**MINUTES OF THE PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD USING ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCING ON TUESDAY 30TH SEPTEMBER 2020.**

 **NO 109**

 **1. Present:** Cllr. Ray, Cllr. Simmons, Cllr. E. Lee, Cllr. J. Lee, Cllr. Stewart, Cllr. Shilvock, Cllr. McMillan.

 Part meeting: District Cllr. Shenton and County Cllr. Cargill.

 **2. Apologies:** Cllr. Fraser due to work commitments.

**3. Written requests for dispensation for Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

 **where that interest is not already in the register of members’**

 **interests.**

No written requests were received.

 **4**. **To approve for signature the Minutes of the Parish Council meeting**

 **held on 20th May 2020.**

 These minutes had been approved electronically by all and signed by the Chairman.

 **5. Public Participation:**

There were no members of the public present.

 **6. Correspondence:**

 Correspondence circulated electronically to date was taken as read.

 Mrs. Stewart reported that the Defibrillator cabinet by the shop had been damaged by an unknown high sided vehicle and as a result is no longer watertight and requires replacing. She had obtained a quotation of £595.00 plus VAT from the original supplier.

 The Clerk was asked to place an order, obtain quotes for an electrician and submit a claim to the Insurance Company.

**7. County & District Councillor reports:**

 Both Councillors provided reports and copies are appended at the end of the minutes.

**8. Planning Applications:**

Status of current applications circulated to Councillors prior to the meeting.

 A large area of land in Pathlow and Bearley was recently purchased by Heart of England Forests and Cllr Ray suggested that maybe a representative would be willing to join us at the next meeting to answer any questions the Councillors may have.

 David Holmes, our regular planning consultant has recently retired and moved out of the area.

 Neil Pearce provides a consultancy service through WALC which has to be a formal minuted request from the Parish Council.

 The following application notifications were received after the agenda had been circulated:

 Application No. 20/01942/FUL Extension to provide additional unit in Use Class E (formerly referred to as Use Class D2)

 Pathlow Farm, Featherbed Lane, Pathlow, Stratford-upon- Avon CV37. After some discussion it was agreed that further information was required before a definitive response could be made.

 Application No. 20/02296/FUL 18 Swanfold, Wilmcote, CV37 9XH for a single storey side extension. Again, it was agreed that further information was required but initial concerns were raised about loss of privacy to an adjoining property.

 **9. Wilmcote School retaining wall project:**

Planning permission has been granted for both the proposed new wall and removal of the various trees. 90% of the cost will be covered by the Church. Cllr. Cargill has offered to make a donation as has the Parish Council and figures will be agreed once we receive a firm quotation for the works from the Architects.

 The general school refurbishment recently undertaken is a completely separate element.

**10. Unitary Authorities:**

*No.*  Various documentation was circulated prior to the meeting and Cllr. Cargill also reported on the subject. It is still at a very early stage.

 **11. My Local Bobby:**

Cllr. Shenton included information on this item in his report.

 The cost for this service would be fairly high. It was agreed that we should wait for the time being to see if any other Parishes were interested in sharing the costs and , if so, perhaps we could have someone come to the meeting to talk about it and answer any questions.

 **12. Standing Orders update on procedure for Cllrs who wish to pay site visits:**

Not yet finalised.

 **13. Shakespeare Line Promotion Group – Wilmcote Station:**

 There was full agreement that the Councillors are very much in favour of this initiative for Wilmcote and other stations to be adopted and preserved along the route. Cllr E. Lee agreed to review the proposed article the Group wishes to include in the parish magazine confirming the Parish Council support and details of who to contact for interested parties.

 **14. Road Traffic items:**

 a) Church Road Safety

 b) Area between train station and canal entrance:

 Cllr Simmons provided a report on both these items.

 Amended drawings and full costings are still awaited for the Church Road area, and Mr. Stanley’s report is still awaited for area b.

 c) Localities Officer: It was suggested by Mr. Stanley that we ask the localities officer to walk the village a member of the Traffic Working Group to identify items requiring attention.

 d) ANPR Cameras: Cllr. McMillan had emailed his contact in February but hasn’t had a chance to follow this up for various reasons. It was agreed to put it on hold for the time being.

 **15. Willow Wood Playground:**

Two items in particular were raised in the September inspection report where timber is beginning to rot, one the platform of the aerial runway and the other a section of the multi play. We are currently waiting for quotes hardwood to replace the damaged parts and this is proving to be difficult because of the worldwide shortage of timber. Both items are low risk.

 Cllr J. Lee suggested that it would be a good idea to have a lockable noticeboard by the play area as notices she has put up, particularly during the Covid-19 situation, are just getting ripped off the gates, as have others, and are having to be replaced. She had circulated an example of one before the meeting and anticipated that the cost would be in the region of £500.00.

 Cllr. Ray suggested this be considered when agreeing the budget for 2021/22.

**16. Gypsy & Traveller Plan:**

A plea for help had been received from Temple Grafton Parish Council to ask our support to move forward the District Council’s policy regarding Gypsy & Traveller pitches in the District. There is currently no adequate supply of sites leaving villages vulnerable to inappropriate developments. All agreed that it would do no harm to write a letter to Cllr Jefferson and John Careford, Policy Manager, and Cllr. J. Lee agreed to put together a draft for approval.

 **17. Memorial bench:**

Deferred to next meeting.

 **18. Speedwatch update:**

Mr. Yates supplied an update earlier in September at which time they had managed to get out once since lockdown was lifted.

 Of the seven who completed the original training there are now only four available team members which is somewhat restricting. I believe one more recruit is intending to submit a vetting form to the Police to be able to carry out the recording/safety positions.

 It was suggested that perhaps a plea for volunteers could be posted in the parish magazine.

 **19. Zoom software:**

Cllr. Shenton has kindly hosted two or three meetings for us and Cllr Simmons suggested that perhaps now the time has come when we should be responsible for hosting them ourselves, particularly if this is the way forward for the foreseeable future and we will gradually be back to holding more meetings. Councillors were in agreement and the Chairman asked the Clerk to go ahead and purchase the software.

 **20. Notification received from WALC of Local Government Services pay agreement 2020 - 21.**

 **21. Items for the agenda for the November meeting:**

Grant application decisions

 Memorial bench

 **22. Date of next meeting :** 18th November 2020

No further business, Chairman closed the meeting at 9.00 p.m.

**Wootton Wawen District Councillor’s report as at 29/09/2020**

**To “D” or not to “D”, that is the question. With apologies to William Shakespeare**

You may be wondering what the above title is all about.

The “D” refers to Devolution and you may well have read in the local papers and the National press that the Government may be looking to consolidate smaller councils/boroughs into larger unitary councils.

I say may because the Government white paper that was expected earlier the month is now not due until October (and it’s quite possible it will be next year before it appears) but a number of applications have already been sent in to the Ministry responsible by various authorities outside of Warwick County.

Until the white paper is published we, as one of five district councils within Warwick County, won’t really know what the Government is thinking of in optimum size, rationale and weight that is given **to the best interests of residents** but County passed a motion last Thursday (24/9/2020) and a special motion over the weekend that the County’s submission should be forwarded to the MHCLG by the 30/09/2020 for consideration in the first instance. The motion seems to suggest that MHCLG have said that they will consider the application in the first round of devolution. This was subsequently the subject of intense lobbying by the 5 District councils and Boroughs to the MP’s who represent these areas as the D & B’s may not have time to submit their plans by the 30/09/2020. Robert Jenrick has given assurances to all three MP’s that he has actually said the opposite to the County and advised them to hold back their submission until the white paper has been published.

Neither the County or the Districts have the view of residents as yet and the application by the County could be seen by some as an attempt to get a decision before the Districts and Boroughs have submitted their suggestions on the way forward. It is creating unnecessary bad feeling and whilst a pragmatic and considered view may well result in an informed decision falling one way or the other, at this stage it feels more like a pre-emptive strike to grab power.

Some numbers have been flying around (regarding the optimum size) ranging from 350,000 to 650,000 in terms of numbers of residents. Stratford has around 130,000 residents and with Warwick we would have around 300,000.

I can promise you that I will keep residents informed through the Parish Council.. Even if the whole process started next year and was agreed it will probably take the best part of another 3 years to implement so whilst there is a lot of talk about devolution, there is a long way to go yet and I hope and suspect that residents will want to give their views on this before any final decision.

**Waste**

Fly tipping remains a big issue across the district and I’ll share a map of where the incidents have been with you later this week, hopefully, as I have the data on all incidents.

I would remind everyone that the Green waste charge is likely to be introduced around March 2021 at £40.

The Government is still considering the comments received as a result of last year’s consultation so whilst it is widely expected that weekly food waste collections will be recommended, nothing else is yet set in stone.

**Speeding**

The PCC is being challenged to press the Chief Constable to allocate the man power that we need to use the new speed gun around the Ward.. I will not let this one go as speeds on the A3400 (at Pathlow) & Featherbed Lane are incredible at times. Cllr. Sarah Whaley-Hoggins, a colleague of mine in the Cabinet, has taken this up and has confirmed that she is pressing the PCC to put pressure on the Chief Constable to review the issue of manning and resource. It seems silly that we have the equipment, we have a trained officer and we have a need, how difficult can it be to bring them all together into this area. Incredibly difficult it seems even with the support of Sgt Andy Eagles who heads up the Arden North SNT.

**Planning**

The planning committee structure, at SDC, has been changed and there will only be one committee but combined with new guidelines should make the process more efficient.

The Government has issued two white papers and asked for comments. One issue that really concerns me is the role of the NDP in this as there is scant mention that leads to concerns that the role of the NDP may be “watered down”. It remains to be seen how quickly any new planning rules and changes are introduced but given that many LPA’s will need to produce or revise their local plans, the indication is that they could be allowed 30 months to do this and so it could 3 years before any major changes take effect.

**Victorian Christmas Market and the MOP**

Unfortunately, as the Markets are part of my Cabinet Portfolio, I had to cancel the VCM this year and the MOP. Unfortunately there were contractual and legal issues to be sorted out but my reasons for considering the MOP in the same way as the VCM stem from the sheer numbers of visitors we were likely to get as other towns and cities have cancelled their mops and Christmas markets. The VCM attracted over 125,000 visitors last year and is welcomed by shops, hotels, restaurants and market traders alike but we could not guarantee social distancing based on the current rules and the possibility that the rules will be with us for some months.

**My Local Bobby**

I have circulated a separate note and spreadsheet on this which you should have. This is an expensive service for one Parish but if a number joined together then it be viable. At present I’m unaware of any other Parishes wishing to join the scheme. If you have any questions on this please contact me before the meeting if at all possible so that I can try and answer your question at the meeting.

**COVID-19 Update**

The number of infections per 100,000 has increased over the last two weeks in Stratford District and whilst we are not on any watch list at the moment it is clear that we need to take extra care to reduce the potential spread of Covid-19.The Stratford district rate is currently just under 21 per 100,000 There is a major concern that mid-October infection rates will be very high and the death rate nationally, by November, could reach 200 a day (per The Times and the BBC) unless we all take note of the guidelines and remember ……....

**“Hands, Face, Space”**

I am here to answer any questions and help. I am aiming to start street surgeries soon so residents can talk to me informally about any concerns that they may have. I’m aiming to get these up and running in October.

**Cllr Ian Shenton**

**District Councillor for Wootton Wawen Ward (Wootton Wawen, Langley, Preston Bagot, Billesley, Bearley, & Wilmcote) – Tel 07971 343073 or 01564 795360**

 Parish and member update

Cases of C19 are continuing to rise at a pace around us leading to the tighter restrictions as announced by the government. For the second successive week Stratford on Avon has witnessed another double-digit increase in the number of new cases over the last seven days, highlighting the importance of being vigilant and taking all the necessary precautions. Stratford District now has 22 cases per 100,000 population (We have approximately 127,000 residents)

**COVID-19 Update**

The cumulative cases across the county as of today are now 3250 up from 3025 (an increase of 225 and up by 67 on last week’s figure) with confirmed cases in Stratford on Avon District increasing by 31 to 628 since last week (12 more than last week),

Out of the 423 SWFT Hospital Beds there remains three confirmed cases of COVID-19 at present and NO patients are in the intensive care unit. The cumulative deaths across Stratford District remains at 168 with the deaths in care home remaining at 82 from a cumulative of 1139 ‘all cause deaths’ in the district. The cumulative total of all COVID-19 deaths in Warwickshire remains at 600 and over the same period there have been 3878 non COVID-19 related deaths in Warwickshire. Across the county there has been a total of 212 COVID-19 deaths in care homes settings (no increase in the last week) compared to 1293 ‘all cause deaths’ in care homes over the same period.

There are 52% of SWFT hospital beds occupied by Non-COVID-19 patients, 1% occupied with confirmed COVID-19 patients and 15% beds occupied with suspected COVID-19 patients and a spare capacity of 32% beds.

NHS Covid-19 App

We are being encouraged to download an NHS app onto our smartphones to let us know if we have been in contact with people testing positive for C19. This may seem as an imposition to some, however the data you provide is as secure as it can be and deleted after 14 days. See notes below.

Local authority reform

A debate was held on Tuesday the 22nd to discuss the proposed white paper on local government reform. The end result was in favour of submission. As it happens the white paper is highly unlikely to be submitted in October or even this year so this vote is premature. Although WCC are still pressing ahead with their submission to MHCLG, the Districts and Boroughs are likely to continue with the consultation period before submission.

Planning system reform

There are two planning reform consultations out. The first details proposed changes to the current system and the second a full-on and fundamental change to the planning system.

See attached note.

Covid19 app details

Once downloaded, you can ‘check in; to any venue or business with areas open to the public, such as pubs, restaurants, hairdressers, cinemas, places of worship or community facilities such as libraries by scanning a QR code displayed on a poster at the venue.

The app has a number of features:

**Trace**: find out when you've been near other app users who have tested positive for coronavirus.

**Alert**: lets you know the level of coronavirus risk in your postcode district.

**Check-in**: get alerted if you've visited a venue where you may have come into contact with coronavirus, using a simple QR code scanner. No more form filling.

**Symptoms**: check if you have coronavirus symptoms and see if you need to order a test.

**Test**: helps you order a test if you need to.

**Isolate**: keep track of your self-isolation countdown and access relevant advice.

The app has been designed to use as little personal data and information as possible. All the data that could directly identify someone is held on their phone, is not stored centrally and is not shared anywhere else. Any data that is provided from the phone will always be anonymised or aggregated, to prevent identification.

For more information on the app, please visit <https://www.nhs.uk/apps-library/nhs-covid-19/>

Mark Cargill

# Changes to the current planning system.

This sets out proposals to improve the effectiveness of the planning system. There are four components to the consultation:

1.Changes to the standard method for assessing housing numbers in strategic plans

2.Delivering First Homes (following consultation on the concept in February 2020)

3.Supporting small and medium-sized developers

4.Extension of the Permission in Principle consent regime

This paper provides a summary of the proposals and sets out some potential implications for SDC. SDC will be submitting their responses.

# 1.Changes to the standard method for assessing housing numbers in strategic plans

The current standard method comprises a baseline of household projections which are then adjusted to take account of affordability and capped to limit the increase for areas. However, this method has attracted criticism for the volatility of household projects and the way in which they can result in artificially low projections in some places, where overcrowding and concealed households suppress the numbers. It is considered that this method cannot forecast housing need, rather it projects past trends forward.

Proposed Method

The new method results in a national housing need of 337,000, this is the starting point for planning and not the final housing requirement as it is designed to provide enough land to account for the drop-off rate between permissions and completions. It is also intended to provide stability by smoothing out areas of potential volatility.

There are 3 key changes proposed to the standard method:

1.Introduces the percentage of existing stock levels into the formula to ensure that diverse housing needs are taken into account and offer stability and predictability.

2.Introduces an affordability adjustment that takes account of changes over time, in addition to the existing approach of considering absolute affordability. This will increase the overall emphasis on affordability in the formula and ensure a more responsive approach to changing local circumstances so that homes are planned for where they are least affordable.

3.Removal of the cap which artificially suppresses the level of housing identified

The proposed standard method would follow a 2-step approach:

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

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

**2. First Homes**

These homes would be sold at a market discount for first time buyers, including key workers, through developer contributions initially until the transition to a new system. Initially First Homes will be introduced through planning policy changes, however possibility through primary legislation at a later date to strengthen to policy and ensure delivery. First Homes will be exempt from CIL Charges.

**Percentage of affordable housing secured through developer contributions**

A minimum of 25% of all affordable housing units secured through developer contributions should be First Homes and will be a national threshold set out in planning policy. For the remaining 75% of affordable housing two options are proposed:

• Option 1 – First Homes should replace as a priority other affordable home-ownership products, prioritising the replacement of those tenures which secure the smallest discount from market price

 Where this replaces all home ownership products, any rental products are then delivered in the same ratio as set out in the Local Plan policy

 Where this does not replace all home ownership products, the remainder of the home ownership tenures are delivered, and the rental tenure mix is delivered in line with the proportions set out in the Local Plan policy.

• Option 2 – A local authority and developer can negotiate the tenure mix for the remaining 75% of units

The Government’s preferred approach is Option 1 as it would provide early clarity for developers as to what constituted a policy compliant development, and would reduce negotiation, which can slow the development process. Option 2 would provide more flexibility but would increase delay.

# Supporting small and medium-sized (SME) developers

The threshold for affordable housing requirements would be temporarily lifted, to up to 40 or 50 units to support SME builders as the economy recovers from Covid-19. If the decision is taken to proceed with this approach, it could be taken forward through the introduction of a Written Ministerial Statement in the autumn. SME builders have been declining in the long term and are now under further pressure due to Covid-19 and the government has already introduced a number of measures to provide support such as the Home Building Fund, Help to Buy programme and the ENABLE Build guarantee scheme. This consultation proposes to reduce the burden of contributions on SMEs for more sites for a time-limited period.

**Extending the small sites policy**

To stimulate economic recovery with a particular focus on SMEs, the affordable housing threshold could be raised to reduce the burden of developer contributions, as smaller sites are more likely to be built out by SMEs. It is anticipated that this would make more sites viable for SME developers and would increase the pace of delivery as the need for negotiation would be removed.

To ensure that this measure is targeted at the economic recovery phase and does not inflate land prices in the longer term, this higher threshold is proposed to have a time-limited period. This will minimise any constraints on the introduction of First Homes.

The increase of the threshold proposed for an initial period of 18 months during which the impact will be monitored before reviewing the approach. To minimise the adverse effect of piecemeal development of up to 40/50 homes to avoid affordable housing contributions, planning guidance is proposed which will advise how local authorities can secure contributions for affordable housing where it is apparent that a larger site is being brought forward.

# Extension of the Permission in Principle (PiP) consent regime

Permission in Principle (PiP) was introduced in 2017 as a new faster way of obtaining planning permission for small-scale housing-led development of less than 10 dwellings, reducing significant costs to developers to establish the principle of development without having to work up detailed plans first. In order to support economic recovery, the Government wants to make it easier for developers to have certainty that the principle of development for housing only needs to be established once in the process before developers need to get into more costly technical matters. This is particularly important for smaller sites which are not usually allocated in local plans. These changes are in advance of the extension of PiP in the White Paper.

**Extending PiP to cover major development**

It is proposed to remove this restriction on major developments to enable applications for PiP to be made for a far wider range of sites (up to 150 homes / more than 5ha). It is envisaged that this will particularly benefit SMEs by reducing upfront planning costs and provide certainty quickly. The PiP may include other uses such as retail, offices or community spaces but housing must occupy the majority of the scheme. The current limit for commercial development is 1000 sqm or 1 ha, the Government proposes to remove this restriction on the basis that it is not necessary as PiPs should only be granted for development that is housing-led.

# Planning for the Future White Paper Government Consultation

Government considers the current planning system as too complex, Planning decisions are discretionary rather than rule based, it takes too long to adopt a local plan, assessments of housing need, viability and environmental impacts are too complex and opaque, it has lost public trust and consultation is dominated by the few willing and able to navigate the process, it is based on 20th century technology, negotiating developer contributions is complex protracted and unclear, there is not enough focus on design and little incentive for high quality new homes and places, and finally it does not lead to enough homes being built.

Proposal one

The role of land use plans should be simplified the proposal is that local plants should identify three types of land; growth areas suitable for substantial development, renewal areas suitable for development and areas that are protected.

Growth areas would include land suitable for comprehensive development including new settlements and urban extension sites. For example, former industrial sites or urban regeneration sites.

Renewal areas would cover existing built areas where smaller scale development is appropriate. This could include gentle densification and infill of residential areas and development in town centres for example. This may lead to some development on the edge of rural villages. There would be a statutory presumption in favour of development being granted for the uses specified as being suitable in each area.

Protected areas would include areas such as the green belt and ANOBs, conservation areas, local wildlife sites, and areas of significant flood risk. It would also include areas of open countryside outside of land in growth or renewal areas.

Proposal 2 is to develop management policies to be established at national scale and there will be an altered role for local plans. Development management policies would be restricted to clear and necessary site or area specific requirements including broad height limits, scale and or density limits. The NPPF would become the primary source of documents for this development management policy. Local planning authorities and neighbourhoods through NDPs, will produce authority wide or locally specific design codes and guides to provide certainty and reflect local character and preferences.

Proposal 3. Local plans should be subject to a single statutory sustainable development test replacing the existing tests of soundness. This will consider whether the plan contributes to achieving sustainable development in accordance with government policy. The intention is that the simpler test should mean lower requirement for assessment and reduce the delay in the plan making process. The duty to cooperate test will be removed although further consideration will be given to how strategic cross boundary issues can be adequately planned for.

**Proposal 4** is for a standard method for establishing housing requirement figures which ensures enough land is released in the areas where affordability is worst. This is 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 the land identified is the most appropriate.

Local plans will need to identify such areas for new homes businesses and community facility facilities for a minimum period of 10 years.

**Proposal 5** revolves around growth areas suitable for substantial development, and would automatically be granted outline planning permission for the principle of development. This is potentially the most contentious proposal and probably the most difficult to do. This zoning of areas would have to take into account small areas within that zone which are unable to be developed and vice versa in very rural areas where it is appropriate for some limited development.

Proposal 6 aims to make decision making faster more certain with firm deadlines and make greater use of digital technology. Greater digitalization of the application process in particular validation should be integrated with the submission of the application so that the right information provided at the start of the process. This would use planning tools and other digital aids to allow full visibility of the application site.

The streamlining of the process will inevitably lead to reduced time scales and this is another area of contention where it may be necessary to delegate decisions on planning applications to the officers as opposed to planning committees. The principle is that if a zone has already been given planning permission in principle then it is a procedural matter where the design and the relevant building codes all the only criteria necessary.

Proposal 7 suggest that local plans should be visual and map based , standardised, and based on the latest digital technology.

The intention is that this would open up new ways for people to inspect or look at applications and the information contained within that Postal

Proposal 8 local authorities in the Planning Inspectorate will be required, through legislation, to meet the statutory timetable for key stages of the process and will consider what sanctions there would be for those who fail to do so. So, a local plan process will be shorter over 30 months and cover five stages.

Stage 1, is six months , the LPA calls for suggestions for growth , renewal and protection areas including public development.

Stage 2, 12 months the LPA prepares proposed local plan and supporting evidence.

Stage 3 is six weeks the plans are submitted to the Secretary of State for examination and the plan is published for the public to comment on .

Stage 4 is 9 months the planning inspector considers whether the plan is suitable as per the statutory test a mixed binding changes which are necessary to satisfy the test.

Stage 5 is six weeks the local plan map, key and text to finalise and come into force. I'm sure that part of this process will be to reduce the costs of local plans.

Proposal 9 his neighbour development plans should be retained as an important means of community input. Again better use should be made of digital tools.

Proposal 10 A stronger emphasis on build out through planning. The revised NPPF will make it clear that master plans and design codes for sites in growth areas should seek to include a variety of development types by different philtres which allow more phases to come forward together.

The second pillar is planning for a beautiful and sustainable place.

**Proposal 11** is to make design expectations more visible visual and predictable. It is expected that design guidance and coast be prepared locally with community involvement so they are suitable for the location and they will be binding on decisions about development.

**Proposal 12** will support the transition to a planning system which is more visual and rooted in local preferences and character. The body is expected to be set up to support the delivery and provability of locally popular design codes and propose at each authority should have a chief officer for design and placed making.

**Proposal 13** will further embed national leadership on delivering better places and will consider how Homes England strategic objectives can give greater emphasis to delivering beautiful places.

**Proposal 14** is intended 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. This will be done through a revised NPPF, as agreed through the permission in principle scheme and the nature of permitted development will be widened and changed to enable popular replicable form of development to be approved easily and quickly but in accordance with design principles. The hope is to foster innovation and support industrialization of house building enabling modern methods of construction to be developed and deployed at scale.

**Proposal 15** will amend the NPPF and ensure it targets those areas where reformed planning system can most effectively play a role in mitigating and adapting to climate change while maximising environmental benefits.

**Proposal 16** is intended to produce a quicker simpler framework processing environmental impacts and enhancements opportunities, to speed up the process while protecting and enhancing the most valuable important habitats and species in England.

**Proposal 17** is all about conserving and enhancing our historic buildings and areas in the 21st century.

**Proposal 18** proposes ambitious improvements in energy efficiency standards for buildings and help deliver our net zero commitment by 2050.

Pillar 3 its planning for infrastructure and connected places.

Proposal 19 is that CIL should be reformed and be charged at a fixed proportion of the development value above a certain threshold with a mandatory nationally set rate or rates and the current system of planning obligations abolished.

Section 106 planning obligations would be considered, and a reformed extended infrastructure levy based on a flat rate charge set nationally. The charge would be levied at the point of occupation however this could prevent money is coming into the local authorities for infrastructure projects. To get over this there is a proposal that local authorities could borrow against the expected CIL income to allow infrastructure projects to be put in at an earlier stage.

**Proposal 20** is the scope of the infrastructure levy should be extended to capture changes of use through permitted development rights .

**Proposal 21** the reformed infrastructure levy should deliver affordable housing provision Previously, affordable housing was secured by section 106 but CIL can't be spent on it. With section 106 removed the new infrastructure levy would enable authorities to use funds raised for affordable housing.

**Proposal 22** gives more freedom to local authorities on how they spend the infrastructure levy. The existing neighbourhood share of up to 25% of CIL receipts would be retained but the local authority spending of CIL receipts would be more flexible once infrastructure priorities have been met.

**Proposal 23** is all about developing final proposals for the new planning system and comprehensive resources and skills strategy for the planning sector to support the implementation and implementation of the reforms .

The cost of the new planning system principally be funded by the beneficiaries of planning gain for example landowners and developers rather than the national or local tax payer. Planning fees would continue to be set on a national basis and cover at least the full cost or processing the application type.

**Proposal 24** is to seek to strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions. There is not much information on this presently.

As you can see the proposed changes to the planning system a wide ranging with some good points being made but some that will have a direct impact on our area and communities, requiring a full and comprehensive assessment to sent to government

Mark Cargill

For information only

The following payments were made between meetings:

E.on energy 160.74 DD

E.on energy 166.11 DD

H. J. Martin Internal Audit 80.00 BACS

CPRE subs 36.00 BACS

Computer Troubleshooters 88.20 BACS

G.Compton mowing 125.00 BACS

E.on energy 166.11 DD

E.on Maintenance 121.61 BACS

E.on energy – 2 months 331.71 BACS

HMRC 393.00 BACS

Zoom Pro annual 115.10 BAC

E.on energy 161.48 DD

Tranter Training –Defib 630.00 BACS

E.on energy 166.87 DD

WILLOW WOOD PLAY AREA

Playground Supplies July 144.00 BACS

Playground Supplies August 144.00 BACS

D. Woodman 180.00 BACS

SDC Lease 100.00 BACS

G.Compton 950.00 BACS

Playground Supplies September 144.00 BACS

Playground Supplies October 144.00 BACS

Playground Supplies November Annual inspection 234.00 BACS