

Planning for the Future: Consultation Response

About You

First Name	
Surname	
Email Address	
Are your views expressed on this consultation your own personal views or an official response from an organisation you represent?	Official response from The Heswall Society, a charity established in 1953 for the public benefit to conserve the heritage of the ward of Heswall
What region of England are you located in? (Select one) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> North East <input checked="" type="radio"/> North West <input type="radio"/> Yorkshire and The Humber <input type="radio"/> East Midlands <input type="radio"/> West Midlands <input type="radio"/> East of England <input type="radio"/> London <input type="radio"/> South East <input type="radio"/> South West <input type="radio"/> Don't know/ Prefer not to say <input type="radio"/> I/We operate nationwide <input type="radio"/> If another country (please specify): 	

Pillar One – Planning for Development

Q1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?	1. slow 2. opaque 3. inconsistent Three words only are insufficient to describe the planning system in England, and furthermore, each word requires a further explanation Slow. This refers to the pace of development of our Local Plan, still in preparation since 2004 and also to a reluctance by planners to finalise a decision where they are minded to refuse an
---	---

	<p>application. However we consider the processing of the majority of more straightforward applications not to be slow.</p> <p>Opaque. We feel that there is inadequate consultation on the local plan development until proposals are well developed, when it becomes much harder to champion alternative and potentially better options. We do not see planning officer reports on new developments unless the application is moved out of delegation.</p> <p>Inconsistent. Due to the lack of a local plan and a very old UDP, there is uncertainty in the weight these retained policies and guidelines are given in the assessment of any particular application. It is not surprising therefore that we see inconsistent application of these policies amongst planning officers on individual applications, and by Inspectors on appeal decisions. This uncertainty encourages developers to attempt to circumvent policies which they claim to be outdated.</p>
<p>Q2. Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area? (Select One)</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p>	<p>The Society reviews every planning application and appeal in the ward of Heswall and makes comments on possible improvements. We submit objections if we feel planning policy and guidelines are contravened, and we perceive inappropriate development is being proposed.</p>
<p>Q2 (a) If no, why not? (Select One)</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Don't know how to</p> <p><input type="radio"/> It takes too long</p> <p><input type="radio"/> It's too complicated</p> <p><input type="radio"/> I don't care</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Other (please specify):</p>	

Q3. Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future? (Select One)

- Social Media
- Online News
- Newspaper
- By post
- Other (please specify):

The Planning Group of the Society relies on the LPA online facilities to obtain our information. We see huge opportunities to improve the capabilities of this system, which is very inefficient from the user perspective (and probably from the LPA's as well). Facilities should be provided in libraries and council offices to help those members of the community without IT skills or access to understand the applications and to be able to comment in writing if so desired. We feel it is essential also to have paper copies of the applications available for consultation to any people unable to access them online, especially in the transition period as the new digital processes are implemented. The Society reviews every application and highlights any concerns to the members. We feel that it is important that the wider public who do not regularly check the LPA online facilities are better informed on applications especially with the demise of wide circulation local papers. We would like to see more efficient ways of communicating planning topics by being able to request filtered email alerts, and by use of social media. The display of site notices and writing to neighbours are highly effective ways of alerting the neighbourhood to new developments and we regret that these practices are not consistently applied on Wirral.

We would also like to see more information made available online, e.g. all appeal documentation (as now introduced as a COVID measure) and also input from statutory consultees. Furthermore all documentation on discharge of conditions should be made public so that compliance can be checked. Planning officer reports on non-delegated applications should be accessible.

Q4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? (Please select **only three** answers)

Other. We believe the choice of priorities is far too simplistic and also ignores the ramifications of one choice against

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Building homes for young people ● Building homes for the homeless ● Protection of green spaces ● The environment, biodiversity and action on climate change ● Increasing the affordability of housing ● The design of new homes and places ● Supporting the high street ● Supporting the local economy ● More or better local infrastructure ● Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas ● Other – please specify: 	<p>another.-,e.g. stopping urban sprawl by protecting green spaces and the Green Belt will also promote regeneration in deprived urban areas.The response to this question depends on how the local area is defined and whether it embraces the LPA area or the immediate local vicinity.For our local area in Heswall our priority is to provide the <u>right homes in the right places</u>, thereby maintaining a balanced and integrated community which is a good place for living, working, shopping, leisure, recreation, and which maintains a local distinctiveness all rooted in sound environmental policy.</p>
<p>Q5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/> No</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Not Sure</p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>No. Whilst we agree the Local Plan should be simplified with much more involvement of the local community in its development, the proposals will actually eliminate important local inputs. Firstly, a binding number for the housing need (which determines many other planning decisions) will be set by the Government, without any involvement of the local authority or community. The housing number will be adjusted to take into account local constraints. It is almost impossible to imagine how the Government could make such an adjustment without knowing the details and nuances of all the regions.</p> <p>Secondly, all development management policies will be set nationally. We do not understand how the Government can be in a better position than the local authority and community to mandate this major aspect of the planning process across England. The new Local Plans would focus on identifying land under three categories, Growth areas, Renewal areas and Protected areas. Local Plans would be restricted to identifying site and area specific rules for these three area types, linked to local design codes. The proposals do not explain how limiting local input in this way , with all</p>

	<p>development management policies mandated nationally, would operate in practice and we have strong doubts about this.</p> <p>We fear Local Plans may be open to judicial challenge if not adequately underpinned by an accompanying evidence base.</p> <p>Regardless of the above major concerns, we support the digitisation of the Local Plans to improve the new civic engagement process, and making proposals easier to understand, together with a much easier feedback process. However the resources, expertise and time needed to achieve this huge transformation to digital should not be underestimated.</p>
<p>Q6. Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/> No</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Not Sure</p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>No. Categorising land in the manner the consultation paper proposes and conferring a 'permission in principle' or 'presumption in favour of development' within growth and renewal areas risks leaving only 'protected areas' with a properly functioning system of planning and development control. We feel that there is scope within the current system for the LPA to make much faster decisions on contentious applications if local and neighbourhood codes and guidance were to be kept updated and applied with confidence. In our region of Wirral the very outdated UDP from 2000 has never been updated via a Local Plan. We have expressed our concerns about removing the ability of LPAs to manage local development management policies in our response to Q5.</p>
<p>Q7(a) Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of “sustainable development”, which would</p>	<p>Not sure. Without explaining the details of the consolidated test of sustainable development, it is difficult to assess the implications of replacing the existing criteria, especially as there will still be an</p>

<p>include consideration of environmental impact?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Sure</p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>overriding requirement to deliver the overall housing numbers. As there will be less community and LPA input into planning decisions in Growth and Renewal areas, we need to ensure there is robust examination of the Local Plan. We therefore cannot support any proposals which introduce less rigour into this process.</p>
<p>Q7. (b) How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?</p>	<p>We accept that the Duty to Cooperate is not effective and requires LPAs to expend resources on producing evidence bases and consultation processes with little prospect of successful outcomes. The Liverpool City Region Combined Authority provides an obvious vehicle for cooperation for significant developments which would necessitate strategic and cross-LPA boundaries issues to be resolved. It would be in the interest of all parties in the Combined Authority to agree a basis to proceed , albeit initially on an informal basis, prior to a final agreement. We would expect collaboration with Cheshire West & Chester Borough on our southern boundary to be on an as-needs basis.</p>
<p>Q8. (a) Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/> No</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Not Sure</p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>No. Planning for housing is best done locally. Local needs and aspirations, and different places' capacity to accommodate development should be the primary criteria to determine housing requirements.</p> <p>In parallel with this White Paper, the government has published its consultation paper on the standard method formula for calculating the annual housing requirement in each local authority. The results of this suggest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Just 50,000 (15%) new homes a year of 337,000 are targeted for the north of England, despite the north being home to one in every four people (25%). • Contradicts the political rhetoric the government places on house building contributing to the northern powerhouse.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is highly unrealistic to expect London will deliver a target of 155,000 homes per year. • The target for Wirral will be increased from a figure which is already unjustified by any impartial analysis of household population trends, simply due to the the algorithm defaulting to a figure of 0.5% of the housing stock with no regard to household growth. These inflated numbers for housing need will place unjustified pressure on Wirral’s Green Belt. <p>The proposed SM, which only focuses on the delivery of <u>additional</u> housing, takes no account at all of the replacement and upgrading of existing housing which is a huge priority for the deprived areas of Wirral . Setting unjustified and excessive targets for additional housing will hinder the provision of upgraded housing for the most deprived population on Wirral who suffer huge health and life expectancy negatives compared to those in the more affluent areas.</p> <p>In summary, we feel that the current and proposed SM will place unnecessary pressure on the Green Belt, negatively impact desperately needed regeneration schemes for east Wirral and will hinder urgent addressing health and housing inequalities across the Borough .</p>
<p>Q8. (b) Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/> No</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Not Sure</p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>No. The capacity of places to accommodate sustainable development should be the primary objective.</p> <p>Simply building more homes won't make them more 'affordable' as developers are unlikely to flood the market to a level that would make house prices fall.</p> <p>The quantity of development planned for should be based upon an assessment of local need and places' capacity to accommodate development in a sustainable manner</p>

<p>Q9. (a) Do you agree that there should be automatic permission in principle for areas for substantial development (<i>Growth areas</i>) with faster routes for detailed consent?</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure </p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>No . We do not agree that Growth areas should be automatically granted outline planning permission by adoption of the Local Plan for the reasons provided in our answers to previous questions 5 & 6. Furthermore we feel that inadequate details are provided on the proposal “ to deliver full permission in these areas through streamlined and faster consent routes which focus on securing good design and addressing site specific issues” to be able to comment. We would like to see minimum information provided including type of housing, possible mixed type of housing, number of houses by type, design guides, environmental implications, infrastructure requirements, potential price of houses, potential infrastructure levy, housing completions by phase if necessary, etc. There should also be adequate time for public consultation.</p>
<p>Q9(b). Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for <i>Renewal</i> and <i>Protected</i> areas?</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure </p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>No. The planning application process provides for public and democratic scrutiny. This is a prerequisite for robust, transparent and fair planning outcomes and should be retained. For Renewal areas, a presumption in favour of development would apply and therefore it is not clear that provision for the same level of public, democratic scrutiny by way of a planning application as we have now would continue.</p> <p>It is vital that this stage be retained and enhanced to ensure at least the level of scrutiny and public participation in decisions remains as under present arrangements. Without these safeguards, the procedures for approval under the reforms risk being less fair, and less rigorous. If planning officers are not seen to consult the community on applications, there will be less public confidence in their decisions</p>

	<p>We welcome the proposed retention of the current procedures in protected areas, but would like to see more use of Article 4 directives to provide additional protection to special features, such as sandstone walls. We disagree that suitably experienced architectural specialists can have earned autonomy from routine listed building consents.</p>
<p>Q9(c). Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime?</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure </p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>We do not have the expertise to comment on this.</p>
<p>Q10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain?</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure </p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>No, not if this involves less detail on planning applications and more delegation to planning officers, especially when there is a lack of resources and expertise within the LPA. The current process is not as inefficient as the Prime Minister's foreword to the consultation suggests. ONS statistics show that in Q4 2018 89% of major applications were determined within 13 weeks, which could easily be improved with better staffing. Only 12% of refusals are appealed and the majority of these refusal decisions are upheld. We support the concept of more democratic input in plan development to define codes and policies which will inform individual decisions on planning applications, but we cannot agree that this will be at the expense of opportunity for public engagement on individual applications. We believe that planning applications could be handled very quickly if the LPA had enough expert resources to develop and maintain the required codes and policies and then to use these confidently. This would imply that pre-application advice becomes more important to avoid a long dialogue between the planning officer and the developer once</p>

	<p>an application is submitted. We would like to see a requirement for applications to be decided within the statutory limits to prevent the long delays on some difficult decisions which we see now (where the LPA is minded to refuse). We feel that metrics for assessing LPA performance should acknowledge that refusals take more time to process than approvals.</p>
<p>11. Do you agree with our proposals for digitised, web-based Local Plans?</p> <p><input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure</p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>Yes. We strongly support this proposal as we find the current LPA website very inefficient. We have already seen the benefits of simple interactive maps in the current Wirral Local plan consultation process. To develop a fully integrated digital system is an enormous undertaking and we would like to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -adequate resources allocated to LPAs to allow it to be achieved -training for both LPAs and public users -adequate arrangements for the difficult transition period -provision for people without IT skills or equipments to still be engaged
<p>Q12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 - month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure</p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>No. We agree that the process needs to be accelerated, especially on Wirral where the LPA has not yet converted the UDP finalised in 2000 into a Local plan .The elimination of unnecessary or repetitive documentation and evidence base should help to speed the process, but the radical changes in the nature of the LP with its classification of all land into three categories (Growth, Renewal, Protected) must be given enough time to be completed properly. Providing additional LPA resources will help in this respect, and outsourcing of all the work, as currently the practice on Wirral, should be avoided as this prevents internal and sustainable expertise being developed.</p> <p>We note that 9 months of the 30 month statutory timescale is on the examination phase, and only 12 months is allocated to the actual drawing up of the plan. This</p>

	preparation timescale is far too demanding for an LPA such as Wirral without an existing approved Local plan to use as a starting point.
<p>Q13. (a) Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system?</p> <p> <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure </p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>Yes. We believe neighbourhood plans are very important in our town where there are special features and localities which are not adequately protected by current policies. We are disappointed that neighbourhood plans do not feature more strongly in the proposals.</p>
<p>Q13 (b) How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?</p>	<p>The drawing up of neighbourhood plans should be made much simpler, as the current process to develop these plans is too onerous and has certainly discouraged this Society from progressing one. The LPA also needs to support the process by championing neighbourhood plans, and making resources available to establish and educate neighbourhood groups so they can take ownership of the plan development. We feel there is an enormous opportunity to engage the community in local design codes and plans, and to encourage public voting on proposals, by using digitally rendered images which bring the designs to life.</p>
<p>Q14. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support?</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure </p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>No comment as this is not within our experience or expertise</p>

Pillar Two – Planning for Beautiful and Sustainable Places

<p>Q15. What do you think about new development that has happened recently in your area? (Select One)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Not sure / indifferent <input type="radio"/> Beautiful / well-designed <input type="radio"/> Ugly / poorly-designed <input type="radio"/> There hasn't been any <input checked="" type="radio"/> Other (please specify): 	<p>We have seen much development recently, which varies enormously in the quality of design and landscaping.. On large developments the intrinsic design can be attractive but the overall impression is often impaired by overcrowding of sites. Landscape plans are now largely omitted in initial applications and imposed by conditions. We suffer from old planning policies and guidelines which are not consistently applied. There are no Article 4 directions in our Conservation Areas to protect important features and unlisted buildings of high importance to the CA. We welcome the proposal to strengthen enforcement.</p>
<p>Q16. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area? (Select One)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Less reliance on cars <input type="radio"/> More green / open spaces <input type="radio"/> Energy efficiency of new buildings <input type="radio"/> More trees <input checked="" type="radio"/> Other (please specify): 	<p>We are fortunate in the number of green and garden spaces with associated landscaping already provided within and surrounding our town, and our priority in terms of sustainability is to nurture these and protect them from development. However we consider all the aspects listed important, plus the need for new builds to be not only energy efficient but using designs and materials reflecting local character.</p>
<p>Q17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>Yes. We would like to see better and updated design codes especially those to be implemented at local and neighbourhood level. The outdated or absent nature of our local and neighbourhood codes, and a reluctance to implement those which do exist, contribute to poor designs in our town. We feel that design codes should be flexible enough to avoid a "cookie cutter" appearance to new developments and to allow for innovation and to be able to seize opportunities which particular sites offer for creative solutions (including repurposing of heritage assets).</p>

<p>Q18. Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making?</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Sure </p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>Not sure as outside our expertise. We would support all initiatives to improve the quality of design, but the first priority must be to resource the LPA sufficiently to ensure existing design codes are implemented professionally. No point is appointing a highly salaried Chief Officer for Design if the implementation team is under resourced and unable to perform the basic role competently.</p>
<p>Q19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England?</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure </p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>No comment.</p> <p><i>i</i></p>
<p>Q20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty?</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure </p> <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>No. While good design matters, many factors determine whether a development is sustainable in terms of impact on the environment and host community. A fast track process would not be subject to the level of scrutiny required to fully assess the impacts of a proposal.</p> <p>A 'beautiful' development is not necessarily a sustainable one, and that should be a minimum requisite (to include zero-carbon, nature friendly), along with compliance with Local Plan policies, for any 'fast track' process. Ideally community led or with community consensus.</p>

Pillar Three – Planning for Infrastructure and Connected Places

<p>Q21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it?</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> More affordable housing <input type="radio"/> More or better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health) <input type="radio"/> Design of new buildings </p>	<p>All of these are important to us, except that we do not wish to see any further retail provision. We wish to see new and extended homes and offices with a style, location and infrastructure which meets the evolving needs of the population and which do not compromise the qualities of Heswall</p>
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> More shops and/or employment space <input type="radio"/> Green space <input type="radio"/> Don't know <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify): 	<p>which make it such a pleasant place to live, i.e. open spaces, trees, views and a variety of housing types, i.e. <u>the right homes in the right places.</u></p> <p>In particular we would strongly resist any development on the Green Belt surrounding Heswall or on the green spaces within the town.</p>
<p>Q22. (a) Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>Q22. (b) Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Nationally at a single rate <input type="radio"/> Nationally at an area-specific rate <input type="radio"/> Locally 	<p>No comment</p>
<p>Q22. (c) Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Same amount overall <input type="radio"/> More value <input type="radio"/> Less value <input type="radio"/> Note sure <p>Please provide supporting statement</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>Q22. (d) Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No 	<p>No comment</p>

<input type="radio"/> Not Sure Please provide supporting statement	
Q23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure Please provide supporting statement	Yes, we see no reason why profits from such changes of use should not be subject to the same levies as other types of development.
Q24. (a) Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure Please provide supporting statement	No comment
Q24. (b) Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure Please provide supporting statement	No comment
Q24. (c) If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure Please provide supporting statement	No comment
Q24. (d) If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality? <input type="radio"/> Yes	No comment

<input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure Please provide supporting statement	
Q25. Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure Please provide supporting statement	No comment
Q25 (a) If 'yes', should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure Please provide supporting statement	

Equalities Impact

Q26. Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Not Sure Please provide supporting statement	No
---	----

Final Question

Have you responded to a Government consultation before? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Yes
---	-----