's too complicated / I don't care /
Other – please specify
3. Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future?
Social media / Online news / Newspaper / By post / All options appropriate.
4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? *Building homes for young people / Protection of green spaces / Increasing the affordability of housing /*
5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals? *Yes*
6. Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally? *Not sure, since national/general policies do not necessarily work locally.*
7. 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 impact? *Not sure, do not believe that all should be replaced.*

(b) How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?
8. (a) Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced? *Yes*

(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*



9. (a) Do you agree that there should be automatic outline permission for areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent? **No**
- (b) Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas? **No**
- (c) Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime? **Yes**
10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain?
Yes
11. Do you agree with our proposals for accessible, web-based Local Plans? **Yes**
12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans? **Yes at least, although 30 months may not be long enough since historically they take longer.**
13. (a) Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system?
Yes
- (b) 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? **Digital tools would be beneficial as would more online details including referendums and agreement to plans especially in the present Covid-19 situation.**
14. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support? **Yes which must include infrastructure.**
15. What do you think about the design of new development that has happened recently in your area? **There hasn't been any.**
16. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area?
More green and open spaces / Energy efficiency of new buildings / More trees / infrastructure and appropriate transport.
17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes? **Yes, a design guide was used in the development of South Woodham Ferrers and consider this to be good practice.**
18. 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? **No since developers have more qualified staff that can better this together with the regulations.**



19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England? *Yes, modern designs are more desirable.*
20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty? *Not sure.*
21. 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 / with priority being "more or better infrastructure" and "green space".
22. (a) Should the Government replace the Community 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*
- (b) Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally? *Locally*
- (c) Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities? *More value*
- (d) Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area? *Yes, transport is needed at the beginning of the development with infrastructure later.*
23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights? *Not sure since a levy may make a change of use of land not viable.*
24. (a) Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present? *Yes*
- (b) 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? *No*
- (c) If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk? *No since we did not agree with 24 (b).*
- (d) If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality? *No, we are not in support of the in-kind delivery approach.*



**SOUTH WOODHAM FERRERS
TOWN COUNCIL**

**Champions Manor Hall, Hullbridge Road
South Woodham Ferrers
Essex CM3 5LJ
Tel. 01245 321 817**

25. Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy?
Yes, if there are fewer restrictions the Town Council can respond faster to the needs of the community.
- (a) If yes, should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed? *Yes*
26. 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 Equality Act 2010? *No*