ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Date: Wednesday 17 July 2002

Time: 2.00 to 5.00 pm

Venue: Committee Room 3, National Assembly Building

PLANNING: DELIVERING FOR WALES.

THE WAY FORWARD

Purpose

1.1 The Committee is invited to consider the results of public consultation on "Planning: delivering for Wales" which was discussed at this Committee on 9 January 2002. An analysis of responses to the consultation is at Annex A.

Summary/Recommendations

2.1 The Committee is invited

- to note the current position with regard to "Planning : delivering for Wales",
- to note the Analysis of Responses at Annex A, and
- to agree that the proposals should be taken forward as appropriate in Wales through primary and secondary legislation, the preparation of guidance and advice, research and further discussion with partners.

Timing

3.1 It is essential for action to be taken to meet expectations for change, raised by the consultation process. The Deputy Prime Minister and the Planning Minister are keen to progress reform of the planning system in England. They are seeking early legislation to implement the changes proposed.

Background

4.1 'Planning: delivering for Wales' set out proposals to change the planning system in Wales, to improve the delivery of development plans and the decision making process. It issued for a 12 week consultation

period at the end of January. When consultation closed on 29 April some 203 responses had been received.

4.2 Planning Policy is also being reviewed in England. Stephen Byer's Planning Green Paper issued for consultation on 12 December 2001. The consultation closed on 17 March 2002. The paper received a considerable number of negative responses .

3. As was stated on 1 May at this Committee, I was invited to the House of Commons Transport, Local Government and the Regions Committee. The Committee was considering the English Planning Green paper. Its reportwas issued on 3 July 2002.

4. The Report comments positively on the approach of the Assembly Government in a number of areas.:

   ❍ a general welcome for the way that we are valuing what is good about the current system, while achieving a radical change in culture and operation;

   ❍ our proposed approach to the public scrutiny of applications in which local authorities have an interest ,and;

   ❍ the Welsh Assembly Government commitment to spatial planning, andits inclusinve preparation process.

4.5 In-house analysis of the responses to consultation indicates that there was widespread support for the proposals for change from a wide cross section of interests in Wales. The key priorities for action identified by consultees were:

1. Improvement to the development plan system

   2. Member and officer training

   3. Wales Spatial Plan to have statutory status

   4. Need for additional resource

  5. Annual monitoring reports on development plans and full review every five years

4.6The review process has been open and inclusive throughout, and the results of consultation and their implications will continue to be discussed with partners and key stakeholders. They were discussed with the WLGA on 25 June, the Welsh Planning Forum on 4 July. A meeting is to be held with Planning Lead Members and Chairs from each local authority in Wales on 17 July.

4.7 The WLGA agreed that the responses to consultation offered widespread support for change, and it would work with the Assembly to improve the planning system in Wales. The Welsh Planning Forum also supported the approach adopted. It was agreed that it would play a full and active part in taking forward the proposed changes.

Consideration

5.1 The proposals when implemented should lead to a change in the culture of planning in Wales and an improvement in the quality of the service provided. Some proposals will require primary and secondary legislation, and a variety of other actions such as the production of technical advice notes and guidance will be taken forward by the Assembly Government. Much will depend on the commitment of local authorities, and the co-operation of the private and voluntary sectors.

5.2 The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) is likely to seek early legislation to implement the proposals to reform the planning system in England and we need to identify our legislative needs

5.3 Primary legislation would be needed to replace the provisions for the planning system for England and Wales now set out in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and in related legislation. This will depend on the parliamentary timetable, which will be determined in the Queen's speech in November..

5.4 Secondary legislation and improving the process will be taken forward by the Welsh Assembly Government and the relevant organisations. I am considering asking the Welsh Planning Forum to form Task and Finish groups to take some of the more complex issues forward, looking at what needs to be changed. This approach worked well in developing Planning Policy Wales.

Development Plans

6.1 Consultation revealed dissatisfaction with progress in development plan preparation in Wales mirroring my concerns. Given the importance of such plans for consistent and clear planning decisions, it is essential that our requirements are taken forward through primary and secondary legislation, and procedural guidance prepared by the Assembly Government.

6.2 There was general support for the preparation of the Assembly's Wales Spatial Plan to be a statutory requirement, and for the plan to be accorded statutory status for use in the preparation of development plans and in decision making. This would be in line with current legislation, which requires development plans to take into account all relevant policy documents.

Planning Decision Making

7.1 There was also support for proposals to improve the planning decision making process to make it a more open, fairer system in which people can have more confidence. Planning: delivering for Wales sought views on proposals to enable the Assembly to introduce standard planning application forms, application delivery contracts, and to address issues related to repeat and twin tracked applications, completion notices and time limits on consents. Emerging from issues raised, there appears to be a need to address issues associated with outline planning permissions and to consider whether to replace them

with statements of development principles.

7.2 Planning: delivering for Wales also sought views on the justification for establishing Business Planning Zones in Wales. There was some support, but most respondents took the view that up to date development plans could provide the necessary guidance and encouragement for development. It seems likely that Business Planning Zones will be taken forward in England and, in due course, the Assembly Government will need to decide whether to do so in Wales.

7.3 While "Planning: delivering for Wales" sets out the main proposals for improving the planning system, proposals for the more effective operation of planning obligations and the compulsory purchase system were the subject of separate consultations in Wales. The UK government has also consulted on new ways for dealing with proposed major infrastructure projects.

Planning Obligations

8.1 Planning Obligations (known as S106 Agreements) can offer ways to enable development where the principle of the use proposed is acceptable. In some cases, this has the potential to require provision of infrastructure by the developer. In such circumstances, planning permission may be allowed subject to agreement with the developer on provision of the required infrastructure or services, which also provide overall community benefits. The UK Government is seeking to change the system for these obligations to make it more open and consistent. Consideration is being given to legislation to provide powers to enable local authorities to set tariffs and specify the types of development affected by planning obligations. Responses to the consultation in Wales are being analysed and proposals formulated.

8.2 It is important at this stage to secure the Assembly's position in relation to any future legislation for planning obligations. It would then be possible to implement such legislation as deemed appropriate to suit circumstances in Wales through secondary legislation.

Compulsory Purchase

9.1 Proposals to improve the Compulsory Purchase system in England and Wales were the subject of consultation early this year. There was support for replacing S226 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 by a new, more widely defined power, making it easier for planning authorities to assemble land for the purpose of carrying out development, redevelopment or improvement which it considers will be for the economic, social and/or environmental benefit of its area.

9.2 There was also support for the introduction of a 'Loss Payment' Regime to improve the compensation arrangements for those whose property is to be acquired, introducing additional "loss payments" for virtually all those who own or occupy such land. This also would require primary legislation.

Major Infrastructure

10.1 Members will be aware that proposals have been put forward by the UK Government for handling major infrastructure schemes in England, including a new Parliamentary procedure. In my view these do not apply in Wales, and I have informed the Minister for Planning in the UK Government of this view. Primary legislation would not, therefore, impact on the Assembly Government's powers to determine

these projects in Wales.

General

11.2 It is essential for the Assembly Government's position to be secured in the preparation of any future primary legislation, to enable the reforms set out in 'Planning: delivering for Wales', and elsewhere, to be taken forward, recognising the particular requirements of the planning system in Wales.

11.3 A key theme in the response to consultation was the lack of resources for the planning service. It is clear that this involves training for Members and Officers in local planning authorities as well as funding for staff, IT.

Financial Implications

12.1 there could be financial implications arising from discussion of the future resource needs of the planning service in Wales.

Compliance

13.1 The Welsh Assembly Government does not have devolved responsibility for the primary legislation needed to implement reform of the planning system. However Concordats with UK Government specify that it will consult the Assembly Government on proposed provisions relating to Wales. The Assembly has power to make the secondary legislation, which will provide the basis for the reform of the development plan and decision making processes.

13.2 There are no issues of regularity or propriety.

Cross -cutting themes

14.1 I am committed to continuing to work with partners in local government, the national parks, and with the public, private and voluntary sectors to ensure that the proposals to improve the planning system are taken forward. In particular, to work with the Planning Forum and in close consultation with Welsh local government.

Input from subject committee

15.1 The Committee is invited to

- note the results of consultation and the approach taken by the Welsh Assembly Government to reforms in Wales;

- support the Assembly's position and flexibility to respond to circumstances in Wales should be

protected in the preparation of any forthcoming primary legislation needed to implement the reforms

- support the proposal that secondary legislation should be prepared as necessary
- support the approach that the Minister for the Environment has adopted to work with partners in the public, private and voluntary sectors to carry through the reforms.

Sue Essex

July 2002

<div align="right">

Annex A

</div>

PLANNING: DELIVERING FOR WALES

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

CONTENTS

SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION

Background

1.1 Planning: delivering for Wales, published on 31st January 2002 included a wide range of proposals to improve and update the planning system in Wales.

1.2 The consultation document was issued following discussions with stakeholders including a "Welsh Planning Forum" in December 2001,which had more than 30 members, representing a wide spectrum of planning interests in Wales[2].

1.3 The consultation exercise is part of an ongoing process to improve the planning system. In March 2002, following another consultation exercise, the final version of "Planning Policy Wales" was published, setting out national planning policy for Wales. The Assembly has also consulted on ways to improve the system of Planning Obligations in Wales.

1.4 The purposes of the consultation exercise were to:

- test the acceptability of the proposals to those with an interest in the planning system in Wales;

- to obtain constructive feedback on the planning system in general; and

- suggest a way forward in Wales.

1.5 This document summarises the responses to the consultation document.

SECTION 2: RESPONSES

Background

2.1 Approximately 850 copies of the consultation document were sent out. A total of 203 responses were received, 2 of which were received too late to include on the database, but they have been included in this analysis.

Stakeholder groups

2.2 The stakeholders were assigned to one of the six groups listed on the response forms. The database

has recorded those respondents falling into more than one group.

Table 2.1

Broad Stakeholder Group	Detail of Stakeholder Group
Private sector	These included businesses with an interest in planning and consultants
Voluntary Sector	These were organisations which had a charity number.
Member of the public	Private individuals
Local Government	Local authorities Councillors Town/ Community Councils
Interest Group	Organisations/ Bodies representing the interest of a particular group including professional bodies and member organisation Political parties
Other	Non Departmental Public Bodies Other Public Bodies Academic Bodies

Analysis

2.3 The analysis gives a balanced view of responses received - this was not weighted in any way. The way forward will depend on further discussion of these results.

SECTION 3: KEY ISSUES RAISED FROM THE CONSULTATION

General Observations

3.1 There was universal support for the review, with many respondents agreeing that there was a need to improve the planning system in Wales so that it should :

- be open, fair and transparent
- inspire public and business confidence
- deliver improved quality and speed
- integrate with other plans, processes and actions

- meet our objectives in the Plan for Wales

3.2 No respondents disagreed with the premise that the system is basically sound. However, weaknesses in delivery were mentioned throughout the responses, problems with delay, cumbersome procedures, no certainty in the decision making process and outdated plans being most prominent.

3.3 There was some criticism that 'Planning: delivering for Wales' did not itself explain the proposals in enough detail to enable respondents to make informed choices. However, many commented that the document was written in easy to understand, plain language and included proposals which they thought could improve the operation of the planning system.

3.4 The importance of sustainability was emphasised by many of the respondents and the need for a clear definition of planning which emphasised this.

3.5 Respondents also pointed out the central paradox, the need to have reasonable speed and involvement. Many considered that more community involvement could slow the process down. However, most considered that participation and quality were crucial, and more important than speed alone.

3.6 Public participation was considered essential and efforts to improve this were welcomed.

National Policy

3.7 The open and inclusive approach the Assembly took when producing the document, and during consultation, was welcomed. It was stressed that speed should not take priority over an open process and that undue delay should not follow from adopting an inclusive approach. It was important that the inclusive and open process was not seen as tokenism and that, for example, the responses and the analysis of this consultation should be publicly available.

3.8 Respondents considered that national policy and technical advice should remain focused and concise but a balance needed to be struck between being overly concise and being clear. Policy documents should be updated frequently and interim Ministerial policy statements were welcomed. Respondents urged adoption of a more easily up-datable format for policy documents. The Planning Policy document was welcomed but there were some criticisms of TANs not being up to date and being too wordy and unclear.

3.9 Confusion on the meaning of the integration of Planning Policy Wales and Minerals Planning Policy Wales was evident. It was unclear whether this meant actually inserting the Minerals Policy as a whole to Planning Policy Wales as it is now or integrating it in Planning Policy Wales. There appeared to be some support for the integration of the documents.

3.10 Respondents expressed support for statutory status for the WSP and sought further clarification on the role of regional work. Concerns were raised that existing regional work is not fully inclusive.

Forward Planning

3.11 There was support for the plan-led system and for changes to development plan procedures to improve speed and quality of plan preparation. Concerns were raised that Planning: delivering for Wales did not contain enough detail for consultees to be able to give support for a change to Local Development Plans. Most respondents favoured Option B, introducing Local Development Plans, but many also commented on the need to consider the appropriate level of detail in such plans. A small number of respondents considered that the focus should be on improving the current Unitary Development Plan system and supplementary planning guidance.

3.12 Action Plans were favoured in principle, however there were important questions raised as to the level of detail, type and purposes of Action Plans. There was no strong support or evidence for Business Planning Zones from any sector. A number of respondents thought the objective could be achieved through other proposals including those for Local Development Plans and Action Plans.

3.13 Many respondents considered the existing system of plans was straightforward and that unnecessary change could cause confusion, and would require new guidance on national/regional plan/ policy linkages and status. There was clear support for map-based rather than criteria based policies.

3.14 Community involvement was favoured in principle as was improved involvement of third parties. For LDPs, respondents favoured impartial and public scrutiny. There were a variety of views on options for independent scrutiny of plans. There was support for a speedier process if it could be shown to be fair and thorough.

3.15 There was little support for a two year time scale for the production of LDPs without a major increase in resources. The conflict between greater inclusivity in the process and speed of delivery needed to be addressed. There were differing views on whether sanctions and penalties for LAs not meeting statutory plan requirement needed to be considered. Most people agreed that authorities should prepare the development plan to an agreed timetable. There was support for regular monitoring and review, but differing views over the frequency of such exercises.

3.16 The majority view was that effort should be concentrated on addressing the causes of delay and not penalising authorities. Default powers already exist for UDP preparation; greater use of these powers for LDPs would be contentious.

3.17 If the LDPs were accepted as the way forward, the overall feeling was that UDPs should be adopted before progressing towards LDPs. However, some respondents suggested proceeding with UDPs and merely changing the regulations for these plans. The Local Advisory Service for local authorities was generally supported though respondents asked for the idea to be explored further to clarify its purpose, role and resourcing.

Decision Making

3.18 Responses varied more widely than those on forward planning, depending on their sector of origin.

3.19 The proposal for a development control report linked to development plan monitoring was welcomed. However, respondents emphasised the need for the report to cover quality as well as quantity, and act as a 'quality assurance' report. Respondents wanted to see more detail of the form and

content of such reports.

3.20 A standardised checklist and planning application form was welcomed.

3.21 The proposal for Delivery Contracts received a mixed reaction - doubts were raised about the necessity for a legally binding contract. Suggestions were made that the 'contract' would be better used as a 'project management' tool for large developments. Concerns about the lack of transparency and lack of inclusion for third party objections were also raised. Some respondents considered that the 'delivery contract' was a positive mechanism which could provide time for environmental assessments to be prepared.

3.22 There was concern that charging for consultation could disadvantage some applicants. There was also concern about the resource implications for the health service of adding Health Authorities to the list of consultees.

3.23 Responses to proposals for Twin-tracking and Repeat applications were sector orientated. Developers were clearly against the proposals whilst others approved. Many commented that twin-tracked applications generate fees to local planning authorities and do not generate much more work for planning officers. Concerns were raised about the legal debate which could arise with the difficulty of defining 'specified time'; 'substantially similar'; 'material change in circumstances'. There was also concern about the lack of an appeal procedure if LPAs could decline to accept such applications. Some saw possible benefits in that this could mean less administrative work for local authorities and therefore release resources. Some considered twin-tracking a tool for the rich to abuse the planning system.

3.24 Most respondents rejected the concept of Master Planning Major Developments. Concerns were raised on the possibility that a developer and the LPA could agree parameters without public consultation. There were suggestions that Master Planning as part of the development plan rather than as part of the development control process.

3.25 The encouragement for access to all and improving customer care received unanimous support. Very positive and constructive suggestions were offered in the responses. Encouraging more openness of committees including opportunities for third parties to speak in planning committees was welcomed.

3.26 Respondents across all sectors were generally in favour of retaining existing targets, and considered quality of outcomes to be more important than speed.

3.27 Most responses recognised that reasons for approving applications were already presented in the officer's report to committee. Concerns were raised that the proposal could lead to third party rights of appeal and that it could waste resources. On the other hand reasons for approval were considered a positive step towards making the system transparent and open. Suggestions were made that reasons should be given for when the proposal represents a departure from the development plan and when the planning committee approves an application contrary to officer advice.

3.28 Some respondents considered that a review of Assembly casework was necessary. Many considered the time taken to process applications from call-in request to determination was too long. There were requests for the Assembly to introduce tougher and statutory targets for processing called-in applications.

3.29 Most consultees referred to inconsistency and confusion inherent in the proposal for Local Development Orders with respect to Permitted Development Rights and saw no need for it. Some thought it would be detrimental to rural diversification and provide added complication to an already complex system. Most preferred a national system. Interpretation of the GPDO was difficult at present and the proposal could hinder development in Wales and lead to problems of enforcement.

3.30 There were diametrically opposed views to limiting the life of a planning permission to three years. Those involved in development control, whether statutorily or voluntarily, favoured the shorter period whereas developers favoured the 5- year period - if not longer. Remarks were made that there was little evidence to support the change. The practice of securing planning permissions by carrying out minor works or operations and the effect that that could have, not only on the proper planning for an area but also on local amenity and local/national conservation interests. raised much concern. Some respondents sought further guidance as to what constituted 'commencement' of development. The removal of the safeguarding of a permission by the carrying out of 'minor works' was suggested.

3.31 Enforcement caused great concern for many and the suggested further consideration and research were welcomed. Useful suggestions on how to improve the enforcement system were made.

3.32 There was clear support for the removal of Crown Development Immunity, subject to previously defined and appropriate safeguards.

3.33 Pre-application discussions were supported. However, there were concerns about resource implications. There was very little support for charging for the service. Respondents believed that in order to have a transparent system, the discussions should be noted on file and included as part of the report to committee and suggestions to expand pre-application discussions to include consultees were also raised.

3.34 The Planning Aid service was commended for the work it has done. Additional funding was considered vital.

3.35 The proposal to make neighbour notification mandatory was supported, but there were varying views on who should be responsible for informing neighbours. Robust guidance would be needed to define 'neighbour'.

3.36 There was very strong support for the provision of training for members and officers. Many respondents wished to see mandatory training and for there to be monitoring of its effectiveness. Training also seen as essential to help increase the stature, effectiveness and confidence of those operating the planning system.

3.37 Respondents agreed the need for improved operation of the completion notice system. They considered there was a need to avoid compensation and other costs to planning authorities.

3.38 Most respondents were in favour of delegating more decisions to officers, but the need for safeguards was stressed. There were suggestions that the targets might be different in rural and urban areas.

3.39 With regard to fees and resources, most respondents considered the planning service under-funded. There was agreement that increased fees carried with them the expectation of an improved service, but there were mixed views on ring fencing resources for the planning system.

3.40 Local authorities opposed changes that would take away their ability to determine their own applications for development. They took the view that existing processes and procedures are adequate to ensure impartiality and that any objectors to local authority proposals have the opportunity to put forward their objections. If any proposals are to be referred to the Assembly they should only be those involving major developments.

3.41 Other respondents were concerned about the need for greater transparency in the way in which local authority proposals are dealt with and the necessity to dispel any doubts, actual and perceived, about bias in the way these type of applications are handled. There was a call for a clear definition of local authority 'interest'.

3.42 Apart from local authorities, there was support for the proposal for local authority applications to be submitted to the Assembly for a decision whether or not to call-in. A number of respondents took the view that all local authority applications should be submitted to the Assembly for determination.

3.43 The majority view was that there should be a public inquiry for all major cases in which the local authority has an interest. A minority suggested that the decision of the inquiry should be binding on the local authority.

3.44 There was a clear message, however, that no matter what local authorities may think about the adequacy of means of redress, the public are not comfortable with local authorities determining their own applications.

Resources

3.45 Concerns were raised in replies to a large number of questions from across the various sectors at the lack of resource available for the planning system. Many were concerned that the proposals in the document could not be achieved without a substantial increase.

Respondents' priorities for Action

3.46 There was universal support for the review of the planning system; many of the respondents considered the consultation timely. There was particular support for measures to improve access to planning information and the operation of committees. There was also strong support for member and officer training and for the provision of adequate resources to enable the quality of service to be improved, including the recruitment and retention of staff and provision of e-government provided those without access to computers were also catered for. Many respondents agreed that quality as well as speed was essential for the planning process.

3.47 The priorities for action identified by those who responded were:

1. Improvement to the development plan system

2. Member and officer training

   3. Wales Spatial Plan to have statutory status, with a clear link to regional work

4. Need for additional resource

      5. Annual monitoring reports on development plan and a full review every five years

SECTION 4: NEXT STEPS

4.1 The results of the consultation will be discussed in a serious of meetings - with WLGA (25th June), Planning Forum (4th July), Annual meeting of planning lead members (17th July) and EPT Committee (17th July) - before the Minister for Environment makes a decision on the way forward and on an implementation programme.

4.2 Many of the proposals involve legislative implications. Some will need to be considered with Wales Office and Office of the Deputy Prime Minister for possible inclusion of a primary legislative opportunity arises. Most of the others can be dealt with by planning policy, technical /procedural advice or subordinate legislation subject to the approval of the Assembly.

4.3 Some of the proposals will require additional research or further consideration.

APPENDIX 1

ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

1. The 12 week consultation period ended on 29th April 2002. Around 65% of the responses were returned electronically - these included the response forms and letters. Others were returned either typed or hand written. Those who had typed their responses were asked, to forward their responses electronically to make inputting easier.

2. An Excel spreadsheet was created to capture information from the response forms and respondents' details. A reference number was given to each response. The information from responses not on the form were transferred by officials to the forms in order to be included on the Excel database.

3. The response sheet was designed so that each question was related to specific paragraphs within the document. This meant that all the responses received in any other formats throughout could be included.

4. Another database held all the responses to each question and view in the response form, foreword and the introduction. The large number of electronic responses received reduced the amount of pre-analysis work considerably. The ones not received electronically were all typed into the database.

5. The database was designed so that there were fields for each sector, 'yes'. 'no' or 'comments' for responses which did not answer the question directly but had commented on the issue. The responses to the Y/N questions were counted without regard to representation, or weighting. However, the conclusions were drawn not just on the numerical analysis but also on the qualitative aspects of responses and the numbers represented by the respondent.

6. All the responses were allocated for consideration and analysis to specific branches within Planning Division and Wales Spatial Plan Unit. Each Branch summarised the responses from each sector and the responses to each question.

7. An overall summary was prepared for each question, to draw out the main conclusions from the consultation exercise, and recommendations from officials were added.

Analysis of Respondents

8. Table A.1 below shows the responses received by category.

Table A.1

Sector	Number of respondents	% of respondents
Private Sector	53	26
Voluntary Sector	19	9
Member of the Public	10	5
Local Government	35	17
Interest Group	42	21
Other	44	22
Total	203	100

9. Not all respondents answered all the questions on the response form provided. Some had specific interests and a breakdown of replies to each question from each sector could be misleading so this information is not used in this report.

10. Scores were recorded for those questions which sought a Yes/No answer. Broad levels of support for each proposal are indicated on the following table. These however, should not be considered alone, as the method of analysis ensured that all views were accounted for. In only 2 cases (Q18 Master Planning Certificates and 23 Local Development Orders), were the responses evenly balanced, in both these cases there was a small majority against the proposal.

11. Questions 7 and 32 and Views 2, 10, 11 and 12 did not require a Y/N answer but only sought comments. The total number of respondents to each of these questions is recorded for completeness of figures.

Table A.2[3]

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Yes:	125	128	112	114	113	119	N/A	114	117	89	128	107	97	129	81	63
No:	0	4	16	9	25	14	N/A	12	11	26	4	15	16	1	44	55

Total	125	132	128	123	138	133	182	126	128	115	132	122	113	130	125	118

	Q17	Q18	Q19	Q20	Q21	Q22	Q23	Q24	Q25	Q26	Q27	Q28	Q29	Q30	Q31	Q32
Yes:	98	57	94	94	96	107	56	88	112	15	137	111	111	110	130	N/A
No:	37	59	41	51	33	3	67	61	4	5	3	6	14	1	6	N/A
Total	135	116	135	145	129	110	123	149	116	130	140	117	125	111	136	115

	V1	V2	V3	V4	V5	V6	V7	V8	V9	V11	V12	V10 -
Yes:	99	N/A	94	84	58	99	5	66	66	N/A	N/A	(A) 41 (B)31 (C) 20 Other comments 18
No:	22	N/A	5	16	26	10	23	23	23	N/A	N/A	
Total	121	N/A	99	100	115	109	28	89	89	91	78	110

APPENDIX 2

LIST OF WELSH PLANNING FORUM MEMBERS - 19th December 2001

Organisation/Division	Names
Minister for the Environment	Sue Essex
Welsh Local Government Association	Victoria Winckler Graham Evans (Wrexham) Wyn Mitchell (Swansea) Nic Wheeler (PCNP)
Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors	Cathy McLean
Royal Town Planning Institute	Owain Wyn
Royal Society of Architects in Wales	Robert Firth (sent apologies)
Welsh Development Agency	Mike Cuddy (Land Division)
Wales Council for Voluntary Action	Sioned Hughes
Confederation of British Industry	Amanda Wilkinson

Planning Officers Society Wales (POSW)	Eifion Bowen
House Builders Federation	Gareth Williams (Convenor - Housing Working Group)
Country Landowners Association	Ross Murray
Countryside Council for Wales	Keith Davies (Convenor - Rural & Countryside Working Group)
Environment Agency	John Lambert
Wales Wildlife and Countryside Link	Merfyn Williams (CPRW)
Wales Consultants Forum	Mike Sant
Planning Inspectorate	Rhys Davies
PEBA	Russel Harris
Law Society Wales	Huw Williams
University of Wales, Cardiff (City & Regional Planning Dept)	Neil Harris
Wales Transport Strategy Group/Institution of Highways and Transportation	Stuart Watkins (Convenor - Transport Working Group)
Planning Aid	Peter Cope
Disability Wales	Graham Findlay
Welsh Women National Coalition	Mary Slater
All Wales Ethnic Minority	Siva Sivapalan
National Assembly	Kay Powell
National Assembly	Lyn Owen
National Assembly	Jeff Spear
National Assembly	Keith Bush
National Assembly	Basil Hollington

National Assembly	Jean Booker
National Assembly	John Bader
National Assembly	David Ward
National Assembly	Marion Davies
National Assembly	Heledd Thomas
National Assembly	Lesley Punter
National Assembly	Nick Bennett

APPENDIX 3

LIST OF QUESTIONS FROM THE RESPONSE FROM IN 'PLANNING:DELIVERING FOR WALES'
PROPOSALS
POLICIES AND PLANS

1. To continue to develop national planning policy using an open and inclusive process (Para 14).

2. To ensure that national policy and technical advice remain as concise and focused as possible(Para 14).

3. Integrate Minerals Planning Policy Wales and Planning Policy Wales when they are next reviewed (Para 17).

4. The Wales Spatial Plan to draw on sub-regional planning work and to feed directly into development plans(Para 20).

5. Introducing new style Local Development Plans (LDPs Option (b)) (Para24).

6. Local Planning Authorities to identify in their LDPs areas for which Action Plans should be prepared (Para 29).

7. Do you have any further comments to make on the proposals for local development plans, including the degree of detail required in the LDP policies and means of scrutinising LDPs and Action Plans? (Para 33)

8. To require LPAs to prepare LDPs to an agreed timetable(Para 31).

9. To require an annual monitoring report on LDPs and a full review every five years(Para 37).

10. To use the power to commission preparation of a Local Development Plan should a Local Planning Authority delay or default on it's preparation(Para 38).

11. To require LPAs to give a clear and specific description of how they are involving the community in the LDP(Para 39).

12. To require LPAs to adopt a UDP before progressing their LDP(Para 40).

DECISION MAKING AND DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

13. Annual report on the speed of decision making and outcomes of the process to be integrated with annual report on the UDP (Para 47).

14. Checklist and a standard application form(Para 48)

15. Delivery contracts(Para 52)

16. Statutory consultees to respond within 21 days and charge for the service(Para 53).

17. Local authorities having the power to refuse to accept repeat applications(Para 55).

18. Certificate for Master Planning large developments(Para 56).

19. Power to refuse to accept 2 substantially similar applications on same site(Para 57).

20. Decision targets – 80% within eight weeks or 16 weeks with an EIA, quarterly reporting on householder, major and minor applications(Para 60).

21. Giving reasons for approving planning applications(Para 61).

22. To improve Assembly casework procedures and provision of information (Para 62).

23. Local Development Orders to amend Permitted Development Rights(Para 64).

24. Permissions and consents to be limited to 3 years(Para 67).

25. To work to improve Enforcement procedures(Para69).

26. To remove Crown Immunity from planning control(Para 70).

27. To encourage greater use of Pre-Application discussions(Para 72).

28. To encourage use of the Planning Aid service(Para 77).

29. Neighbour notification to become mandatory(Para 75).

30. Information for Customer Care(Para 78)

31. To work with WLGA and ELWa to deliver major developments in member and officer training (Para 83).

32. Do you have any further comments to make on the proposals for the decision making and development control system?

VIEWS WERE ALSO INVITED ON THE FOLLOWING:

V1. Should we seek statutory status for the Wales Spatial Plan?(Para 19)

V2. Justification for introducing Business Planning Zones (Para 30).

V3. Establishing a local planning advisory service for local authorities (Para 45).

V4. Completion notices could be used to secure completed development (Para 68).

V5. The definition of major development as ten dwellings or 0.5 hectares and over; commercial or industrial floorspace to be more than 1000 square metres or site of over 1 hectare(Para 52).

V6. Further delegation to officers, and your views on appropriate targets(Para 58).

V7. Review planning committee cycles to introduce greater flexibility (Para 59) .

V8. How best to secure effective participation before decisions are taken(Para 73).

V9. Should planning fees be ring-fenced? (Para 86)

V10. What is your preferred option for independent scrutiny of applications in which local authorities have an interest?(Para 79).

V11. What changes would make a significant improvement in ensuring access for all?(Para 76)

V12. Please identify, in order of importance, the proposals in "Planning: delivering for Wales" which you think would make the most significant improvement in current practice or procedures to better enable the planning system to deliver for Wales