

# B

## PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE – 10 JULY 2013

### PROPOSED NEW FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL REVISED 1APP (PLANNING APPLICATION) LOCAL REQUIREMENTS.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Government requires all Local Planning Authorities to review their Local 1APP planning information requirements (The Local Requirements) every two years, with the first review completed by the end of July this year. The Local Requirements mean that applicants must submit additional information, in terms of drawings and supporting documents, beyond the basic National Requirements which comprise the forms, fee, certificates, some drawings and Design and Access Statements in certain circumstances.
- 1.2 This matter was reported to the Planning Development Control Committee in May 2013, at which time the report attached as Appendix One and the Table attached as Appendix Two were agreed by Members for consultation purposes.
- 1.3 On the 9<sup>th</sup> May a substantial electronic consultation was launched, covering Town and Parish Councils, regular consultees and regular agents. All comments received as a result are set out in a summarised form below. They will be available in full on the day and can be inspected in full in advance if required.

#### 2. COMMENTS RECEIVED

##### 2.1 Ringwood Town Council:

Wish to see the requirement for Statements of Community Involvement retained.

Feel that Officers not applicants should decide when a Tree Assessment is required.

Consider that site location plans showing adjacent road names must be provided.

Stress the benefits of drawings showing the relationship between proposed and existing development in terms of elevations and block plans.

##### 2.2 Natural England:

It should be a requirement that applications assess the impact on nationally and internationally designated sites and habitats and species identified as of principal importance.

Reference should be made to Natural England's standing advice on protected species and the information available from The Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre in policy drivers.

2.3 NFDC Drainage Team:

Need to refer to NFDC and NFNPA Strategic Flood Risk Assessment as policy drivers.

2.4 Environment Agency:

No comments to make.

2.5 Cranbourne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB:

Applicants should be asked to confirm whether proposal lies within the AONB.

Applicants should be advised that a light pollution position statement is available.

Photographs should be retained as a mandatory requirement.

The AONB Management plan should be included as a policy driver re planning obligations.

Landscape character assessments should be required and landscape plans should be required whenever reference is made to its use as mitigation.

2.6 NFNPA Trees:

No comment as similar to the Park's requirements.

2.7 Southern Water:

The requirement for a foul sewerage, drainage and utilities assessment should be retained.

2.8 Highways Agency:

No specific comments.

2.9 HCC Archaeology:

Broadly endorses approach but notes need to require Heritage Statements when archaeological impacts and asks that this is included in the "when required" column.

Reference should be made to the Historic Environment Record and the County Archaeologist as a source of further assistance.

2.10 Ringwood and Fordingbridge Ramblers Association:

Plans should show rights of way with information as to whether any will be affected.

2.11 Colin Burt (Regular Agent):

Welcomes the reduction in required information and the lesser sets of plans etc but requests the ability to still submit in a paper format.

2.12 Barley Associates Ltd (Agent):

Concerned as to the cost of affordable housing contributions and Code Level requirements and ask that these are looked at as part of the review process.

### 3. THE PROPOSED RESPONSE

3.1 The proposed changes are shown in bold text on the Table attached as Appendix Two. The proposed changes, and indeed the entire 1APP process, must be seen in context. The Council can still require the submission of such additional information as it considers necessary once the application has been registered and the Case Officer has undertaken an initial evaluation. The only change is that all the information will no longer be required in respect of every application, whether it is relevant or not. This proportionate approach fully reflects the Government's move away from front loading the planning application process towards using existing powers to require further information after registration, following a more thorough and informed look at the proposals and the issues raised. It is also a more efficient use of resources and will meet customer expectations, especially if they make use of the extensive pre application advice service now available.

3.2 The comments not taken on board are set out below, together with the reasons why they were not accepted.

Statement of Community Involvement: It is not felt this should be a mandatory requirement for all large scale applications or that it could be an essential requirement post registration. However, the benefits of such a document can be made clear at the pre application stage, as many agents already support proposals by stressing who they consulted and when. Such information can be requested post registration if required.

Tree Assessments: It is the Officers who decide when a Tree Assessment is required and this is normally identified as part of pre application discussions.

Site Location Plans: These are a national requirement, with set parameters that we cannot particularly influence. We can however encourage applicants to provide such information when we cannot easily identify the site.

Location of Existing Development: Our Local Requirements already seek this in terms of elevations and plans and, while we could be dogmatic, we apply the requirements proportionally. It may only be post registration that the need for such detailed information becomes clear, at which point it can be requested.

Landscape Character Assessments: It is not felt that all applications in the AONB need to be supported by a Landscape Impact Assessment. Cases where they are required can be identified post registration.

AONB Management Plan: It is not felt that it is appropriate to refer to this with regard to possible planning contributions.

Foul Sewerage and Drainage Assessment: Changes in legislation are likely to mean these issues will be picked up in parallel to the planning process on Major sites. They will not always be necessary and the need for such a submission can be identified at the pre application stage or post receipt of an application following the initial Case Officer case review.

Rights of Way: It is a National Requirement that rights of way are shown on location plans. It would not be reasonable to require applicants to identify when they would be affected. This is however a valid consideration for the Case Officers to identify and take on board.

Affordable Housing and Code Level Requirements: Points noted, but they fall outside the scope of this review.

- 3.3 It should also be noted that since the NFDC 1APP consultation the Government have announced a relaxation in the national requirements for Design and Access Statements. These will only now be required to support Major development proposals and proposals in Conservation Areas for more than one dwelling or the erection of sizeable buildings. It is not felt that this change requires any amendment to the Local Requirements for the reasons set out in Paragraph 3.1.

#### **4. ENVIRONMENTAL, CRIME AND DISORDER, EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS**

- 4.1 The proposed revised 1APP requirements and the manner in which they are used would ensure that sufficient information is to hand regarding environmental, crime and disorder, equality and diversity during an application's process allowing this to be available to all interested parties and to be taken on board when the decision is reached.

#### **5. CONCLUSION**

- 5.1 In conclusion, the overall support for, and lack of objection to, the proposed Local 1APP requirements is welcomed. The comments received have led to minor but beneficial changes to the proposed requirements. The success or not of the Local Requirements will be judged over time. The two yearly review will include not just a look at the Requirements but also an examination of how they are used as part of the wider planning process. This will ensure that, overall, the Council's approach to dealing with development proposals and its Requirements are proportional and that, while requiring sufficient information is to hand to facilitate an informed decision, they do not unnecessarily inhibit development and allow the Council to work with applicants.

## 6. RECOMMENDATION

- 6.1 That the proposed Local 1APP Requirements as set out in the Table attached to this report be adopted.

### **For further information contact:**

David Groom  
Development Control Manager  
e-mail: [david.groom@nfdc.gov.uk](mailto:david.groom@nfdc.gov.uk)  
Tel: 023 8028 5345

### **Background Papers:**

Guidance on information requirements and validation  
DCLG March 2010  
Development Management Policy Annex DCLG  
March 2010  
Current NFDC Local List of 1APP  
requirements.(2008)