



# WOODBIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

Shire Hall Market Hill Woodbridge Suffolk IP12 4LP

Locum Town Clerk: Mr G E Diaper

Tel: 01394 383599

Email: [townclerk@woodbridge-suffolk.gov.uk](mailto:townclerk@woodbridge-suffolk.gov.uk)



## TO MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Cllr Bale

Cllr Lady Blois

Cllr Holdcroft

Cllr Mapey

Cllr Miller

Cllr O'Nolan

Cllr Sanders

Cllr Sutton

Cllr Walsh

You are hereby summoned to attend the **MEETING** of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** to be held **virtually** on: **TUESDAY 25<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2020 at 6PM**

Greg Diaper

Locum Town Clerk

18<sup>th</sup> August 2020

### **Public Attendance**

*Members of the public and press are welcome to join the Zoom meeting. Members of the public will be invited to give their views/questions the Town Council on issues on the agenda, or raise issues for consideration or inclusion at future meetings. This item will be limited to 30 minutes duration but may be extended at the discretion of the Mayor. The Zoom login details are provided below;*

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89783748586?pwd=QjBhR2d2M0o5T2hINhucFpJMG16Zz09>

Meeting ID: 897 8374 8586

Passcode: 495867

## AGENDA

### 1. APOLOGIES

To receive apologies for absence.

### 2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Members and officers are invited to make any declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary or Local Non-Pecuniary Interests that they may have in relation to items on the Agenda and are also

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

reminded to make any declarations at any stage during the meeting if it becomes apparent that this may be required when a particular item or issue is considered.

**3. REQUESTS FOR DISPENSATION**

Councillors with a Pecuniary Interest in an item on this Agenda, who wish to remain, speak, and/or vote during consideration of that item, may apply for a dispensation in writing to the Town Clerk prior to the meeting. Applications may also be considered at the meeting itself should the nature of the interest become apparent to a Councillor at the time of the meeting.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

For the public to ask questions of the Council or raise issues for consideration at a future meeting of the Council. 15 minutes maximum.

**5. CONFIRMATION OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES**

To confirm the minutes of the Planning Committee held on Tuesday 11<sup>th</sup> August 2020 – Copies in the Members' area and the public area of the website.

**6. TO COMMENT ON APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION**

As set out on the attached schedule.

**7. TO COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PLANNING SYSTEM – ATTACHED**

To comment on the proposed changes to the Planning System –

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/907647/MHCLG-Planning-Consultation.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907647/MHCLG-Planning-Consultation.pdf)

**8. TO COMMENT ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EXISTING PLANNING SYSTEM – ATTACHED**

**9. TO AGREE THE STATEMENTS TO BE INCLUDED AS PART OF THE REGISTRATION PROCESS FOR SIZEWELL C INSPECTION**

**10. CLOSURE**

---

## WOODBRIIDGE TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of an on-line meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE held on TUESDAY 11<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2020 at 6pm

### Councillors:

Present: S Bale, Lady C Blois, G Holdcroft, S Miller, R Sanders, M Sutton

Apologies: E O’Nolan and C Walsh

Absent without  
Apologies: C Mapey

In Attendance: Locum Town Clerk, Locum Deputy Town Clerk and no members of the public

*Action*

### 273. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Miller, O’Nolan and Walsh.

### 274. MEMBERS AND OFFICERS WERE INVITED TO MAKE ANY DECLARATIONS OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY OR LOCAL NON-PECUNIARY INTERESTS THAT THEY MAY HAVE IN RELATION TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA AND WERE ALSO REMINDED TO MAKE ANY DECLARATIONS AT ANY STAGE DURING THE MEETING IF IT BECOMES APPARENT THAT THIS MAY BE REQUIRED WHEN A PARTICULAR ITEM OR ISSUE IS CONSIDERED, AND TO DEAL WITH DISPENSATIONS AS REQUESTED BY INDIVIDUAL COUNCILLORS IN LINE WITH S33 OF THE LOCALISM ACT 2011

No members declared an interest in matters on the agenda.

### 275. COUNCILLORS WITH A PECUNIARY INTEREST IN AN ITEM ON THIS AGENDA, WHO WISH TO REMAIN, SPEAK AND/OR VOTE DURING CONSIDERATION OF THAT ITEM, MAY APPLY FOR A DISPENSATION BY WRITING TO THE TOWN CLERK PRIOR TO THE MEETING. APPLICATIONS MAY ALSO BE CONSIDERED AT THE MEETING ITSELF SHOULD THE NATURE OF THE INTEREST BECOME APPARENT TO A COUNCILLOR AT THE TIME OF THE MEETING

There were no requests from Councillors with a Pecuniary Interest in an item on this Agenda for a dispensation.

276. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were no members of the public present.

277. CONFIRMATION OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MINUTES

The Committee agreed and approved the signing of the minutes of the meeting held 28<sup>th</sup> July 2020 as a true record.

278. TO CONSIDER APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

Application No and Address	Committee Comments
DC/20/2585/FUL Gault House, 3A Thoroughfare	We recommend REFUSAL. There is material information missing from the application, which both fails to identify, and mediate the impact of the development on the copper beech tree in the neighbouring garden. There is also a loss of amenity value to neighbouring properties by virtue of the proposed position of the new dwelling on the site.
DC/20/2725/FUL The Crown Hotel, 2 Thoroughfare	We recommend APPROVAL
DC/20/2726/LBC The Crown Hotel, 2 Thoroughfare	We recommend APPROVAL
DC/20/2787/TCA 28 Naverne Meadow	We recommend APPROVAL
DC/20/2790/FUL 37 Theatre Street	We recommend REFUSAL. The Council's 2009 Community Infrastructure Study advised that there should be 0.2 sq metres of community centre facilities per resident, and the loss of this community facility would reduce the overall capacity in Woodbridge to below this ideal. There is no evidence to indicate that the site has been "realistically" marketed for a continuous period of six months, and no study which demonstrates an over-capacity of community centre space in Woodbridge.
DC/20/2775/TCA 2 St Annes School House, Crown Place	We recommend APPROVAL

**279. TO COMMENT ON THE NON-MATERIAL CHANGES TO THE EAST ANGLIA HUB OFF-SHORE WIND TURBINES PROJECT – ATTACHED**

The Committee had no comments to make on the non-material changes to the East Anglia Hub off-shore wind turbines project.

**280. TO AGREE THE COMMENTS TO BE ASKED AT THE SIZEWELL C PRE-EXAMINATION Q & A EVENT**

The Committee asked Councillor Sanders to ask how the following concerns could be avoided, mitigated or compensated: -

- a) rat runs to Sizewell via Woods Lane/Woodbridge to Rendlesham, Tunstall, Snape possibly linked with avoiding use of park & rides.
- b) possible use of Rendlesham business park for off site support offices, stores etc. This could impact as HGV usage of Woods Lane/Woodbridge may be considerably increased,
- c) lack of consideration of the impact of HGV on traffic between Seven Hills (A14) and Woods Lane leading to rat runs into/out of Woodbridge
- d) impact on tourism and use of Woodbridge as a shopping centre
- e) noise of up to 6 Sizewell C linked overnight trains through the town

The Committee also asked Councillor Sanders to explore further support by Planning Aid, and how the joint concerns of (say) Martlesham, Melton and Woodbridge regarding road traffic, and Saxmundham and Woodbridge regarding increased rail traffic and noise, could be replicated in each of the pre-registration statements.

**281. CLOSURE**

The meeting was closed at 6.40pm.

Councillor Miller  
Chair

## ITEM 6

### TO CONSIDER APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

#### Links to East Suffolk Council planning portal:

##### **DC/20/2810/FUL - 1 Doric Place**

Erection of HSP summerhouse

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QE639DQXL6000&prevPage=inTray>

##### **DC/20/2854/FUL - 3 Lime Kiln Quay**

Proposed removal of existing fence and construction of boundary wall to match existing adjacent wall (on line of existing fence)

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QEA101QX06000&prevPage=inTray>

##### **DC/20/2996/FUL - 44 Chapel Street**

Single storey rear extension

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QEOX2DQXLEV00&prevPage=inTray>

##### **DC/20/3119/FUL - 26 Bullards Lane**

Proposed single storey front and rear extensions

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QF59WKQXLLT00&prevPage=inTray>

##### **DC/20/3139/TCA - Fitzgerald Green Sun Lane**

T1 - Silver Maple

Remove

- Very large tree - dominates the gardens of 3 properties. Over extended growth is causing distress for the occupants of all properties, with the risk of failure.

<https://publicaccess.eastsuffolk.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=QF7L9BQXLMV00&prevPage=inTray>

## **ITEM 7**

### **TO COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PLANNING SYSTEM**

This consultation seeks any views on each part of a package of proposals for reform of the planning system in England to streamline and modernise the planning process, improve outcomes on design and sustainability, reform developer contributions and ensure more land is available for development where it is needed.

First, it will streamline the planning process with more democracy taking place more effectively at the plan-making stage, and will replace the entire corpus of plan-making law in England to achieve this:

- Simplifying the role of Local Plans, to focus on identifying land under three categories – Growth areas suitable for substantial development, and where outline approval for development would be automatically secured for forms and types of development specified in the Plan; Renewal areas suitable for some development, such as gentle densification; and Protected areas where – as the name suggests – development is restricted. This could halve the time it takes to secure planning permission on larger sites identified in plans. The Government also want to allow local planning authorities to identify sub-areas in their Growth areas for self- and custom-build homes, so that more people can build their own homes.
- Local Plans should set clear rules rather than general policies for development. The Government will set out general development management policies nationally, with a more focused role for Local Plans in identifying site- and area-specific requirements, alongside locally produced design codes. This would scale back the detail and duplication contained in Local Plans, while encouraging a much greater focus on design quality at the local level. Plans will be significantly shorter in length (an expected reduction in size of at least two thirds), as they will no longer contain a long list of “policies” of varying specificity – just a core set of standards and requirements for development.
- Local councils should radically and profoundly re-invent the ambition, depth and breadth with which they engage with communities as they consult on Local Plans. These reforms will democratise the planning process by putting a new emphasis on engagement at the plan-making stage. At the same time, the Government will streamline the opportunity for consultation at the planning application stage, because this adds delay to the process and allows a small minority of voices, some from the local area and often some not, to shape outcomes. The Government want to hear the views of a wide range of people and groups through this consultation on our proposed reforms. ***It is difficult to comprehend how a system which will be designed to encourage and enable more people to engage in the consultation on a local plan can, at the same time streamline the process.***
- Local Plans should be subject to a single statutory “sustainable development” test, and unnecessary assessments and requirements that cause delay and challenge in the current system should be abolished. This would mean replacing the existing tests of soundness, updating requirements for assessments (including on the environment and viability) and abolishing the Duty to Cooperate. ***The abolishment of the Duty to Co-operate would lead to a complete failure of integrated planning in respect of infrastructure.***
- Local Plans should be visual and map-based, standardised, based on the latest digital technology, and supported by a new standard template. Plans should be significantly shorter in length, and limited to no more than setting out site- or area-specific parameters and opportunities.

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

- Local authorities and the Planning Inspectorate will be required through legislation to meet a statutory timetable (of no more than 30 months in total) for key stages of the process, and there will be sanctions for those who fail to do so.
- Decision-making should be faster and more certain, within firm deadlines, and should make greater use of data and digital technology

Second, the Government will take a radical, digital-first approach to modernise the planning process. This means moving from a process based on documents to a process driven by data. They will:

- Support local planning authorities to use digital tools to support a new civic engagement process for Local Plans and decision-making, making it easier for people to understand what is being proposed and its likely impact on them through visualisations and other digital approaches. They will make it much easier for people to feed in their views into the system through social networks and via their phones.
- Insist local plans are built on standardised, digitally consumable rules and data, enabling accessible interactive maps that show what can be built where. The data will be accessed by software used across the public sector and also by external PropTech entrepreneurs to improve transparency, decision-making and productivity in the sector.
- Standardise, and make openly and digitally accessible, other critical datasets that the planning system relies on, including planning decisions and developer contributions. Approaches for fixing the underlying data are already being tested and developed by innovative local planning authorities and they are exploring options for how these could be scaled nationally.
- Work with tech companies and local authorities to modernise the software used for making and case-managing a planning application, improving the user-experience for those applying and reducing the errors and costs currently experienced by planning authorities. A new more modular software landscape will encourage digital innovation and will consume and provide access to underlying data. This will help automate routine processes, such as knowing whether new applications are within the rules, making decision-making faster and more certain.
- Engage with the UK PropTech sector through a PropTech Innovation Council to make the most of innovative new approaches to meet public policy objectives, help this emerging sector to boost productivity in the wider planning and housing sectors, and ensure government data and decisions support the sector's growth in the UK and internationally

Third, to bring a new focus on design and sustainability, the Government will:

- Ensure the planning system supports our efforts to combat climate change and maximises environmental benefits, by ensuring the National Planning Policy Framework targets those areas where a reformed planning system can most effectively address climate change mitigation and adaptation and facilitate environmental improvements.
- Facilitate ambitious improvements in the energy efficiency standards for buildings to help deliver our world-leading commitment to net-zero by 2050.
- Ask for beauty and be far more ambitious for the places we create, expecting new development to be beautiful, and to create a 'net gain' not just 'no net harm', with a greater focus on 'placemaking' and 'the creation of beautiful places' within the National Planning Policy Framework.
- Make it easier for those who want to build beautifully through the introduction of a fast-track for beauty through changes to national policy and legislation, to automatically permit proposals for high-quality developments where they reflect local character and preferences.

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

- Introduce a quicker, simpler framework for assessing environmental impacts and enhancement opportunities, that speeds up the process while protecting and enhancing England's unique ecosystems.
- Expect design guidance and codes – which will set the rules for the design of new development – to be prepared locally and to be based on genuine community involvement rather than meaningless consultation, so that local residents have a genuine say in the design of new development, and ensure that codes have real 'bite' by making them more binding on planning decisions. ***It is unclear as to whether this design guidance and codes are produced concurrent with the Local Plan. They certainly need to be.***
- Establish a new body to support the delivery of design codes in every part of the country, and give permanence to the campaigning work of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission and the life of its co-chairman the late Sir Roger Scruton.
- Ensure that each local planning authority has a chief officer for design and place-making, to help ensure there is the capacity and capability locally to raise design standards and the quality of development.
- Lead by example by updating Homes England's strategic objectives to give greater emphasis to delivering beautiful places.
- Protect our historic buildings and areas while ensuring the consent framework is fit for the 21st century

Fourth, the Government will improve infrastructure delivery in all parts of the country and ensure developers play their part, through reform of developer contributions. They propose:

- The Community Infrastructure Levy and the current system of planning obligations will be reformed as a nationally set, value-based flat rate charge (the 'Infrastructure Levy'). A single rate or varied rates could be set. They will aim for the new Levy to raise more revenue than under the current system of developer contributions, and deliver at least as much – if not more – on-site affordable housing as at present. This reform will enable Councils to sweep away months of negotiation of Section 106 agreements and the need to consider site viability. They will deliver more of the infrastructure existing and new communities require by capturing a greater share of the uplift in land value that comes with development.
- They will be more ambitious for affordable housing provided through planning gain, and will ensure that the new Infrastructure Levy allows local planning authorities to secure more on-site housing provision.
- They will give local authorities greater powers to determine how developer contributions are used, including by expanding the scope of the Levy to cover affordable housing provision to allow local planning authorities to drive up the provision of affordable homes. They will ensure that affordable housing provision supported through developer contributions is kept at least at current levels, and that it is still delivered on-site to ensure that new development continues to support mixed communities. Local authorities will have the flexibility to use this funding to support both existing communities as well as new communities.
- They will also look to extend the scope of the consolidated Infrastructure Levy and remove exemptions from it to capture changes of use through permitted development rights, so that additional homes delivered through this route bring with them support for new infrastructure.

Fifth, to ensure more land is available for the homes and development people and communities need, and to support renewal of our town and city centres, The Government proposes:

- A new nationally determined, binding housing requirement that local planning authorities would have to deliver through their Local Plans. This would be focused on areas where affordability pressure is highest to stop land supply being a barrier to enough homes being built. They propose that this would factor in land constraints, including the Green Belt, and

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

would be consistent with our aspirations of creating a housing market that is capable of delivering 300,000 homes annually, and one million homes over this Parliament.

- To speed up construction where development has been permitted, the Government propose to make it clear in the revised National Planning Policy Framework that the masterplans and design codes for sites prepared for substantial development should seek to include a variety of development types from different builders which allow more phases to come forward together. They will explore further options to support faster build out as the Government develop our proposals for the new planning system.
- To provide better information to local communities, to promote competition amongst developers, and to assist SMEs and new entrants to the sector, they will consult on options for improving the data held on contractual arrangements used to control land.
- To make sure publicly owned land and public investment in development supports thriving places, they will:
  - ensure decisions on the locations of new public buildings – such as government offices and further education colleges
  - support renewal and regeneration of town centres; and
  - explore how publicly owned land disposal can support the SME and self-build sectors.

The Consultation requires answers to these questions by 29<sup>th</sup> October 2020. Rather than attempt to answer every question at one meeting **Members are recommended to consider and provide a response or answer a part of the 24 proposals and 26 questions over a period until mid-October.**

If Members agree the recommendation above the first five questions to be addressed are shown below. It is interesting that some a single-choice, so responding to question 3 on behalf of our whole community is difficult.

#### Questions

1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?
- 2(a). Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area? [Yes / No]
- 2(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]
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 / Other – please specify]
4. 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 existing heritage buildings or areas / Other – please specify]

And the first proposal, and question five is here:-

#### **Proposal 1:**

The role of land use plans should be simplified. The Government proposes 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.

All areas of land would be put into one of these three categories:

- **Growth areas** “suitable for substantial development” – the Government proposes that the term substantial development be defined in policy to remove any debate about this descriptor.

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

The Government envisages this category would include land suitable for comprehensive development, including new settlements and urban extension sites, and areas for redevelopment, such as former industrial sites or urban regeneration sites. It could also include proposals for sites such as those around universities where there may be opportunities to create a cluster of growth-focused businesses. Sites annotated in the Local Plan under this category would have outline approval for development (see proposal 5 for more detail). Areas of flood risk would be excluded from this category (as would other important constraints), unless any risk can be fully mitigated;

- **Renewal areas** “suitable for development” – this would cover existing built areas where smaller scale development is appropriate. It could include the gentle densification and infill of residential areas, development in town centres, and development in rural areas that is not annotated as Growth or Protected areas, such as small sites within or on the edge of villages. There would be a statutory presumption in favour of development being granted for the uses specified as being suitable in each area. Local authorities could continue to consider the case for resisting inappropriate development of residential gardens;

- **Areas that are Protected** – this would include sites and areas which, as a result of their particular environmental and/or cultural characteristics, would justify more stringent development controls to ensure sustainability. This would include areas such as Green Belt, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), Conservation Areas, Local Wildlife Sites, areas of significant flood risk and important areas of green space. At a smaller scale it can continue to include gardens in line with existing policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. It would also include areas of open countryside outside of land in Growth or Renewal areas. Some areas would be defined nationally, others locally on the basis of national policy, but all would be annotated in Local Plan maps and clearly signpost the relevant development restrictions defined in the National Planning Policy Framework.

This new-style Local Plan would comprise an interactive web-based map of the administrative area where data and policies are easily searchable, with a key and accompanying text. Areas and sites would be annotated and colour-coded in line with their Growth, Renewal or Protected designation, with explanatory descriptions set out in the key and accompanying text, as appropriate to the category.

In Growth and Renewal areas, the key and accompanying text would set out suitable development uses, as well as limitations on height and/or density as relevant. These could be specified for sub-areas within each category, determined locally but having regard to national policy, guidance and legislation (including the National Model Design Code and flexibilities in use allowed by virtue of the new Use Classes Order and permitted development). For example, it may be appropriate for some areas to be identified as suitable for higher-density residential development, or for high streets and town centres to be identified as distinct areas. In Growth areas, the Government would also want to allow sub-areas to be created specifically for self and custom-build homes, and community-led housing developments, to allow a range of housing aspirations to be met and help create diverse and flourishing communities. In the case of self and custom-build homes, local authorities should identify enough land to meet the requirements identified in their self-build and custom housebuilding registers. For Protected areas, the key and accompanying text would explain what is permissible by cross-reference to the National Planning Policy Framework.

**Alternative options:** Rather than dividing land into three categories, the Government are also interested in views on more binary models. One option is to combine Growth and Renewal areas (as defined above) into one category and to extend permission in principle to all land within this area, based on the uses and forms of development specified for each sub-area

within it. An alternative approach would be to limit automatic permission in principle to land identified for substantial development in Local Plans (Growth areas); other areas of land would, as now, be identified for different forms of development in ways determined by the local planning authority (and taking into account policy in the National Planning Policy Framework), and subject to the existing development management process.

**Question 5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals? [Yes / No / Not sure. Please provide supporting statement.]**

## **ITEM 8**

### **TO COMMENT ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE EXISTING PLANNING SYSTEM**

This consultation -

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/907215/200805\\_Changes\\_to\\_the\\_current\\_planning\\_system\\_FINAL\\_version.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/907215/200805_Changes_to_the_current_planning_system_FINAL_version.pdf) - sets out proposals for measures to improve the effectiveness of the current planning system. The 4 main proposals are:

- changes to the standard method for assessing local housing need
- securing of First Homes through developer contributions in the short term until the transition to a new system
- supporting small and medium-sized builders by temporarily lifting the small sites threshold below which developers do not need to contribute to affordable housing
- extending the current Permission in Principle to major development

#### **Changes to the Standard Method for Assessing Local Housing Need**

The proposed changes would result in more than a 10% increase in the number of houses assessed as needing to be built, with a clear congregation of development in and around towns with a population of 10,000 or greater.

#### **Securing of First Homes through developer contributions in the short-term until the transition to a new system**

The Government intends to set out in policy that a minimum of 25 per cent of all affordable housing units secured through developer contributions should be First Homes. This will be a national threshold, set out in planning policy.

The impact of this revised policy is the likelihood that a greater proportion of “affordable” housing will be by way of First Homes (lower initial purchase price), and shared-ownership, with a reduction in properties for rent.

#### **Supporting small and medium-sized builders by temporarily lifting the small sites threshold below which developers do not need to contribute to affordable housing**

To stimulate economic recovery with a particular focus on SMEs, the threshold for affordable housing contributions could be raised. This would reduce the burden of developer contributions, as smaller sites are more likely to be built out by SMEs. 77. We understand the trade-off between introducing measures to increase the number of developable small sites and the importance of securing section 106 planning obligations to deliver affordable housing including First Homes. For example, for a threshold of up to 40 units we would expect to see

*Please be aware that the recording of this meeting is probable*

a reduction of between 7% and 14% of section 106 affordable housing delivery over a single year, assuming overall housing delivery remained constant.

For a threshold of up to 50 units, this would be between 10% and 20%. However, we anticipate that raising the threshold would make more sites viable for SME developers and would increase the pace of their delivery as the need for negotiation would be removed. On balance, the proposed approach would allow more small sites to come forward and help minimise the economic pressure that SMEs are under.

### **Extending the current Permission in Principle to major development**

Permission in Principle was introduced in 2017 as a new faster way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development, which reduced the need for landowners and developers to incur significant costs to establish the principle of development for housing. This was done by giving authorities the power to grant Permission in Principle to suitable sites allocated on registers of brownfield land. Subsequently, Permission in Principle by application was introduced in 2018, for minor development (i.e. small sites that support fewer than 10 dwellings).

Planning for the Future proposes that land allocated for substantive development in local plans should be automatically granted a form of permission of principle so that the principle of development is established, and subsequent consents only focus on detailed technical matters. As this new framework will take time to implement, the Government is keen to expand the current Permission in Principle framework for housing-led development as an early opportunity to move towards this new approach.

We propose to remove the restriction in the current Permission in Principle regulations on major development. This will enable applications for Permission in Principle to be made for a far wider range of sites, enabling more landowners and developers to use this route to secure permission for housing development. Currently, 84% of planning applications for residential development are for schemes of 10-150 homes, which deliver 46% of new housing development each year.

### **Summary**

These are important changes which will affect development in and around Woodbridge, and **Members are recommended to delegate the Committee's response to the Town Clerk in consultation with the Chair of Committee**