

**REPORT OF THE HEAD OF PLANNING**  
**RE: GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON STREAMLINING**  
**INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS FOR PLANNING APPLICATIONS**



Hinckley & Bosworth  
Borough Council

*A Borough to be proud of*

**ALL WARDS**

---

1. **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To advise Members of, and to seek Members` agreement on, the appended consultation response on the proposed changes to the Streamlining information requirements for planning applications consultation, issued by the Department of Communities and Local Government in July 2012.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

That Members:

- (i) note the content of the report, in particular the proposed changes to the publicity of planning applications; and
- (ii) agree the appended consultation response.

3. **BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT**

The Plan for Growth, issued alongside the 2011 Budget, announced a programme of measures to simplify and streamline the arrangements for making and determining planning applications in England which reflects the wider ambition to make the planning system more efficient and positive in outlook and operation.

The Killian Pretty Review 2008 recommended that information requirements for all planning applications should be made clearer, simpler and more proportionate, with unnecessary requirements removed. A range of regulatory, policy and guidance changes were then made, but concern about disproportionate information persists.

The key issue is that the right information must be available, at an appropriate time, to support good decision-making. The National Planning Policy Framework guides applicants to discuss information requirements with the local planning authority and key consultees early on. The changes proposed here support this approach: they remove nationally-imposed requirements that are not needed for every application, allowing space for local agreement on what is needed.

**Scope of Proposed Changes**

The paper seeks views on two sets of changes to secondary legislation and one change to the standard application form:

- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| Proposal A | Reduce the nationally-prescribed information requirements for outline planning applications                            |
| Proposal B | Strong encouragement for local planning authorities to keep their local information requirements under frequent review |
| Proposal C | Amalgamate standard application form requirements for agricultural land declarations and ownership certificates        |

## **What would remain the same?**

This paper does not propose changes to the following:

Primary legislation. There is no immediate vehicle for further reforms to primary planning legislation. Substantive improvements can be made through changes to existing secondary legislation, though the strength of existing primary legislation on local authority powers to require information is a point of concern.

The basic information requirements for planning applications prescribed nationally.

Design and Access Statements. Requirements for these have already been scaled back, and the Government does not wish to undermine the ability to promote good design through the planning system. However it is open to views for changes that could be made, especially at the outline stage.

Local planning authority powers to decline to determine an outline application if they are unable to do so unless further details (relating to 'reserved matters') are submitted.

Requirements in respect of other regulations such as Environmental Impact Assessments and the Habitats Regulations.

### 4. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS [PE]**

None arising directly from this report.

### 5. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS[MR]**

None arising directly from the response.

### 6. **CORPORATE PLAN IMPLICATIONS**

This document contributes to Strategic Aim 2 of the Corporate Plan.

- Thriving economy.

### 7. **CONSULTATION**

The appended response is on behalf of this Authority. Neighbouring Authorities in England, applicants and third parties can respond independently should they wish.

### 8. **RISK IMPLICATIONS**

It is the Council's policy to proactively identify and manage significant risks which may prevent delivery of business objectives.

It is not possible to eliminate or manage all risks all of the time and risks will remain which have not been identified. However, it is the officer's opinion based on the information available, that the significant risks associated with this decision / project have been identified, assessed and that controls are in place to manage them effectively.

The following significant risks associated with this report / decisions were identified from this assessment:

Management of significant (Net Red) Risks		
Risk Description	Mitigating actions	Owner
None		

9. **KNOWING YOUR COMMUNITY – EQUALITY AND RURAL IMPLICATIONS**

Annex 3: Consultation Stage Impact Assessment

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2169897.pdf>

10. **CORPORATE IMPLICATIONS**

By submitting this report, the report author has taken the following into account:

- Community Safety implications
- Environmental implications
- ICT implications
- Asset Management implications
- Human Resources implications
- Planning Implications
- Voluntary Sector

---

Background papers: Streamlining information requirements for planning applications:  
Consultation

Contact Officer: Cathy Horton, Principal Planning Officer (Ext 5605)

Executive Member: Stuart Bray



## **Response form**

### **Streamlining information requirements for planning applications: Consultation**

We are seeking your views to the following questions on the proposals to streamline information requirements for outline planning applications, encouraging local authorities to review their local lists taking into account cost burdens, and changes to the standard application form.

How to respond:

**The closing date for responses is 11 September 2012.**

This response form is saved separately on the DCLG website.

Responses should be sent preferably by email:

Email responses to: [info.requirements@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:info.requirements@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

Written responses to:

Julie Shanahan  
Information Requirements Consultation  
Department for Communities and Local Government  
Planning Directorate  
Zone 1/J3  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London SW1E 5DU

## About you

### i) Your details:

Name:	Cathy Horton
Position:	Principal Planning Officer
Name of organisation (if applicable):	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Address:	Argents Mead Hinckley Leicestershire LE10 1BZ
Email:	cathy.horton@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk
Telephone number:	01455 255605

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

Organisational response

Personal views

### iii) Please tick the box which best describes you or your organisation:

District Council

Metropolitan district council

London borough council

Unitary authority/county council/county borough council

Parish council

Community council

- Non-Departmental Public Body (NDPB)
- Planner
- Professional trade association
- Land owner
- Private developer/house builder
- Developer association
- Voluntary sector/charity
- Other

(please comment):	
-------------------	--

**iv) What is your main area of expertise or interest in this work  
(please tick one box)?**

- Chief Executive
- Planner
- Developer
- Surveyor
- Member of professional or trade association
- Councillor
- Planning policy/implementation
- Environmental protection
- Other

(please comment):	
-------------------	--

Would you be happy for us to contact you again in relation to this questionnaire?

Yes  No

## ii) Questions

Please refer to the relevant parts of the consultation document for narrative relating to each question.

**Question 1: Do you agree with the proposal to remove the national requirement for details of layout to be specified at the outline stage, where layout is 'reserved'?**

Yes  No

Comments

The local planning authority will retain the power to require any details of the 'reserved matters' to be submitted with the outline application, if they consider this necessary.

**Question 2: Do you agree that there should not be a mandatory national requirement to provide details on scale at the outline stage, where scale is 'reserved'?**

Yes  No

Comments

The local planning authority will retain the power to require any details of the 'reserved matters' to be submitted with the outline application, if they consider this necessary.

**Question 3: Do you agree with the proposal to retain the national requirement for access points to be indicated in the outline planning application, even where access is 'reserved'?**

Yes  No

Comments

The local planning authority requires consultation from the County Highway Authority. Delays in receiving consultation responses, which may result in the need to request access information to be submitted, would result in further delays which could be avoided if this requirement is retained.

**Question 4: Do you consider that there would be merit in reviewing the content of Design and Access Statements where these are being provided in support of outline applications?**

Yes  No

Comments



In most instances applicants/agents require a proforma to guide the compilation of such documents. This should reflect any content requirements.

**Question 5: Are there any additional changes that could be made in respect of outline applications, to further reduce any unnecessary information requirements at that stage?**

Yes  No

Comments

**Question 6: Do you agree with the proposal to amend Articles 10 and 29 of the DMPO, to require local planning authorities (if they wish their local information requirements to have an impact on validation) to republish their local lists of information requirements (at least) every two years?**

Yes  No

Comments

Subject to no further requirements being imposed on the local planning authority.

**Question 7: Do you agree that the standard application form should be amended to include reference to agricultural tenants in the ownership certificate?**

Yes  No

Comments

**Question 8: Do you agree that the standard application form could be further rationalised?**

**If yes, please suggest components of the standard application form which could be omitted without affecting the ability of the local planning authority to determine the application.**

Yes  No

Comments

Removal of elements of the standard application form may result in delays and have resource implications.

**Question 9: Are there any further changes that could be made in respect of information requirements for planning applications?**

Yes  No

Comments

Production of guidance/example submissions for publication on websites to assist applicants/agents with submissions. To reduce the inconsistency between LPAs

**Question: Impact Assessment**

**Do you have any comments on the assumptions and analysis set out in the consultation stage Impact Assessment? (See Annex 3)**

**See also the further specific questions within that Impact Assessment**

Yes  No

Comments

**Thank you for your comments.**