

Consultation response form

This is the response form for the consultation on the draft revised National Planning Policy Framework. If you are responding by email or in writing, please reply using this questionnaire pro-forma, which should be read alongside the consultation document. The comment boxes will expand as you type. Required fields are indicated with an asterisk (*)

Your details

First name*	Sarah
Family name (surname)*	Davis
Title	Senior Policy and Practice Officer
Address	CIH, Octavia House
City/Town*	Westwood Way, Coventry
Postal code*	CV4 8JP
Telephone Number	02476 851700
Email Address*	Sarah.davis@cih.org

Are the views expressed on this consultation your own personal views or an official response from an organisation you represent?*

Organisational response

If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, please select the option which best describes your organisation. *

Trade association, interest group, voluntary or charitable organisation

If you selected other, please state the type of organisation

Click here to enter text.

Please provide the name of the organisation (if applicable)

Chartered Institute of Housing

Chapter 1: Introduction

Question 1

Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 1?

CIH welcomes the clear drive and ambition of the redrafted NPPF to address the housing crisis but it must enable local planning authorities to tackle more than simply numbers; the NPPF shapes a clear vision for development, and ensures that local plans identify and support delivery of the right homes to meet the needs of current and future populations; including the needs of people on low incomes, disabled people, people ageing with multiple and limiting conditions etc. The quality, type and tenure of new housing is important alongside its connectivity with transport, employment, health and other facilities.

Chapter 2: Achieving sustainable development

Question 2

Do you agree with the changes to the sustainable development objectives and the presumption in favour of sustainable development?

Not sure

Please enter your comments here

There should be a more explicit link to the UK Sustainable Development Strategy 2005, and the UN Sustainable Development Goals to reinforce the importance of this to shape the definition of sustainable development. The text on the three high level objectives for planning is clear.

Question 3

Do you agree that the core principles section should be deleted, given its content has been retained and moved to other appropriate parts of the Framework?

Not sure

Please enter your comments here

The list of core principles at the start of the current NPPF has the advantage of summarising the key elements around which the local planning process should be focused, which is then explored in greater detail within the following chapters; it is most important that these chapters give clear guidance to reinforce the principles, if the summary is to be removed.

Question 4

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 2, including the approach to providing additional certainty for neighbourhood plans in some circumstances?

No further comment

Chapter 3: Plan-making

Question 5

Do you agree with the further changes proposed to the tests of soundness, and to the other changes of policy in this chapter that have not already been consulted on?

Yes

Please enter your comments here

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Question 6

Do you have any other comments on the text of chapter 3?

CIH welcomes the focus on developing clear strategic priorities; these should emphasise the need to deliver a coherent and ambitious vision for local areas and how these will develop over the time scale of the plan and beyond. The draft refers to local policies that may be produced to provide more detail but there should be a stronger expectation for those local policies to be developed to provide that detail; we are concerned that, given the resource constraints on many local authorities, where this is not clearly required it may not then be delivered.

The strategic priorities set out in paragraph 20 should reinforce the need not only to address the numbers of homes required, but to ensure that these are of appropriate type and standard for the needs of the current and future population, including meeting the needs of older and disabled people etc. (20b).

Chapter 4: Decision-making

Question 7

The revised draft Framework expects all viability assessments to be made publicly available. Are there any circumstances where this would be problematic?

Not sure

Please enter your comments here

CIH welcomes the proposal for viability assessments to be publicly available. We also note the proposals in the draft planning guidance in relation to viability which we believe are significant, notably that the price paid for land is not a relevant justification for failing to accord with relevant

policies in the plan (which has been reinforced by the recent decision in the High Court for Islington in its case against the developer, Parkhurst Road Limited).

The Centre for Progressive Capitalism estimates that although £2.8 billion of land value uplift arising from newly built homes was captured through s106 agreements and CIL in 2014/15, £9.3 billion was not, so there is room for significant improvement in capturing that value to support increased infrastructure investment and affordable housing. However, viability has become a lever to negotiate down or remove affordable housing contributions which are vital to meet housing needs; we welcome measures that can reinforce and deliver these, particularly where this includes social and affordable homes to rent.

In relation to viability we welcome the draft planning guidance in establishing cost of land at existing use value plus a premium for landowners, that should disregard 'hope value'. We believe that there should be a more balanced sharing of the increase in value that comes from local authorities' investment in public infrastructure across landowners, developers and local communities, including through the provision of more affordable homes for people in those communities, and this will enable that approach to be developed (please also see our comments on S106 and viability in our response to the separate consultation on developers' contributions).

Question 8

Would it be helpful for national planning guidance to go further and set out the circumstances in which viability assessment to accompany planning applications would be acceptable?

Yes

Please enter your comments here:

We think the guidance should be clear that it would only be in exceptional circumstances that new viability assessments should be considered at application, and that these should not be based on reduction in profit for the landowner or developer.

Question 9

What would be the benefits of going further and mandating the use of review mechanisms to capture increases in the value of a large or multi-phased development?

Please enter your comments below

A requirement in national guidance to use review mechanisms to capture uplift in value in large/ multi-phased schemes may strengthen the local authority's position to apply this and capture the added value for local communities.

Question 10

Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 4?

We welcome the draft's recognition of the need for early discussion about requirements for infrastructure and affordable housing to ensure that these are not

later revisited and reduced.

Chapter 5: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Question 11

What are your views on the most appropriate combination of policy requirements to ensure that a suitable proportion of land for homes comes forward as small or medium sized sites?

Please enter your comments here

We welcome the positive encouragement on the use of small and medium sized sites. There should be reasonable flexibility for local authorities to identify the proportion and scale.

Question 12

Do you agree with the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development where delivery is below 75% of the housing required from 2020?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

Where housing delivery falls below 75 per cent of the target, CIH would argue this should be a trigger for investigation and discussion with the local authority as to the main underpinning issues underlying the failure of delivery, and for the development of a clear action plan to step up delivery.

Question 13

Do you agree with the new policy on exception sites for entry-level homes?

No

Please enter your comments here

The agreement and support of local communities is critical in bringing forward and developing rural exception sites. CIH is concerned that the inclusion of housing, even for first time buyers, that would not secure affordability in perpetuity for people in those rural communities would dilute or put at risk that support. We would not therefore support this being an automatic or blanket application but dependent on identified need and community support for its application in rural exception sites.

Question 14

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 5?

CIH welcomes the inclusion that the threshold for affordable housing contribution can be lower in rural areas, as significant numbers of rural sites are well below the existing threshold of 10 units

(paragraph 64).

In respect of the measure that 10 per cent of homes should be for affordable home ownership (paragraph 65), we would argue that this should be a maximum level, and that local authorities should have the flexibility to set a lower percentage where there is a clear need for more affordable and social homes to rent. If the target is to be required without such flexibility, there should be careful monitoring at local and national level as to whether this is leading to a reduction in the numbers of social and affordable homes developed.

The draft proposes the exclusion of some developments (for example; specialist housing for older people) from all affordable provision; this will also require monitoring in terms of impact on overall delivery of affordable homes to rent.

Chapter 6: Building a strong, competitive economy

Question 15

Do you agree with the policy changes on supporting business growth and productivity, including the approach to accommodating local business and community needs in rural areas?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 16

Do you have any other comments on the text of chapter 6?

No comment

Chapter 7: Ensuring the vitality of town centres

Question 17

Do you agree with the policy changes on planning for identified retail needs and considering planning applications for town centre uses?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 18

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 7?

No comment

Chapter 8: Promoting healthy and safe communities

Question 19

Do you have any comments on the new policies in Chapter 8 that have not already been consulted on?

No further comment

Question 20

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 8?

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Chapter 9: Promoting sustainable transport

Question 21

Do you agree with the changes to the transport chapter that point to the way that all aspects of transport should be considered, both in planning for transport and assessing transport impacts?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 22

Do you agree with the policy change that recognises the importance of general aviation facilities?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 23

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 9?

No comment

Chapter 10: Supporting high quality communications

Question 24

Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 10?

No comment

Chapter 11: Making effective use of land

Question 25

Do you agree with the proposed approaches to under-utilised land, reallocating land for other uses and making it easier to convert land which is in existing use?

Yes

Please enter your comments here

We agree with the proposed approaches to under-utilised land and reallocating land for other uses, where the local planning authority has sufficient flexibility in its application, for example, giving consideration to location and connections to adequate facilities and transport if reallocating retail or employment land for housing development.

Question 26

Do you agree with the proposed approach to employing minimum density standards where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs?

Yes

Please enter your comments here

We agree with the use of minimum density standards where local planning authorities have flexibility to apply these, to ensure the provision of additional homes to address the identified needs of the local community (for example, accessible and adaptable homes) and, where appropriate, additional facilities to support the increased size of communities.

Question 27

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 11?

No further comment

Chapter 12 : Achieving well-designed places

Question 28

Do you have any comments on the changes of policy in Chapter 12 that have not already been consulted on?

No

Question 29

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 12?

CIH previously called for government to have a stronger role in setting minimum standards for development. The toolkit for well-designed places should also incorporate guidance and requirements around space standards, accessibility - for example, building regulations M4 (categories 2 and 3) - energy efficiency and security. It would be appropriate for the principles of the Garden Cities approach to be included, as in the current NPPF.

Chapter 13: Protecting the Green Belt

Question 30

Do you agree with the proposed changes to enable greater use of brownfield land for housing in the Green Belt, and to provide for the other forms of development that are 'not inappropriate' in the Green Belt?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 31

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 13?

No comment

Chapter 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Question 32

Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 14?

No further comment

Question 33

Does paragraph 149b need any further amendment to reflect the ambitions in the Clean Growth Strategy to reduce emissions from building?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Click here to enter text.

Chapter 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Question 34

Do you agree with the approach to clarifying and strengthening protection for areas of particular environmental importance in the context of the 25 Year Environment Plan and national infrastructure requirements, including the level of protection for ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 35

Do you have any other comments on the text of Chapter 15?

No comment

Chapter 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Question 36

Do you have any comments on the text of Chapter 16?

No comment

Chapter 17: Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals

Question 37

Do you have any comments on the changes of policy in Chapter 17, or on any other aspects of the text in this chapter?

No comment

Question 38

Do you think that planning policy in minerals would be better contained in a separate document?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 39

Do you have any views on the utility of national and sub-national guidelines on future aggregates provision?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Transitional arrangements and consequential changes

Question 40

Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No comment

Question 41

Do you think that any changes should be made to the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites as a result of the proposed changes to the Framework set out in the consultation document? If so, what changes should be made?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

No further comment

Question 42

Do you think that any changes should be made to the Planning Policy for Waste as a result of the proposed changes to the Framework set out in the consultation document? If so, what changes should be made?

Please select an item from this drop down menu

Please enter your comments here

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Glossary

Question 43

Do you have any comments on the glossary?

We are concerned about the ambiguity of definitions of affordable housing. CIH has previously raised concerns about the expanded definition of affordable housing and how this may reduce the inclusion of the most affordable tenures to rent (notably social housing) in favour of more low cost home ownership, thus reducing access to sustainable housing (without help with costs) for many low income households. Within the glossary, this is further obscured by reference to housing with rent set in accordance with the government's rent setting policy rather than an explicit reference to social housing for rent.