



OPEN REPORT

LOCAL PLAN SUB COMMITTEE 27TH SEPTEMBER 2023

LOCAL PLAN SUB COMMITTEE 27TH SEPTEMBER 2023

Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill – Consultation on Implementation of Plan Making Reforms

Report of Director of Regeneration and Policy

Report Author and Contact Details

Mike Hase, Policy Manager

Tel 01629 761251 email mike.hase@derbyshiredales.gov.uk

Wards Affected

All Outside of the Peak District National Park

Report Summary

The Government commenced a consultation on proposed changes to the arrangements for the preparation of Local Plans on 25th July 2023. It is seeking views on these proposals by 18th October 2023. This report provides details of those proposed changes and recommends a response to the Government.

Recommendations

1. That the contents of the consultation be noted.
2. That the recommended Officers' response to the consultation questions as set out in Appendix 2 forms the basis of a submission to the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities by the deadline of 18th October 2023.
3. That any additional comments from Members following consideration of this report be sent to the Policy Manager for inclusion in the submission to the Secretary of State by no later than 13th October 2023.
4. That authority be delegated to the Director of Regeneration and Policy to make the final submission to the Secretary of State on behalf of the District Council.

List of Appendices

Appendix 1 Copy of Consultation Proposals

Appendix 2 Officer Recommended Response to Consultation Questions

Background Papers

Details of the Government proposals can be found on the following website:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/plan-making-reforms-consultation-on-implementation/levelling-up-and-regeneration-bill-consultation-on-implementation-of-plan-making-reforms>

Consideration of report by Council or other committee

Details of consultation circulated to members of the Local Plan Sub Committee for information and initial comments. None received at time fo writing this report.

Council Approval Required

Yes

Exempt from Press or Public

No

Levelling UP and Regeneration Bill – Consultation on Implementation of Plan Making Reforms

1. Background

- 1.1 As some Members will be aware the Government has committed itself to making reforms to the planning system as part of its Levelling Up reforms that were first mooted in the [Levelling Up White Paper](#) published in February 2022.
- 1.2 The Government commenced on 25th July 2023 a 12 week public consultation on proposed changes that it would like to introduce as a means of improving the preparation of Local Plans, and at the same time make them faster to prepare, easier to understand and positively shaped by communities whose future area they are intended to influence. The Government is seeking responses to the public consultation by 18th October 2023.
- 1.3 A copy of the consultation and the questions is set out in **Appendix 1**.

2. Key Issues

- 2.1 The Government have indicated that they want to make it clearer what the role of plans should be, and what they should or might contain. It is suggested that the changes would allow them to be simpler, shorter and more visual, showing more clearly what is planned in local areas so that local communities and other users of the plan can engage more easily.
- 2.2 To achieve this, the Government suggest that local plans will need to contain a locally distinct vision which will anchor the plan, provide strategic direction for the underpinning policies and set out measurable outcomes for the plan period.
 - the vision should serve as a “golden thread” through the entire local plan, with policies and allocations linking directly to delivering the outcomes set out in the vision
 - the vision should set out measurable outcomes for the plan period, underpinned by the planning authority’s evidence base, which are actively monitored following adoption of the plan and
 - the vision should be supported by a key diagram which sets out the vision spatially for the plan area
- 2.3 In line with the Levelling up and Regeneration Bill it is proposed that the Government would prepare a suite of National Development Management policies. Local Plans would include locally generated development management policies that should be underpinned by appropriate justification and wherever possible enable delivery of the Plan’s vision.
- 2.4 One of the criticisms from the Government is that Local Plans lack standardisation and consistency which make it challenging for users to use. It is proposed that nationally defined digital templates be introduced to help

local planning authorities prepare their plans within the prescribed 30 month timescale.

2.5 A timeframe of 30 months (two and half years) is proposed to prepare and adopt a plan. The process will become more standardised for planning authorities to follow. Before the timeframe begins, planning authorities would need to undertake preparatory work to be in the best position to start their plan, and will be required to announce when the formal plan preparation process will start.

2.6 To achieve the proposed 30 month timescale it is proposed that there would be a number of key stages and activities:

- A scoping and early participation stage
- Plan visioning and strategy development
- Evidence gathering and drafting the plan
- Engagement, proposing changes and submission of the plan

2.7 It is proposed that a project management approach is taken to the development of a Local Plan, with the Government's advice being that to meet the 30 month timescales that local planning authority should have the necessary resources in place to ensure that the team can focus on the plan content and stakeholder engagement. A Project Initiation Document is proposed to be used by local planning authorities at the outset to essentially set out the scope of the plan, local issues, governance arrangements, and the overall community engagement processes.

2.8 The four preparation stages set out above are intended to be defined by the Government to ensure that the 30 month timetable is adhered to so far as is possible.



2.9 It is considered by the Government that one way to speed up the production of plans and make the process simpler and more accessible is by making best use of digital technology. The Government advises that digital technology and support authorities in plan-making and has been proven to improve accessibility, when used alongside more traditional methods of engagement.

2.10 The Government has an ambition for digital plan making to provide faster, simpler, more accessible plans and policies to deliver better outcomes, informed by up-to-date data and shaped more actively by communities and other stakeholders.

2.11 The approach being advocated is that Regulations will seek to ensure planning data is open enabling users to freely reuse it, and that data is standardised for use. It is however, acknowledged that there is still some way to go before digital plan making is a fully viable proposition. As such the Government has put in place a PropTech Innovation Fund to help deliver better plans;

- Visualisation of plans, policies and spatial data
- templates, checklists and step-by-step guides to provide clarity and efficiencies
- standardisation of data for consistency, access and use
- dashboards and platforms for transparency and communication
- search tools to better access information
- automation tools and AI to process and report
- the sharing of best practice via case studies and blogs

2.12 To ensure that the plan making process remains on timetable the Government is proposing to require local planning authorities to prepare their timetable consistently and to report against the same milestones, and the Local Development Scheme would not be required. It proposes that plan making be governed by a series of three Gateways. These would involve the local planning authorities progress being assessed by independent specialist support, including the Planning Inspectorate. They are envisaged to be essentially advisory checks, except the final gateway which would be a binding stop/go check which would allow, or otherwise, a plan to proceed to examination. The costs of gateway assessments would be recovered.

	 Gateway 1 (Advisory)	 Gateway 2 (Advisory)	 Gateway 3 (Stop/Go)
 Focus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring the plan sets off in the right direction • Supporting early diagnosis of potential issues – legal and procedural requirements and soundness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting early resolution of potential soundness issues, where possible • Ensuring legal and procedural compliance • Monitoring and tracking progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checking the plan is ready to proceed to examination • Ensuring legal and procedural compliance • Monitoring and tracking progress
 Role	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising, observing and supporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advising, observing and supporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validating that key requirements have been met (a "stop/go" check)
 Duration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 weeks (up to 6 by exception) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 weeks (up to 6 by exception) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 weeks (up to 6 by exception)
 Assessor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent, specialist hands-on support • May involve Planning Inspectors (as required) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Inspectors • Optionally supported by technical specialists 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Inspectors

- 2.13** The Government still advocates a strong evidence base to inform and support plans, but at the same time the weight of evidence is often seen as being disproportionate. The Government are therefore considering the requirements and approaches to the evidence base such that it still delivers a plan within the 30 month timeframe. As part of this the Government is considering more use of standard data and freezing data at particular points in time during the plan making process. It is proposed that only documents required to support the soundness of the plan need be submitted to the Secretary of State.
- 2.14** To deliver a quicker preparation of plans the Government is suggesting that Examination in Publics last no more than six months, although this would be beyond the 30 month timeframe. Most of the proposed changes are however envisaged to be procedural.
- 2.15** At the same as wanting to speed up the plan preparation process the Government is also wanting to increase the amount of engagement that takes place during the plan making process. It suggests four themes:
- Greater role for digital
 - Planning and monitoring the engagement approach
 - Focus of early participation
 - Standardised approach to consultation.
- 2.16** The requirements would do away with the District Council to prepare a Statement of Community Involvement, which allow for more creativity and innovation in approaches to engagement as set out in the Project Initiation Document. There would also be a need for local planning authorities to notify stakeholders and invite early participation on matters that might shape the direction of the plan. This would sit in the scoping period prior to the commencement of the 30 month timeframe. The two statutory consultations would still remain but with longer time periods than previously.
- 2.17** It is proposed that if local planning authorities are not getting the assistance from relevant statutory bodies that it can formally inform the body of the need to provide relevant assistance through the Requirement to Assist proposal.
- 2.18** Whilst still maintaining the necessity to monitor local plans the Government is suggesting a new more focussed approach. This would involve the Government setting out a minimum number of metrics that local planning authorities would need to report on annually and how successful they have been in the implementation of their specific vision for the local plan.

PROPOSED MONITORING METRICS	DETAIL OF METRICS
Housing	Net additional dwellings completed (including conversions)
	Net affordable units completed
	Proportion of new homes permitted on brownfield land
	Net additional pitches & plots for gypsies and travellers
Economy	Net change in employment floorspace
Environment and Open space	Net change in designated open space
	Net change in designated habitats due to development
	Delivery of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain
	Progress toward net zero emissions from buildings (to be developed)
Minerals*	Aggregate landbank
	Amount (ha) of non-mineral development granted permission in a Mineral Safeguarding Area despite a Mineral Planning Authority objection
Waste*	Waste generated (split by waste stream)
	Waste management methods (% recycled, recovered and disposed)
	Capacity at waste management facilities (split by management method)
Environmental Outcome Reports (EORs)	Assessment of the contribution to meeting Environmental Outcomes and identification of any remedial action that needs to be undertaken

2.19 Other aspects of the proposals include the ability for local planning authorities to prepare statutory Supplementary Plans, which the Government see as being used to react quickly to changes in local circumstances. These could be used, for example, to put in place a design

code or masterplan for a site allocated in a local plan. It is suggested that they should not duplicate any future national development management policies, and must be in conformity with the relevant spatial development strategy (local plan). They must also be subject to formal consultation and independent examination, and can only be adopted if it is considered that they have met the relevant procedural requirements.

- 2.20** Existing Supplementary Planning Documents will remain in force until local planning authorities adopt a new style local plan. However it is envisaged that where Local Plans are under review existing SPDs consideration should be given to identifying content to be taken forward in a new local plan.
- 2.21** The consultation confirms that the cut off date for the submission of local plans under the current system will be 30th June 2025, and that these plans will in general need to be adopted by 31st December 2026. Any plans not meeting the 30th June 2025 submission deadline will be required to prepare plans under the new plan-making system.
- 2.22** The Government propose that the related regulations, policy and guidance would be in place by Autumn 2024.
- 2.23** Much of what has been included within this consultation has added to the scope of the consultation undertaken in December 2022 or confirmed the Government's intention to move forward with its proposals as envisaged in December 2022.
- 2.24** Many of the suggestions contained within the consultation are intended to speed up the preparation and adoption of local plans, as well as make them more accessible to local communities. As such the proposal for a well-articulated vision for the local area, with locally distinct development management policies is supported.
- 2.25** Whilst the headline timeframe is identified by the Government is 30 months in reality taking the four month scoping phase and the six month examination in public phase into account the overall time for the preparation of a local plan will be up to 33% longer at 40 months.
- 2.26** It is considered that the more formal 'project management' approach with reviews to the preparation of local plans is wholly appropriate. Although local planning authorities paying for the costs of gateway reviews, when changes are not instigated by local planning authorities seems unreasonable, especially as in order areas for example Biodiversity Net Gain the Government has provided additional burdens funding.
- 2.27** The Government has recognised that local planning authorities have resource capacity issues and put in place capacity and capability measures to help delivery this new regime. However other agencies involved in the plan-making process including the Planning Inspectorate may themselves have resource issues which are/have not been adequately addressed. As such to achieve this new plan-making

regime as envisaged, it will require there to be adequate resources available for each agency involved.

- 2.28** Any resource capacity issues will have an impact upon the potential for local planning authorities to deliver these reforms. In the event that the timescales are not met the Government has not indicated what, other than possibly 'calling-in' a plan, the penalties may be for a local planning authority not achieving the set timeframes. Having an understanding of what interventions may apply is likely to dictate the extent to which a local planning authority fully engages in the reforms.
- 2.29** There is advantage in trying to standardise the content of local plans, however care needs to be taken to ensure that the 'local' issues that they are meant to address are not missed by this process. Similarly the approach to standardised monitoring data should also ensure that the 'local' aspects of a plan are not overlooked.
- 2.30** The approach to utilising digital data to support the preparation of plans should be supported as it should allow for the preparation time for plans to be shortened – although this does assume that all data required to underpin plans is available from the relevant agencies. However the Requirement to Assist should help local planning authorities as it puts an appropriate responsibility on the different bodies to provide relevant data/information necessary to progress local plans.
- 2.31** Although digital technology is significantly more widespread than ever before in a rural area such as Derbyshire Dales there is inevitably some locations where online access is going to be limited. Furthermore with an aging population, Derbyshire Dales is likely to have proportionally more people with no or limited access to digital technology either by choice or by availability of facilities. As such it is imperative that access to plans remains available to those without access to digital technology.
- 2.32** Supplementary Plans will replace Supplementary Planning Documents, and because they will be subject to Examination in Public they will have greater weight in the determination of planning applications. As the intention is that Supplementary Planning Documents will remain in force until new style plans are adopted and the suggestion is that existing Supplementary Planning Documents are integrated into local plans it is considered that their value in the determination of planning applications will not be lost.
- 2.33** The transitional arrangements appear reasonable, however as plans submitted before 30th June 2025 will be examined under the current arrangements it will still necessitate local planning authorities such as Derbyshire Dales to engage in the Duty to Co-operate and satisfy the Test of Soundness, which are likely to be a higher bar than emerging under the new system. However this has to be balanced against that for Derbyshire Dales delaying the adoption of a new local plan will

expose the local planning authority to risk of speculative development in unfavoured locations.

2.34 The recommended responses to the questions posed by this consultation are set out in Appendix 2

3. Options Considered and Recommended Proposal

3.1 As this is a Government consultation no options have been considered by the District Council at this time. The implementation of any proposed changes to the NPPF, and legislation both in the short and medium term will require further consideration by the District Council in the future.

3.2 The recommended responses to the questions posed by this consultation are set out in **Appendix 2**.

4. Consultation

4.1 Members of the Local Plan Sub Committee were asked for their views on this consultation, prior to the preparation of this report.

5. Timetable for Implementation

5.1 The Government has indicated that the legislation to introduce these changes will be in place by Autumn 2024.

5.2 The District Council will need to ensure that in order to progress the completion of the review of the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan that the updated plan is submitted to the Secretary of State by 30th June 2025.

5.3 Failure to meet this will require the District Council to prepare a new Local Plan under the auspices of the new regime.

6. Policy Implications

6.1 None at this time.

6.2 Any changes to the legislation introduced by the Government following this consultation will require the District Council to consider the implications for the ongoing review of the Derbyshire Dales Local Plan.

6.3 It will also be necessary to consider the implications that any future national planning policy changes will have on the determination of future planning applications.

7. Financial and Resource Implications

- 7.1 None identified at this time - There are no costs associated with making the submission and in the short term.
- 7.2 Future changes to the process of preparing local plans and the necessity to achieve a 30-month timeframe are likely to require additional resources, both financial and human, to achieve. If any additional responsibilities are identified when the final legislation is set, the resource and financial implications will be identified to Members in a future report with a request for budget approval.
- 7.3 The financial risk of this report's recommendations is assessed as low.

8. Legal Advice and Implications

- 8.1 This report summarises for Members proposals published by the Government for updating the approach to the preparation of local plans.
- 8.2 Any future changes to national planning policy or legislation that has legal consequences will be advised to Members at the appropriate time.
- 8.3 There are 4 recommended decision to be taken in connection with this report and the legal risk associated with the decision as recommended has been assessed as low.

9. Equalities Implications

- 9.1 No specific equality issues arise directly for the District Council as a consequence of this consultation. The implementation of any of the proposed changes in the future may have equality implications. These will be addressed at the time.

10. Climate Change and Biodiversity Implications

- 10.1 These consultation proposals do not have any direct Climate Change or Biodiversity implications.

11. Risk Management

- 11.1 There are no risks associated with this report.

Report Authorisation

Approvals obtained from:-

	Named Officer	Date
Chief Executive	Paul Wilson	15/09/2023
Director of Resources/ S.151 Officer (or Financial Services Manager)	Karen Henriksen	15/09/2023
Monitoring Officer (or Legal Services Manager)	Kerry France	18/09/2023

APPENDIX 1

**LEVELLING UP AND REGENERATION BILL – CONSULTATION ON
IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN MAKING REFORMS**

APPENDIX 2 – DRAFT RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION QUESTIONS

CONSULTATION QUESTION	PROPOSED DERBYSHIRE DALES RESPONSE
Question 1: Do you agree with the core principles for plan content? Do you think there are other principles that could be included?	Yes – although in reality much of what is being asked for is the same as sought in current Local Plans.
Question 2: Do you agree that plans should contain a vision, and with our proposed principles preparing the vision? Do you think there are other principles that could be included?	Many of the suggestions contained within the consultation are intended to speed up the preparation and adoption of local plans, as well as make them more accessible to local communities. As such the proposal for a well-articulated vision for the local area, with locally distinct development management policies is supported.
Question 3: Do you agree with the proposed framework for local development management policies?	Yes – so long as they allow local authorities to apply locally derived policies.
Question 4: Would templates make it easier for local planning authorities to prepare local plans? Which parts of the local plan would benefit from consistency?	Templates would help local planning authorities to prepare Local Plans. They should not necessarily be taken to be slavishly adhered to otherwise any scope for local flexibility will be lost.
Question 5: Do you think templates for new style minerals and waste plans would need to differ from local plans? If so, how?	No Comment
Question 6: Do you agree with the proposal to set out in policy that planning authorities should adopt their	In principle there is to objection to setting a timescale for the adoption of a new Local Plan. The proposal of 30 months will be challenging especially

CONSULTATION QUESTION	PROPOSED DERBYSHIRE DALES RESPONSE
<p>plan, at the latest, 30 months after the plan preparation process begins?</p>	<p>given the current level of resources invested in local planning authorities and other agencies associated with the Planning System.</p> <p>However other agencies involved in the plan-making process including the Planning Inspectorate may themselves have resource issues which are/have not been adequately addressed. As such to achieve this new plan-making regime as envisaged, it will require there to be adequate resources available for each agency involved</p>
<p>Question 7: Do you agree that a Project Initiation Document will help define the scope of the plan and be a useful tool throughout the plan making process?</p>	<p>It is considered that the more formal 'project management' approach with reviews to the preparation of local plans is wholly appropriate.</p>
<p>Question 8: What information produced during plan-making do you think would most benefit from data standardisation, and/or being openly published?</p>	<p>Whatever data is provided it must be focussed on local planning authority areas and not just local authority areas e.g. Derbyshire Dales and Peak National Park are separate local planning authorities with 50% overlap with data at local authority level makes it very difficult to distinguish between the two.</p>
<p>Question 9: Do you recognise and agree that these are some of the challenges faced as part of plan preparation which could benefit from digitalisation?</p>	<p>The approach to utilising digital data to support the preparation of plans is supported as it should allow for the preparation time for plans to be shortened – although this does assume that all data required to</p>

CONSULTATION QUESTION	PROPOSED DERBYSHIRE DALES RESPONSE
<p>Are there any others you would like to add and tell us about?</p>	<p>underpin plans is available from the relevant agencies. However the Requirement to Assist should help local planning authorities as it puts an appropriate responsibility on the different bodies to provide relevant data/information necessary to progress local plans.</p>
<p>Question 10: Do you agree with the opportunities identified? Can you tell us about other examples of digital innovation or best practice that should also be considered?</p>	<p>No Comments</p>
<p>Question 11: What innovations or changes would you like to see prioritised to deliver efficiencies in how plans are prepared and used, both now and in the future?</p>	<p>The use of more digital technologies is to be welcomed, however it is important that this does not discriminate against those who do not have access to or do not wish to access digital technology.</p>
<p>Question 12: Do you agree with our proposals on the milestones to be reported on in the local plan timetable and minerals and waste timetable, and our proposals surrounding when timetables must be updated?</p>	<p>Setting milestones for the preparation of a Local Plan is important to ensure that the community and developers know how local planning authorities are progressing against the timetable. How they are published should be determined locally.</p>
<p>Question 13: Are there any key milestones that you think should automatically trigger a review of the local plan timetable and/or minerals and waste plan timetable?</p>	<p>No Comments</p>

CONSULTATION QUESTION	PROPOSED DERBYSHIRE DALES RESPONSE
Question 14: Do you think this direction of travel for national policy and guidance set out in this chapter would provide more clarity on what evidence is expected? Are there other changes you would like to see?	Yes – it gives a clear idea of the Governments thinking on what it expects in the future
Question 15: Do you support the standardisation of evidence requirements for certain topics? What evidence topics do you think would be particularly important or beneficial to standardise and/or have more readily available baseline data?	Housing as a minimum, all others could be determined locally
Question 16: Do you support the freezing of data or evidence at certain points of the process? If so which approach(es) do you favour?	Yes – it will ensure that there is no unnecessary delay to the holding of the Examination in Public whilst the implications of any published updated data is considered further, which would thereby delay the finalisation of the Local Plan.
Question 17: Do you support this proposal to require local planning authorities to submit only supporting documents that are related to the soundness of the plan?	Yes – this will ensure that no extraneous material is published.
Question 18: Do you agree that these should be the overarching purposes of gateway assessments? Are there other purposes we should consider alongside those set out above?	Yes these allow for assessment of progress to be reviewed, and if necessary corrected going forward.

CONSULTATION QUESTION	PROPOSED DERBYSHIRE DALES RESPONSE
Question 19: Do you agree with these proposals around the frequency and timing of gateways and who is responsible?	The duration appears reasonable however they need to ensure that they do not result in being too onerous on local planning authorities, otherwise the benefit will not be derived from them.
Question 20: Do you agree with our proposals for the gateway assessment process, and the scope of the key topics? Are there any other topics we should consider?	Yes they seem reasonable – subject to the caveat that they should not be made too onerous for local planning authorities.
Question 21: Do you agree with our proposal to charge planning authorities for gateway assessments?	No – these are new Government initiative and creates additional burdens on local planning authorities. The costs of the Gateway reviews should be funded by Government as it does with other additional burdens
Question 22: Do you agree with our proposals to speed up plan examinations? Are there additional changes that we should be considering to enable faster examinations?	Yes – so long as the costs do not rise significantly to the local planning authorities as a result of additional Planning Inspectors having to be engaged
Question 23: Do you agree that six months is an adequate time for the pause period, and with the government’s expectations around how this would operate?	Yes
Question 24: Do you agree with our proposal that planning authorities should set out their overall approach to engagement as part of their Project Initiation Document? What should this contain?	Yes

CONSULTATION QUESTION	PROPOSED DERBYSHIRE DALES RESPONSE
Question 25: Do you support our proposal to require planning authorities to notify relevant persons and/or bodies and invite participation, prior to commencement of the 30 month process?	Yes – it will give the agencies the time to prepare themselves for when data will be requested to assist with the preparation of new or revised Local Plans.
Question 26: Should early participation inform the Project Initiation Document? What sorts of approaches might help to facilitate positive early participation in plan-preparation?	If there is any early engagement there is no reason why it should not be taken into account in the PID
Question 27: Do you agree with our proposal to define more clearly what the role and purpose of the two mandatory consultation windows should be?	Yes – this will provide more certainty for all involved in the plan preparation process including the local community, and the development industry about what the expectations about each stage of consultation is.
Question 28: Do you agree with our proposal to use templates to guide the form in which representations are submitted?	Yes – this will make it easier for submissions to be analysed. But will need to ensure that other comments received in other forms are still eligible.
Question 29: Do you have any comments on the proposed list of prescribed public bodies?	No Comments
Question 30: Do you agree with the proposed approach? If not, please comment on whether the alternative approach or another approach is preferable and why.	Yes – any early engagement with agencies will be supported.
Question 31: Do you agree with the proposed requirements for monitoring?	A simplified and consistent approach to monitoring is to be welcomed.

CONSULTATION QUESTION	PROPOSED DERBYSHIRE DALES RESPONSE
Question 32: Do you agree with the proposed metrics? Do you think there are any other metrics which planning authorities should be required to report on?	Yes - they appear to be most relevant matters communities are interested in.
Question 33: Do you agree with the suggested factors which could be taken into consideration when assessing whether two or more sites are 'nearby' to each other? Are there any other factors that would indicate whether two or more sites are 'nearby' to each other?	Whether sites are nearby is irrelevant – it should be up to the local planning authority to determine what the contents of a Supplementary Plan should contain.
Question 34: What preparation procedures would be helpful, or unhelpful, to prescribe for supplementary plans? e.g. Design: design review and engagement event; large sites: masterplan engagement, etc.	When and what Supplementary Plans should be dictated by the local planning authorities taking account of local circumstances. Government can provide some guidance on areas in the NPPF etc
Question 35: Do you agree that a single formal stage of consultation is considered sufficient for a supplementary plan? If not, in what circumstances would more formal consultation stages be required?	Yes – As they are most likely to be single subject plans it is not considered necessary for them to have more than one single consultation period. Any more will delay their preparation, adoption and their usefulness in implementation
Question 36: Should government set thresholds to guide the decision that authorities make about the choice of supplementary plan examination routes? If so, what thresholds would be most helpful? For example, minimum size of development planned for, which could be quantitative both in terms of land use	No – all Supplementary Plans should be subject to examination – preferably by Written Reps.

CONSULTATION QUESTION	PROPOSED DERBYSHIRE DALES RESPONSE
and spatial coverage; level of interaction of proposal with sensitive designations, such as environmental or heritage.	
Question 37: Do you agree that the approach set out above provides a proportionate basis for the independent examination of supplementary plans? If not, what policy or regulatory measures would ensure this?	Yes – it allows for an examination of the factors relevant to the Supplementary Plans
Question 38: Are there any unique challenges facing the preparation of minerals and waste plans which we should consider in developing the approach to implement the new plan-making system?	No Comments
Question 39: Do you have any views on how we envisage the Community Land Auctions process would operate?	No Comments
Question 40: To what extent should financial considerations be taken into account by local planning authorities in Community Land Auction pilots, when deciding to allocate sites in the local plan, and how should this be balanced against other factors?	No Comments
Question 41: Which of these options should be implemented, and why? Are there any alternative options that we should be considering?	The options for the roll out of new style plans starting with a small number of front runner local planning authorities is sensible. However after that the options appear to be a bit convoluted. It is considered that a much simpler idea would be to

CONSULTATION QUESTION	PROPOSED DERBYSHIRE DALES RESPONSE
	allow local planning authorities to determine when they wish to commence the preparation of a new plan and ensure they have a new plan in place by a set back stop date depending upon local circumstances.
Question 42: Do you agree with our proposals for saving existing plans and planning documents? If not, why?	Yes
Question 43: Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?	No Comments