

Cheltenham Borough Council
Cabinet – 13th October 2020
Response to ‘Planning for the Future’ – ADDITIONAL
NOTE

Accountable member	Councillor Atherstone, Cabinet Member for Economy and Development
Accountable officer	David Oakhill

1. Further to the published Cabinet Paper – Response to ‘Planning for the Future’ – a Planning Liaison Member Working Group (PLMWG) was held on the 08/10/2020. The purpose of that meeting was to seek members’ views on ‘Planning for the Future’ to inform Cheltenham Borough Councils response to the consultation paper. The following are the key matters arising from PLMWG that will inform the Council’s final response, in no particular order:
 - a. Climate Change needs to be ‘front and centre’ not an afterthought.
 - b. The environment needs to be on an equal footing to development. Simplifying evidence requirements, particularly Environmental Impact Assessment requirements will have negative effects on the environment.
 - c. The introduction of a new planning system in England will take time. Those countries cited as positive examples of ‘zonal’ planning have had such systems for many years. Rushing implementation of a new planning system will have negative consequences.
 - d. More detail is required on proposed ‘zones’ to understand their effect and implementation. As presented they are too simplistic.
 - e. Through zoning how will matters such as connected natural spaces, green

corridors, water management systems be implemented? This needs to be clarified.

- f. Zoning land for growth needs due consideration, supported by evidence and community engagement. Proposed timeframes for Local Plan preparation will make this challenging.
- g. The proposed zones need to be expanded to cater for existing built up areas that neither require 'renewal' nor should be limited by 'protection'
- h. The future of local designations which align with current government guidance (for example Local Green Space designations) needs to be clarified.
- i. The removal of a 'duty to cooperate' is irresponsible and will not enable positive and proper planning for growth in areas such as Cheltenham.
- j. Public participation in the planning application process is particularly important and should not be removed. This is a serious concern.
- k. The white paper does not address land banking and/or the incentives and disincentives available to ensure land with permission is developed.
- l. Centralisation of control (setting development management policies, setting housing numbers for local authorities etc.) is a real concern. This ignores local circumstances.
- m. Any exclusion of the public and members from individual planning decisions is a real concern.
- n. Despite the promise in the white paper, it is unclear how affordable housing delivery will be affected by the proposals. Furthermore the proposed delivery mechanism for affordable housing will likely incentivise offsite affordable housing delivery – damaging the aim of creating sustainable and mixed communities.