

## Meeting Notes of the Planning Sub-Group

**26<sup>th</sup> March 2024, 11am**

**Held on Microsoft Teams**

### Present

Paul Barnard (Chair), Adam Birchall, Andrew Duthie, Ashley Baldwin, Barry Wyatt, Caroline Danby, Jamie Chadwick, David Dale, Sarah McLaughlin, Xavier Preston, Michael Brereton, Mark Patchett, Lucy Hargreaves, Rebecca Drake, Laura McCulloch, Mike Garrity, Hannah Bartram, Kylie Russell (apologies, incomplete list taken).

### Apologies

Charlotte Ashton, David Dale, Catherine Duggan, Georgina Bright, Julian Harlow, Jonathan Smith, Matthew Brown, Nicola Melville, Pam Neal, Caroline Sutton, Colin Haigh, Joe Jenkinson, Samantha Campbell, Helen Leach, Ian Achurch, Louise Wood, Sally Gill, James Crosbie, Rob Harbour, Anna Rose, Jan Feeney, Rob Murfin, Katie Hornsey, Margaret Baddeley, Matthew Jericho, Alison Ives, Jo Wall, Rob Westcott, Alison Ives, James Chadwick, David Sutherland, Georgina Bright, Laurence Fallon, Matthew Jericho, Oliver Meek, Rachael Ferry-Jones, Rafi Cohen, Stacey Wylie, Michael Bingham

Item	Notes	Actions
1	<p><b>Stewardship Hub – Mark Patchett &amp; Andrew Duthie</b></p> <p><b>Presentation from Stewardship Hub</b> (with PowerPoint slides)</p> <p><u>Why is a New Stewardship Solution is needed?</u></p> <p>Adoption of new estates has become far less common so developers are turning to management companies. Resident owned public open space solutions are no longer viable. The CMA has highlighted the shortcomings of current solutions in their review of POS estate management and have advocated for LPA adoption without considering the financial burden of this. All stakeholders need to come together and support a secure and cost-effective solution that answers the challenges of good long-term stewardship and community care on modern housing development. Stewardship Hub are looking for an alternative solution and are putting it to ADEPT for views.</p> <p><u>What do we need from a new solution?</u></p>	

Item	Notes	Actions
	<p>In addition to removing burden from LPAs we need to ensure this does not add additional burden to developers and housebuilders.  There is a need for the new solution to be affordable.  The Stewardship Hub is looking to creating a trust or similar to look after the estate. It will need to be not for profit with resident participation.  Service charge would be initially covered by the developer and then passed on to residents.  Value for money and transparency are crucial.  The end result is to deliver places people are proud to be living in.</p> <p><u>Governance</u>  There will be a small board to govern the Stewardship Hub  Developers will agree site by site to enter into the Stewardship Hub arrangement. The stewardship hub will be at a county level with around 20,000 units to a hub.  Each site would have a managing agent appointed to manage charge collection, site management and handover once site is complete. It will take a few years for the Stewardship Hub to grow in numbers.  Any residents charge is determined at the beginning of the process and is transparent.  End outcome is to look to achieve places people are proud to live in  Stewardship Hub is aiming to have around 5/6 hubs in 2024 and build from there based on interest from county councils and developers.</p> <p><u>Summary</u>  Implement hub in each county.  Start of each development – developer signs up to tri-partite agreement  POS is brought forward and transferred.  Housebuilders commit to using the Hub.  Facilities are transferred.</p> <p><b>Questions</b></p> <p>Paul  Q: Reference to procurement frameworks, please can you expand?  A: The Hub specialise in open space management. CMA highlighted overcharging and poor service. HUB would hold the service providers to a level of standards. These would be a minimum set of standards to tender under the Hub for a management contract. Should the provider not meet the Hub’s standards, they will be replaced. This provides home owners a certainty to standard of management. The ownership of land would be under The Hub to ensure easy switching of providers.  The hub also seeking to deliver county level arrangements to encourage cost efficiencies through local supply chain networks.</p> <p>Sarah  Q: Role of LPA (planning role), please explain agreement principles  A: hub is still evolving. The Hub is doing this at a county level. Understood the LPA is the determining authority but the aim is to get LPAs to agree that the Hub is an appropriate stewardship solution.</p>	

Item	Notes	Actions
	<p>Adam Birchall  Q: How do you perceive the interface with parishes, who often have a varied relationship with concepts of stewardship organisations?  A: Currently the Hub’s proposal has been very well received by stakeholders. Understood that this is not an inflexible solution and that there are local nuances. Parishes can participate in this as part of the solution.</p> <p>Q: Growing role of heat networks  A: Asset management could be put into the hub. Those are often commercial so may be kept by developer</p> <p>Q: Who is the privity of contract between ultimately in terms of performance?  A: The contract is with the Hub and is acting as the broker in the middle of developer and managing agent. The Hub will assess performance of the managing agent and remedy where necessary.</p> <p>Michael Brereton  Q:Timeline for west midlands region? Currently experiencing serious issues with current sites.  A: Happy to pick up separately.</p> <p>Q: Registered Providers  A: More than willing to embrace this approach as RPs have an even longer interest in the site and its success and are willing to buy in to something that guarantees a good solution.</p> <p>Barry Wyatt  Q: Sustainable drainage approval bodies. Assume this is something that could be taken on by the Hub?  A: Yes, SuDS can indeed be taken on by the Hub.</p> <p>Presentation to be circulated</p>	<p>Slides to be circulated</p>
<p>2</p> <p><b>Consultations, Lucy Hargreaves &amp; Rebecca Drake</b></p>	<p><b>Accelerated Planning System consultation, DLUHC</b>  Consultation live: 6<sup>th</sup> March – 1<sup>st</sup> May 2024</p> <p>Consultation seeks views on a range of proposals for an accelerated planning system:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The introduction of a new accelerated planning service which would offer a new application route with accelerated decision dates for major commercial applications and fee refunds wherever these are not met.</li> <li>2. Changes in relation to extensions of time agreements, including a new performance measure for speed of decision-making against statutory time limits, and an end to the use of extension of time agreements for housebuilder applications and repeat agreements for the same application for other types of application.</li> <li>3. An expansion of the current simplified householder and minor commercial appeal service to more written representation appeals.</li> </ol>	

Item	Notes	Actions
	<p>4. Detail on the broadening of the ability to vary a planning permission through section 73B applications and on the treatment of overlapping planning permissions.</p> <p>Accelerated planning service: All LPAs would be required to offer the accelerated planning service. Applicants would pay a higher fee but LPAs would have just 10 rather than 13 weeks to determine. Fee refunded if timescale not met.</p> <p>This would be for major commercial applications</p> <p>Two options being considered;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discretionary option, or</li> <li>• Mandatory option (where only accelerated planning is available for these types of applications)</li> </ul> <p>These applications would still be dealt with in the normal way. Fee is to cover the faster determination. Refund would kick in even if an extension of time has been agreed. Guidance is sought on this point however.</p> <p>New planning performance dashboard has been published. The draft will become a formal publication in June 2024. This is intended to be a helpful tool to help LPAs to improve their performance. Updates will happen every quarter.</p> <p>Changes to extension of times plus also banning these on householder applications.</p> <p>Proposing simplified process for planning appeals to cover more written reps appeals;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Seek to reduce pressure on LPAs</li> <li>- Supporting amends rather than appeals</li> </ul> <p>Varying planning permissions. Currently through NMAs and S73. Proposals to changes to these current routes.</p> <p><b>Questions</b></p> <p>Mike Garrity</p> <p>Q: Implication of timeline on accelerated planning. EOT have a role to play</p> <p>A: Statistics on EOT use have increased markedly. These should be used where helpful but it should however not be the default to add an EOT. This is a consultation and it is hoped that the consultation will provide some evidence on where best to make changes.</p> <p>Michael Brereton</p> <p>Q: concern on shortening timeframes due to capacity issues and that the planning system is more complex now than ever. What is intent of Gov to adequately resource?</p> <p>A: Fee uplift to enable resources. Fee will be a full cost recovery. Will be nationally set cost uplift</p>	

Item	Notes	Actions
	<p><b>Julie Shanahan – Presentation on PDR permitted development right (with PowerPoint slides)</b> consultation 8 week consultation closing 9<sup>th</sup> April.</p> <p>Highlights of the consultation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase single storey rear extension by 1m and double storey by 1m</li> <li>• Introduce wrap around extensions</li> <li>• Remove limit on max size loft conversions and allow ridge height increase by 30cm</li> <li>• Bike &amp; bin stores in front gardens</li> <li>• Extending upwards</li> <li>• Demolition and rebuild of buildings proposing alternative types of buildings allowed or other flexibilities on this PDR</li> <li>• EV charge points changes</li> <li>• Air source heat pumps: remove 1m boundary rule and introduce noise limits as opposed to size limits.</li> </ul> <p><b>Questions</b></p> <p>Concerns were raised on loss of fees from more PDR taking applications away but it was stated that as the current fees don't cover full costs it should be a net gain.</p> <p>Paul B Q: any update on local plan regs timescales? A: Cannot provide date</p> <p>Laura McCulloch Q: LNRS update A: no answer provided in meeting – will get back to you.</p> <p><b>Future Housing consultation – Mike Garrity</b></p> <p>Adept consultation response draft shown on screen.</p>	
3	AoB  N/A	

Item		Notes	Actions
4	Confirm date of next meeting	23 <sup>rd</sup> April 2024 at 11am (MS Teams)	