

Item 6 - APPENDIX 1 SUMMARY OF PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE WHITE PAPER

Pillar One – Planning for development

Proposal 1: *All areas of land would be put into one of the following categories:*

Growth areas “suitable for substantial development”

The term substantial development will be defined in policy. This category would include land suitable for comprehensive development (including new settlements, urban extension sites and areas for redevelopment such as urban regeneration sites).

New legislation will require that design guidance and codes and masterplans are agreed as a condition of the permission in principle which is granted through the plan (see Design Guidance and Design Codes section and Proposal 11, Proposal 14).

Development in Growth areas would automatically be granted outline planning permission (Proposal 5) as the principle of development would be conferred by adoption of the Local Plan. Further details would be agreed and full permission achieved through a streamlined process.

Detailed planning permission could be secured in one of three ways:

- a reformed reserved matters process for agreeing the issues which remain outstanding;
- a Local Development Order prepared by the local planning authority for the development which could be prepared in parallel with the Local Plan and be linked to a master plan and design codes; or
- for exceptionally large sites such as a new town a Development Consent Order under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime could be an appropriate route to secure consents. Similarly, government will consider how the planning powers for Development Corporations can be reformed to reflect this new framework.

Renewal areas “suitable for development”

This would cover existing built areas where smaller scale development is appropriate. It could include the densification and infill of residential areas, development in town centres, and development in rural areas that is not annotated as Growth or Protected areas, such as small sites within or on the edge of villages. There would be a statutory presumption in favour of development being granted for the uses specified as being suitable in each area. Local authorities could continue to consider the case for resisting inappropriate development of residential gardens;

In Renewal areas there would be a general presumption in favour of development established in legislation. Consent for development would be granted in one of three ways:

- through a new permission route which gives an automatic consent if the scheme meets design and other prior approval requirements (see design guidance and codes)
- for other types of development, a faster planning application process where a planning application for the development would be determined in the context of the Local Plan description, for what development the area or site is appropriate for, and with reference to the National Planning Policy Framework; or
- a Local or Neighbourhood Development Order.

In addition they will legislate to widen and change the nature of permitted development in Renewal areas to enable replicable forms of development that’s in accordance with certain design principles (such as standard building types, heights and setbacks) to be approved quickly. (Proposal 14)

To do this they intend to develop a limited set of form-based development types that allow the redevelopment of existing residential buildings where the relevant conditions are satisfied. Prior approval would still be needed for aspects of the design (such as materials), as well as for the avoidance of flood risk and securing safe access. (Proposal 14)

They also propose that local planning authorities or neighbourhood planning groups would be able to use local orders to modify how the standard types apply in their areas, based on local evidence of what options are most popular with the wider public.

They will develop a pilot programme to test the concept. Where they are taking forward existing schemes to expand the scope of permitted development through upwards extensions and demolition/rebuilding, they also intend to legislate so that prior approval for exercising such rights takes into account design codes which are in place locally (or, in the absence of these, the National Model Design Code). The National Model Design Code has yet to be published. (Proposal 14)

Areas that are Protected

This would include sites and areas which, as a result of their particular environmental and/or cultural characteristics, would justify more stringent development controls to ensure sustainability. This would include areas such as Green Belt, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), Conservation Areas, Local Wildlife Sites, areas of significant flood risk and important areas of green space. At a smaller scale it can continue to include gardens in line with existing policy in the National Planning Policy Framework. It would also include areas of open countryside outside of land in Growth or Renewal areas. Some areas would be defined nationally, others locally on the basis of national policy, but all would be annotated in Local Plan maps and clearly signpost the relevant development restrictions defined in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Digitalisation of Local Plans

Local Plans to be fully digitalised and web based and will be accessed by software used across the public sector. MHCLG to publish a guide on data standards and principles and will run pilots to develop innovative solutions to support plan-making activities and make community involvement more accessible and engaging (could include measures to improve access to live information and data or the use of 3D visualisations).

Local Plans would comprise an interactive web-based map of the administrative area. Areas and sites would be annotated and colour-coded in line with their Growth, Renewal or Protected designation, with explanatory descriptions set out in the key and accompanying text appropriate to their category.

In Growth and Renewal areas, the key and accompanying text would set out suitable development uses, as well as limitations on height and/or density. These could be specified for sub-areas within each category, determined locally but having regard to national policy, guidance and legislation (including the National Model Design Code and flexibilities in use allowed by virtue of the new Use Classes Order and permitted development – see Renewal areas section).

For Protected areas, the key and accompanying text would explain what is permissible by cross-reference to the National Planning Policy Framework.

The text-based component of plans should be limited to spatially-specific matters and capable of being accessible in a range of different formats, including through simple digital services on a smartphone.

Self and Custom-build Homes

Sub-areas are to be identified in Growth areas for self and custom-build homes, and community-led housing developments. In the case of self and custom-build homes, local authorities should identify enough land to meet the requirements identified in their self-build and custom housebuilding registers.

Proposal 2: Development management policies established at national scale and an altered role for Local Plans.

Local Plans will no longer contain development management policies instead policies in a Local Plan will be restricted to specific development standards such as broad height limits, scale and/or density limits for land included in Growth areas and Renewal areas, established through the accompanying text.

The National Planning Policy Framework would become the primary source of policies for development management.

Design Guidance, Design Codes and Masterplans

Local Planning Authorities (and neighbourhoods through Neighbourhood Plans) are to prepare design codes and guidance for development. These could be produced for a whole authority area, or for a smaller area or site (as allocated in the Local Plan) or a combination of both.

These should be prepared alongside the Local Plan either for inclusion in the Local Plan or as Supplementary Planning Documents.

They should be at a level of detail commensurate with the size of site and key principles to be established. For example, a set of simple 'co-ordinating codes' to set some initial key parameters for the site layout. Where sites are expected to come forward in the near future, more developed masterplans or codes, prepared by the local planning authority or site promoter would be appropriate. (Proposal 14)

MHCLG are to set up a new body to support the delivery of design codes and it is implied that the Building Better and Beautiful Commission's recommendations as set out in their 'Living with Beauty'¹ document will form the basis of design guidance and codes.

Proposal 3: Local Plans should be subject to a single statutory "sustainable development" test, replacing the existing tests of soundness.

The examination of a local plan determines whether the local plan has been prepared in accordance with the Duty to Cooperate, legal and procedural requirements and whether it passes the test of 'soundness' which includes whether it has been:

- Positively prepared - based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development

¹ Living with Beauty <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/living-with-beauty-report-of-the-building-better-building-beautiful-commission#:~:text=The%20Building%20Better%2C%20Building%20Beautiful%20Commission%20is%20an%20independent%20body,out%20its%20recommendations%20to%20government.>

- Justified – the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.
- Effective – the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities and consistent with national policy.

The proposal is to replace these tests with a single *sustainable development test* which will be set by a policy issued by the Secretary of State and will include a slimmed down assessment of deliverability of the plan.

The Sustainability Appraisal system will also be abolished and replaced with a simplified process for assessing the environmental impact of plans (see Pillar Two);

The Duty to Cooperate test would be removed (as this has resulted in delays to Local plans and the failures of many a local plan at examination). They haven't made it clear whether there would still be a requirement for an LPA to accommodate a neighbouring authority's unmet needs although they have stated that there will be a binding housing requirement that LPAs would have to deliver so it is implied (see Proposal 4).

In addition guidance will be issued around the requirement of more limited evidence based studies required to support a Local Plan together with a model template to standardise Local Plans.

Proposal 4: A standard method for establishing housing requirement figures which ensures enough land is released in the areas where affordability is worst, to stop land supply being a barrier to enough homes being built. The housing requirement would factor in land constraints and opportunities to more effectively use land, including through densification where appropriate, to ensure that the land is identified in the most appropriate areas and housing targets are met.

The main change here is that the housing requirement as calculated by the new standard would be binding – it has previously been seen as a starting point and where an LPA could not accommodate that need they could approach neighbouring authorities to take some of that unmet need and, subject to evidence, be able to demonstrate at an examination that a lower number would be more appropriate. The introduction of a binding target removes these options.

It should be noted that a revision to the standard method for calculating housing needs which is subject to a separate consultation (Changes to the current planning system available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/changes-to-the-current-planning-system>) is to be used as the basis for plan making prior to any changes outlined in Planning for the Future. The new calculation for the binding target will be finalised following this consultation.

Proposal 5: Areas identified as Growth areas (suitable for substantial development) would automatically be granted outline planning permission for the principle of development, while automatic approvals would also be available for pre-established development types in other areas suitable for building.

See Proposal 1

Proposal 6: Decision-making should be faster and more certain, with firm deadlines, and make greater use of digital technology (For Spending Review, the Government will prepare a specific, investable proposal for modernising planning systems in local government).

The established time limits of eight or 13 weeks for determining an application from validation to decision will be a firm deadline (at present it is possible to agree an extension to the time period).

To achieve this, they propose:

- the greater digitalisation of the application process
- the validation of applications will be integrated with the submission of a planning application
- A new, more modular, software landscape to encourage digital innovation and provide access to underlying data to automate routine processes. Government intend to work with tech companies and LPAs to modernise the software used for case-managing a planning application to improve the user-experience for those applying and reduce the errors and costs currently experienced by planning authorities;
- a national data standard for smaller applications will be created.
- standardised planning statement of no more than 50 pages to justify the development proposals will be needed for major applications (in addition to drawings and plans)
- data-rich planning application registers will be created and monitored at a national scale
- data sets that underpin the planning system, including planning decisions and developer contributions will be standardised and made open and digitally accessible;
- a digital template for planning notices will be created and used by new digital services;
- greater standardisation of technical supporting information (eg local highway impacts, flood risk and heritage matters) as design codes will help to reduce the need for significant supplementary information. Where there is still a need for site specific information to mitigate wider impacts, national data standards and templates will be developed with statutory consultees;
- standard national planning conditions will be produced to cover common issues;
- a streamlined approach to developer contributions (See Pillar Three);
- the delegation of detailed planning decisions to planning officers where the principle of development has been established, as detailed matters for consideration should be principally a matter for professional planning judgment.

Proposal 7: Local Plans should be visual and map-based, standardised, based on the latest digital technology, and supported by a new template.

(See Interactive web-based map section)

Proposal 8: Local authorities and the Planning Inspectorate will be required through legislation to meet a statutory timetable for key stages of the process, and we will consider what sanctions there would be for those who fail to do so.

Proposals to shorten Local Plan process to 30 months in the following five stages:

Stage 1 [6 months]: “calls for” suggestions for areas under the three categories, including comprehensive “best in class” (no definition) ways of achieving public involvement at this plan-shaping stage for where development should go and what it should look like. (Can be more than one consultation).

Stage 2 [12 months]: LPA draws up its proposed Local Plan, and produces any necessary evidence to inform and justify the plan. “Higher-risk” (no definition) authorities will receive mandatory Planning Inspectorate advisory visits, in order to ensure the plan is on track prior to submission.

Stage 3 [6 weeks]: The local planning authority simultaneously:

- I. submits the Plan to the Secretary of State for Examination together with a Statement of Reasons to explain why it has drawn up its plan as it has; and

- II. publish the plan for the public to comment on. Comments seeking change must explain how the plan should be changed and why. Responses will have a word count limit.

Stage 4 [9 months]: A planning inspector appointed by the Secretary of State considers whether the three categories shown in the proposed Local Plan are “sustainable” as per the statutory test and accompanying national guidance and makes binding changes which are necessary to satisfy the test. The plan-making authority and all those who submitted comments would have the right to be “heard” by the inspector (whether face to face, by video, phone or in writing – all at the inspector’s discretion). The inspector’s report can, as relevant, simply state agreement with the whole or parts of the council’s Statement of Reasons, and/or comments submitted by the public.

Stage 5 [6 weeks]: Local Plan map, key and text are finalised, and come into force.

Transition arrangements

A statutory duty for LPAs to adopt a new Local Plan by a specified date – either 30 months from the legislation being brought into force, or 42 months for local planning authorities who have adopted a Local Plan within the previous three years or where a Local Plan has been submitted to the Secretary of State for examination. In the latter case, the 42 month period would commence from the point at which the legislation is brought into force, or upon adoption of the most recent plan, whichever is later.

The requirement for LPAs to review Local Plans at least every five years remains.

LPAs that fail to do what is required to get their plan in place, or keep it up to date, would be at risk of government intervention. A range of intervention options will be available, including the issuing of directions and preparation of a plan in consultation with local people. Decisions on intervention would also have regard to:

- the level of housing requirement in the area;
- the planning context of the area, including any co-operation to get plans in place across local planning authority boundaries;
- any exceptional circumstances presented by the local planning authority.

Proposal 9: Neighbourhood Plans should be retained as an important means of community input, and we will support communities to make better use of digital tools

Neighbourhood Plans to be retained in the reformed planning system, but their content should become more focused to reflect proposals for Local Plans with the potential to allow them to set their own rules for the form of development they want to see in small areas such as individual streets.

MHCLG to run pilot projects and data standards to help neighbourhood planning groups use digital platforms (such as 3D visualisation technologies).

Proposal 10: A stronger emphasis on build out through planning

The revised NPPF will make clear that the masterplans and design codes for sites prepared for substantial development (discussed under Pillar Two) should seek to include a variety of development types by different builders which allow more phases to come forward together.

Strategic sites are often sold off in parcels to several developers which allows for faster building so the suggestion here is to make this a requirement. Would it be up to the LPA to allocate phases of

development to different builders? Can we realistically require a landowner to sell off their land if they want to develop the site themselves?

Pillar Two – Planning for beautiful and sustainable places

Proposal 11: To make design expectations more visual and predictable, we will expect design guidance and codes to be prepared locally with community involvement, and ensure that codes are more binding on decisions about development.

The National Design Guide, National Model Design Code (not yet available) and the revised Manual for Streets are to have a direct bearing on the design of new communities but local guides and codes are to be prepared wherever possible. These can be brought forward by local planning authorities to supplement and add a visual dimension to their Local Plans; through the work of neighbourhood planning groups; or by applicants in bringing forward proposals for significant new areas of development.

However it will be made clear that designs and codes should only be given weight in the planning process if they can demonstrate that there has been effective input from the local community, in which case decisions on design should be made in line with these documents.

Where locally-produced guides and codes are not in place the National Design Guide, National Model Design Code and Manual for Streets should guide decisions on the form of development.

Proposal 12: To support the transition to a planning system which is more visual and rooted in local preferences and character, we will set up a body to support the delivery of provably locally-popular design codes, and propose that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making.

A step-change in the design skills available to many local planning authorities, as well as the right prioritisation and leadership across the sector is required.

MHCLG to consider options for establishing a new expert body which can help LPAs make effective use of design guidance and codes, as well as performing a wider monitoring and challenge role for the sector in building better places.

Proposals are due later this year for improving the resourcing of planning departments more broadly; the streamlining plan-making and planning applications will allow some re-focusing of professional skills.

Effective leadership within authorities will be crucial so each LPA should appoint a chief officer for design and place-making.

Proposal 13: To further embed national leadership on delivering better places, we will consider how Homes England's strategic objectives can give greater emphasis to delivering beautiful places.

The Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission recommended that Homes England should attach sufficient value to design as well as price, and give greater weight to design quality in its work.

Homes England have already champion design quality in their land disposals programme, through implementation of a design quality assessment approach, with a minimum standard which must be achieved for a proposal to progress.

MHCLG will engage Homes England, as part of the forthcoming Spending Review process, to consider how its objectives might be strengthened to give greater weight to design quality, and assess how design quality and environmental standards can be more deeply embedded in all Homes England's activities and programmes of work.

Proposal 14: We intend to introduce a fast-track for beauty through changes to national policy and legislation, to incentivise and accelerate high quality development which reflects local character and preferences.

This relates to the use of design guidance, design codes and masterplans and changes to permitted development set out under Design Guidance, Design Codes and Masterplan and Renewal areas sections respectively.

Proposal 15: We intend to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to ensure that it targets those areas where a reformed planning system can most effectively play a role in mitigating and adapting to climate change and maximising environmental benefits.

- Revised NPPF to include policies to ensure all new streets are tree lined
- Looking at strengthening policies on flood risk and
- Developing a national framework of green infrastructure requirements

Local Plans to look at densities of development appropriate in different locations, the ability to maximise walking, cycling and public transport and to opportunities to improve public access or places where renewable energy or woodland and forestry creation could be accommodated.

Proposal 16: We intend to design a quicker, simpler framework for assessing environmental impacts and enhancement opportunities that speeds up the process while protecting and enhancing the most valuable and important habitats and species in England.

Strategic Environmental Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal, and Environmental Impact Assessment to be replaced by a streamlined environmental assessment that will be consulted on in the autumn.

Proposal 17: Conserving and enhancing our historic buildings and areas in the 21st century

Revised NPPF for listed buildings and conservation areas, to ensure their significance is conserved while allowing, where appropriate, sympathetic changes to support their continued use and address climate change (energy efficiency measures).

Looking at possibility of routine Listed Building Consent not being required where a suitably qualified and experienced architects are used.

Proposal 18: To complement our planning reforms, we will facilitate ambitious improvements in the energy efficiency standards for buildings to help deliver our world-leading commitment to net-zero by 2050.

Future Homes Standard –to be published in autumn setting out carbon emission standards and new homes to be fit for a zero carbon future and options for the future of energy efficiency standards, beyond 2025.

Seeking consultation responses from LPAs on how they can set energy efficiency standards for new build developments.

They suggest that LPAs will be able to reassign resources following these reforms to focus more fully on enforcement. Ensuring that planning standards and building regulations are met, whether for new homes or for retrofitting old homes.

Pillar Three – Planning for infrastructure and connected places

Proposal 19: *The Community Infrastructure Levy should be reformed to be charged as a fixed proportion of the development value above a threshold, with a mandatory nationally-set rate or rates and the current system of planning obligations abolished.*

S106 and Community Infrastructure Levy to be axed and replaced by a new ‘Infrastructure Levy. Levy’.

This would be based upon a flat-rate, valued-based charge, set nationally, at either a single rate, or at area-specific rates.

It will be:

- charged on the final value of a development (or to an assessment of the sales value where the development is not sold, e.g. for homes built for the rental market), based on the applicable rate at the point planning permission is granted;
- be levied at point of occupation, with prevention of occupation being a potential sanction for non-payment;
- include a value-based minimum threshold below which the levy is not charged, to prevent low viability development becoming unviable, reflecting average build costs per square metre, with a small, fixed allowance for land costs. Where the value of development is below the threshold, no Levy would be charged. Where the value of development is above the threshold, the Levy would only be charged on the proportion of the value that exceeded the threshold ;

Local authorities to borrow against Infrastructure Levy revenues so that they could forward fund infrastructure. Local authorities should assure themselves that this borrowing is affordable and suitable.

Proposal 20: *The scope of the Infrastructure Levy could be extended to capture changes of use through permitted development rights*

The new Infrastructure Levy would be extended to capture changes of use which require planning permission, even where there is no additional floorspace, and for some permitted development rights including office to residential conversions and new demolition and rebuild permitted development rights.

The exemption of self and custom-build development from the Infrastructure Levy will remain.

Proposal 21: *The reformed Infrastructure Levy should deliver affordable housing provision*

LPAs to be able to use funds raised through the new infrastructure levy to secure affordable housing.

Affordable housing can be delivered through in-kind delivery onsite (could be made mandatory where an authority has a requirement, capability and wishes to do so).

LPAs can specify the forms and tenures of the onsite provision (working with a nominated affordable housing provider)

Providers of affordable housing could purchase the dwelling at a discount from market rate, as now. However, rather than the discount being secured through Section 106 planning obligations, it would instead be considered as in-kind delivery of the Infrastructure Levy. In effect, the difference between the price at which the unit was sold to the provider and the market price would be offset from the final cash liability to the Levy. First Homes, which are sold by the developer direct to the customer at a discount to market price, would offset the discount against the cash liability.

Under this approach there is risk in transferring to the LPA, and that would need to be mitigated in order to maintain existing levels of on-site affordable housing delivery through policy design. In particular, in the event of a market fall, LPAs could 'flip' a proportion of units back to market units which the developer can sell, if Levy liabilities are insufficient to cover the value secured through in-kind contributions. Alternatively, we could require that if the value secured through in-kind units is greater than the final levy liability, then the developer has no right to reclaim overpayments. Government could provide standardised agreements, to codify how risk sharing would work in this way.

To ensure developers are not rewarded for low- standard homes under the Levy, LPAs could have an option to revert back to cash contributions if no provider was willing to buy the homes due to their poor quality.

LPAs could also accept Infrastructure Levy payments in the form of land within or adjacent to a site.

Through borrowing against further Infrastructure Levy receipts, other sources of funding, or in partnership with affordable housing providers, they could then build affordable homes, enabling delivery at pace.

Proposal 22: More freedom could be given to local authorities over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy

The Neighbourhood Share (up to 25%) would be kept and they propose to look at ways in which Parishes can enhance community engagement around how these funds are used (specifically through digital innovation to promote engagement).

Considering to allow LPAs to spend receipts on their policy priorities, once core infrastructure obligations have been met.

The balance of affordable housing and infrastructure will vary. It might be necessary to consider ring-fencing a certain amount of Levy funding for affordable housing to ensure that affordable housing continues to be delivered onsite at current levels (or higher).

Alternatively, the permitted uses of the Levy could remain focused on infrastructure and affordable housing, as they are broadly are at present. Local authorities would continue to identify the right balance between these to meet local needs, as they do at present.

Delivering change (Transitional Arrangements)

Separate consultation 'Changes to the current planning system' looks at four shorter-term measures which includes: www.gov.uk/government/consultations/changes-to-the-current-planning-system

- changes to the standard method for assessing local housing need,
- securing of First Homes, sold at a discount to market price for first time buyers, including key workers, through developer contributions in the short term until the transition to a new system;

- temporarily lifting the small sites threshold, below which developers do not need to contribute to affordable housing, to up to 40 or 50 units;
- extending the current Permission in Principle to major development so landowners and developers now have a fast route to secure the principle of development for housing on sites without having to work up detailed plans first;

These will be summarised in a separate briefing paper.

They then go on to talk about other government strategies not relating to the changes including:

Public assets and investment - make better use of surplus land owned by the public sector by ensuring investment in new public buildings supports renewal and regeneration of town and city centres across the country and exploring how disposal of publicly-owned land can support the SME and self-build sectors. This will be done through a new cross-government strategy on how land owned by the Government can be managed and released more effectively and put to better use. As part of this review, we will explore how we can support SME housebuilders, community land trusts and self-builders to identify public land opportunities.

Supporting innovation in delivery – they want encourage more development corporations and will be publishing their response to the consultation on the legislative framework for development corporations undertaken last year later this year.

Making sure the system has the right people and skills

The preparation of reformed Local Plans, development of new design codes, a major overhaul of development contributions, and a new streamlined approach to decision-making will have profound implications for how local planning authorities operate in future. They will need to have sufficient leadership, a strong cadre of professional planners and good access to technical expertise, as well as transformed systems which utilise the latest digital technology.

They envisage the focus of local planning authorities shifting towards the development of clear Local Plans and high-quality design codes which set the parameters for development – rather than making discretionary decisions based on vague policies.

The Planning Inspectorate and statutory consultees, will have to transform the way they operate in response to these reforms, given their critical role supporting the preparation of Local Plans and decision-making.

Proposal 23: As we develop our final proposals for this new planning system, we will develop a comprehensive resources and skills strategy for the planning sector to support the implementation of our reforms. In doing so, we propose this strategy will be developed including the following key elements:

Planning fees to continue to be set on a national basis and cover at least the full cost of processing the application type based on clear national benchmarking. This should involve the greater regulation of discretionary pre-application charging.

A small proportion of the income for the new infrastructure levy should be earmarked to LPAs to cover their overall planning costs, including the preparation and review of Local Plans and design codes and enforcement activities.

Some local planning activities still to be funded through general taxation but time limited funding will be made available through the new burdens principle to support local planning authorities to transition to the new planning system as part of the next Spending Review.

LPAs to be subject to a new performance framework across all planning functions (from Local Plans to decision-making and enforcement).

Workforce planning and skills development, including training, should be principally for the local government sector to lead on, working closely with Government, statutory consultees, planning consultancies and universities.

Reform should be accompanied by a significant enhancement in digital and geospatial capability and capacity across the planning sector to support high-quality new digital Local Plans and digitally enabled decision-making.

Government will continue to engage with the innovators and the UK PropTech sector through a Minister-led PropTech Innovation Council (announced in November 2019) to make the most of innovative new approaches to meet public policy objectives, help this emerging sector to boost productivity in the wider planning and housing sectors, and ensure government data and decisions support the sector's growth in the UK and internationally.

Proposal 24: *We will seek to strengthen enforcement powers and sanctions*

They will review and strengthen the existing planning enforcement powers and sanctions available to LPAs and introduce more powers to address intentional unauthorised development, consider higher fines, and look to ways of supporting more enforcement activity.

This will include implementing our commitments from the Government's response to the consultation on unauthorised development and encampments, to strengthen national planning policy against intentional unauthorised development and ensure temporary stop notices are more effective. And will also consider what more can be done in cases where the Environment Agency's flood risk advice on planning applications is not followed.