



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a forum involving business representatives to discuss common goals to inform local strategies and development planning.</li> <li>• It is proposed, rather than defining or fixing the boundaries of partnerships which may not reflect changing regional relationships over time, that local authorities be responsible for defining the geography of their involvement.</li> </ul>	
10 - 1.21	<b>Proposal 3:</b> improving national spatial planning and policy. The NPF to reflect regional priorities and make local development planning simpler and more consistent.	
10 - 1.22	The NPF should describe spatial planning priorities consistent with the infrastructure investment plan such that spending on infrastructure will be aligned with proposals for future growth, regeneration and development. Regional partnerships and infrastructure providers should jointly share ownership of the NPF.	
10 - 1.24	The review cycle for the NDF should be extended to 10 years (with a 30 year vision), whilst making provision for interim updates where necessary. Additionally the period for Parliamentary consideration should be extended from 60 days to 90 days. Local development plans to be independently tested and confirmed for consistency with the NPF.	
10 - 1.26	Local Development Plans should be supported by Scottish Planning Policy (SPP) such that policy is not repeated in the LDP. The SPP could be prepared alongside the NPF and given the same level of consultation and consideration by Parliament. This would allow LDP's to provide a clear and engaging spatial strategy rather than acting as a rule book for future decision-making.	
10 - 1.27		
11 - 1.28	<b>Proposal 4:</b> stronger local development plans. The plan period should be extended to 10 years and the preparation period reduced. The Main Issues Report (MIR) stage and references to Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) should be removed. A new "Gatecheck" would help improve plan examinations by dealing with significant issues at an earlier stage.  To make consultation more effective, planning authorities should produce draft plans, fully informed by robust evidence from the outset.	
11 - 1.29	In summary the proposed changes are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MIR will be removed and replaced with a draft plan. Any changes to the draft plan made after</li> </ul>	

<p>12 - 1.34</p> <p>12 - 1.35</p> <p>12 - 1.36</p> <p>12 - 1.38</p>	<p>consultation will be explained to those who have commented on the draft plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDP review period will be 10 years.</li> <li>• Plans may be updated during the 10 year period but updating “triggers” are to be agreed nationally and locally to prevent constant updating.</li> <li>• There should be no need for supplementary planning guidance. All statutory supplementary guidance should form part of the LDP.</li> </ul> <p>The LDP should be “gatechecked” by a panel chaired by an independent reporter from DEPA before the draft plan is prepared and assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the development plan scheme has been framed in consultation with the relevant Community Councils and sets out how the local community will be involved.</li> <li>• The plan takes account of community planning</li> <li>• the key outcomes required from the plan have been clearly defined</li> <li>• required environmental assessment work, including a flood risk appraisal, is carried out</li> <li>• existing infrastructure and necessary interventions have been identified and prioritised.</li> </ul> <p>The panel should involve specialists and include the views of a citizen’s panel.</p> <p>They will reject it should deal with unresolved issues but assuming the interim gate check has been properly carried out should be brief.</p> <p>The LDP process should be project managed</p>	
<p>13 - 1.39</p> <p>13 - 1.42</p>	<p><b>Proposal 5:</b> making plans that deliver. Improve the delivery program to help ensure that planned development happens on the ground.</p> <p>The allocation of a site in and LDP should give more certainty to the development happening. This will be enhanced if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure providers commit to the proposals set out in the plan.</li> <li>• There should be confidence that the sites allocated in the plan will be taken forward as programmed. This also means that other areas will be protected.</li> </ul> <p>The proposal that there could be less consultation on allocated sites, for example by reducing or removing requirements for consultation before the application is made, is under discussion; as is the idea that allocated sites are automatically given planning permission in principle. It</p>	<p>Views are sought on these points.</p>

<p>13 - 1.44</p> <p>14 - 1.47</p>	<p>is proposed that there should be stronger measures for public involvement for sites that are not included in the plan as allocated sites.</p> <p>Those proposing a site for development will be required to submit a minimum level of information to support the inclusion of the site in the LDP. This would include economic and market appraisal information.</p> <p>Planners should be confident in promoting a broader, zoned approach to meeting short and longer term housing requirements. This is preferred to piecing together individual sites promoted by developers.</p> <p>A focus on deliverable programmes could introduce extra demands on time and resources for local planning teams. Further, wider expertise may be required to address matters such as development economic programming and costing of infrastructure. However, it is argued that this would help to reduce the level of work required at the development management stage.</p>	
<p>17 - 2.6/9</p>	<p><b>Proposal 6:</b> Giving people an opportunity to plan their own place. Communities should be given the right to prepare local place plans.</p> <p>It is proposed that changes to legislation enables communities to prepare local place plans that set out where development requirements, as defined by the broader local development plan, can be met. A duty will be placed on planning authorities to adopt these plans as part of the statutory development plan. The chronology is envisaged as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A recognised community body, for example a Community Council, would register their interest in preparing a local place plans.</li> <li>2. Local authorities would have a duty to consider such applications and if approved it will be this body that the local authority empowers to prepare a local place plan.</li> <li>3. Community bodies would provide/agree: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. boundary of the area of the community</li> <li>b. who they will involve and how</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. The community body prepares the plan in line with local and national planning policies and ensures that the plan plays a positive role in delivering development. The local community are consulted and approval obtained. How majority approval is obtained efficiently, effectively and economically is to be considered.</li> <li>5. Unless the community plan opposes the wider</li> </ol>	

<p>19 - 2.13</p> <p>20 - 2.16</p>	<p>aims of the development plan it will be adopted.</p> <p>6. The local place plans will be updated in a similar manner to the LDP.</p> <p>7. If the local authority does not adopt the local place plan the community body can appeal to Scottish Ministers.</p> <p>Community will be defined in legislation.</p> <p>Support, training and guidance will be provided to Community Councils to enable them to realise their full potential to contribute to the planning process. It is intended this will involve the Improvement in Service, Edinburgh Napier University and the Community Council Liaison Officers to encourage networking and sharing of good practice. A website has been launched.  <a href="http://www.communitycouncils.org.uk">www.communitycouncils.org.uk</a></p>	<p>How should community be defined.</p>
<p>21 - 2.18</p>	<p><b>Proposal 7:</b> getting more people involved in planning. It is proposed that a wider range of people, including children and young people, be encouraged and inspired to get involved in planning.</p> <p>It is proposed that, as a priority, planning authorities be required to consult more widely including methods that are likely to involve children and young people in the process. The involvement of children and young people will be assured through secondary legislation and including a test of the steps taken by the planning authority to engage as part of the early examination gatecheck.</p>	
<p>23 - 2.27</p> <p>23 - 2.31</p> <p>23 - 2.32</p> <p>24 - 2.34</p>	<p><b>Proposal 8:</b> improving public trust. Community councils will be involved in the preparation of the development plan scheme which will be authorised by the local authority convenor and chief executive.</p> <p>The statutory requirements for pre-application consultation for major and national developments with include a requirement for developers to feed back to communities how their views have been taken into account before any formal application is submitted. There should be greater community involvement where proposals are not supported in the LDP.</p> <p>The development sector will be required to undertake high quality and innovative training in community involvement.</p> <p>The applicant's right to submit a revised or repeat of application at no cost will be removed. A "right first time" approach will be encouraged by requiring a fee for all applications for planning permission. The fees for</p>	

	retrospective planning consent will be substantially increased.	
25 - 2.40	<b>Proposal 9:</b> keeping decisions local -- right of appeal. More review decisions should be made by local authorities rather than centrally. There should continue to be no third party right of appeal. Community views should be addressed in the decision notice.	Should more decisions be considered locally?
25 - 2.42	Currently there is a right of review where the decisions on local developments were taken by a planning officer rather than by elected members. The hierarchy of developments will be explored to determine the extent to which reviews of decisions can be handled locally. For major developments which accord with the LDP there is scope for decisions granting permission to be determined under delegated powers and reviewed by the local review body rather than appealed to Scottish Ministers.	Most appeals are decided by a reporter. If there were fewer appeals referred to Ministers then Ministers could take the decision.
25 - 2.45	A fee should be charged for all appeals to a local review body and to Ministers.	
29 - 3.4	<b>Proposal 10:</b> being clear about how much housing land is required. Planning should take a more strategic view of the land required for housing development early in the plan process allowing all parties to focus on how delivery can be achieved. Clear national and regional aspirations for new homes are proposed to support this. This will require:	
30 - 3.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using the HNDA tool to inform NPF nationally and regionally</li> <li>• Give certainty to developers by “signing off” the number of homes needed at an early stage of LPD development.</li> <li>• Publish a housing sites register online.</li> </ul>	
31 - 3.12	<b>Proposal 11:</b> closing the gap between planning consent and delivery of homes by requiring planning authorities to proactively facilitate development rather than reacting to proposals for housing. Planning authorities should negotiate an agreed plan of allocated sites which have a high chance of being developed; accounting for the infrastructure cost and it’s financing.	
31 - 3.16	If a site does not progress as predicted in the LDP delivery program or there is insufficient evidence that an application is deliverable then planning authorities should either take action to resolve any blockage or remove the allocation from the plan.	
32 - 3.20	A number of land reform initiatives are being discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clear, accessible, effective and efficient system of</li> </ul>	

	<p>legislation and policy which allows for the compulsory acquisition and purchase of legal interests in land and property for the public benefit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local authorities to be given the powers to compulsory purchase land which is not being used as allocated within the development plan.</li> <li>• Local authorities to be given powers to compulsorily purchase abandoned buildings and land to ensure the productive use of vacant and derelict land.</li> <li>• A development tax on those who, anticipating a greater profit, fail to release land for development.</li> </ul>	
33 - 3.23	<p><b>Proposal 12:</b> releasing more "development ready" land. Plans should take a more strategic and flexible approach to identifying land for housing. Consents could be put in place was owned housing land through greater use of Simplified Planning Zones.</p>	
33 - 3.24	<p>A system of "consented development" zones is proposed which is effectively a consented master plan for specified development for which no planning application need to be made. Community involvement would form an integral part of the master planning process.</p>	
33 - 3.26	<p>It is anticipated that because of the cost and time burden on planning authorities to create Simplified Planning Zones that these will be developed in partnership with developers.</p>	
35 - 3.33	<p><b>Proposal 13:</b> embedding an infrastructure first approach. There is a need for better coordination of infrastructure planning at a national and regional level this will require a stronger commitment to delivering development from all infrastructure providers. A national infrastructure and development delivery group is proposed, comprising representation from the Scottish government and its agencies, public and private sector infrastructure providers and the Scottish futures trust. This group would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use the NTF and LDP is to prioritise future infrastructure spend.</li> <li>• Broker solutions and support delivery.</li> <li>• Draft proposals for an infrastructure levy.</li> <li>• Consider how developer contributions could work with wider funding and finance solutions.</li> </ul>	
36 - 3.38	<p>Commitment is required from infrastructure providers including providers of digital, telecommunications and energy networks.</p>	

37 - 3.44	<p><b>Proposal 14:</b> a more transparent approach to funding infrastructure. A new local levy to raise additional finance for infrastructure is proposed along with improvements to section 75 obligations. This will entail:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restricting the developer’s ability to modify the requirements of section 75 obligations.</li> <li>• Putting in place changes which reduce the time scales for concluding section 75 obligations.</li> <li>• A charging mechanism based on the submission of a business case prepared by the planning authority approved by ministers.</li> <li>• Income from the charge should be collected locally.</li> <li>• The fund will not replace national level infrastructure investment.</li> <li>• The fund will not replace site-specific contributions necessary to mitigate impacts of individual developments secured through section 75 obligations.</li> </ul>	
38 - 3.47	<p><b>Proposal 15:</b> innovative infrastructure planning to deliver low carbon solutions, new digital technologies and facilities that communities need. This will involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrating land use and transport planning, including "active travel".</li> <li>• Including the planning of green space.</li> <li>• Targeting low carbon energy infrastructure.</li> <li>• Ensuring compliance with government policy on digital connectivity.</li> </ul>	
41 - 4.3	<p><b>Proposals 16:</b> developing skills to deliver outcomes by working with the planning profession's institutes, and influencing education at primary, secondary and tertiary levels.</p>	
43 - 4.14	<p><b>Proposals 17:</b> investing in a better resourced planning a service by increasing fees. Proposed changes to fee structures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A revised maximum fee.</li> <li>• Higher fees for retrospective applications.</li> <li>• Higher fees for applications related to sites not supported by the adopted LDP.</li> <li>• Higher fees for fast tracked applications.</li> <li>• Charging for appeals and reviews of decisions.</li> <li>• Fees for the contribution of agencies with a critical role in the development management process.</li> <li>• Discretionary fees for pre-application discussions and for establishing Simplified Planning Zones.</li> <li>• Removing “no cost right” to submit a revised or repeat application.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advertising costs to be included within a revised planning fee.</li> <li>• Fees for funding of relevant central government functions.</li> <li>• Improving clarity and ensuring the fee structure is proportionate and focused on cost recovery. Authorities to be given discretion in charging fees for developments which support wider objectives.</li> </ul>	
44 - 4.19	<p><b>Proposal 18:</b> a new approach to improving performance by strengthening the monitoring and reporting of performance. With higher fees must come exemplary performance ensured by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A focus on the customer with feedback from service users for all authorities in Scotland.</li> <li>• Support from the improvement service.</li> <li>• Improved peer review.</li> <li>• Identifying and national performance coordinator.</li> <li>• A positive supportive approach rather than the application of sanctions.</li> </ul>	
45 - 4.23	<p><b>Proposal 19:</b> making better use of resources -- efficient decision-making will be ensured by removing the need for planning consent from a wider range of developments including for example digital telecommunications infrastructure, allotments and aquaculture.</p> <p>Targeted changes to development management will help to ensure decisions are made more quickly and more transparently specifically by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amending the duration of a planning permission in principle and simplifying and clarifying procedures for approving the detail of proposals that are granted planning permission in principle.</li> <li>• Allowing planning authorities to choose whether predetermination hearings should be in front of a committee or the full Council.</li> </ul>	
46 - 4.29	<p><b>Proposal 20:</b> innovation, designing for the future and the digital transformation of the planning service. Taking advantage of the opportunities provided by information technology to pioneer the digital transformation of planning services.</p>	