

APPENDIX 1

Impact of the Technical Consultation on Planning on SCDC and the Council's Proposed Response

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
Section 1 Neighbourhood Planning	<p>Time limit for taking decisions on the designation of a neighbourhood area</p> <p>We are proposing to set a statutory time limit of 10 weeks (70 days) within which a Local Planning Authority (LPA) must make a decision on whether to designate a neighbourhood area that has been applied for. This time limit will apply where the area applied for follows parish or electoral ward boundaries and there is no existing designation or outstanding application for designation, for all or part of the area for which a new designation is sought.</p>	<p>A 10 week period to carry out a consultation would be challenging. Documentation has to be prepared before consultation starts and contact details need to be found for local consultees for each individual neighbourhood area. Consultation itself takes a statutory 6 weeks. SCDC intends to take a report to the Planning Portfolio Holder (PPH) at the end of a neighbourhood plan consultation. Being restricted to 10 weeks to undertake the whole process may prove difficult if the timing of the next PPH meeting is outside of the time period. It is unreasonable to then suggest that if the 10 week period is not met the neighbourhood area is considered designated.</p>	<p>South Cambridgeshire District Council considers that a 10 week period for taking decisions on the designation of a neighbourhood area is challenging. The statutory 6 week consultation period does not leave much time for the Local Planning Authority to prepare consultation material or consider responses received before making a decision on whether to designate an area. The Council proposes that the time period has some flexibility rather than being a set 10 weeks. Alternatively, if a specific time must be given then a 12-16 week would be preferred.</p>
	<p>Pre-submission consultation</p> <p>We propose removing the current statutory requirement for a minimum of six weeks of consultation and publicity by those preparing a neighbourhood plan or Order.</p>	<p>The duplication of this consultation followed by the requirement for the Council to carry out consultation will inevitably lead to consultation fatigue in the neighbourhood</p>	<p>The Council supports the removal of the pre-submission consultation if, as the Government proposes, a basic condition is introduced to test the extent of consultation undertaken. The degree of</p>

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
		area. There needs to be a robust consultation process undertaken for any neighbourhood plan and it should be appropriate to the nature and scale of proposals in the plan. Parish Councils could still choose to carry out the 6 week consultation if they wish.	consultation undertaken should be appropriate to the nature and scale of the proposals within the neighbourhood plan.
	Consulting landowners We propose to require those preparing a neighbourhood plan to consult certain landowners; those with an interest in land which may be allocated for development.	Having certainty over the delivery of development proposals is a relevant part of plan making. It is therefore beneficial for landowners to be consulted about proposals in a neighbourhood plan.	If land is being proposed for development within a neighbourhood plan it is appropriate that the landowner should be consulted. This will ensure certainty over the deliverability of proposals in the plan.
	Introducing an additional basic condition to test the extent of consultation We intend to introduce a new statutory requirement (basic condition) to test the extent of the consultation undertaken during the preparation of a neighbourhood plan or Order (including a community right to build order).	This proposal is supported as it will ensure that the appropriate consultation is carried out on a draft plan.	The Council supports the introduction of a new basic condition to test the extent of consultation to ensure that appropriate consultation has been undertaken.
	Strategic Environmental Assessment We intend to clarify the information that should be submitted with a neighbourhood plan in order that its compatibility with obligations under the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive can be assessed. We will do this in regulations.	This clarification would be useful as currently the regulations are not clear on this matter.	The Council welcomes this change as the current regulations are unclear.
Section 2 Reducing planning	Proposal A: Creating new homes from light industrial and warehouse Buildings	Potential loss of light industrial uses. SCDC Local Plan policies seek to protect employment	The Council objected to the temporary permitted development right to change from offices (B1(a))

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
regulations to support housing, high streets and growth	Proposes new permitted development right to allow light industrial buildings (B1(c)) and storage and distribution buildings (B8), which were in that use at the time of the 2014 Budget, to change use to residential (C3) use. Seeks views on whether it should include a floorspace limit.	land, particularly in villages to maintain their vitality. Question suitability of buildings for conversion (materials & style) and location (often clusters on an industrial estate on edge of a village) – issues of poor design and sustainability.	to Residential (C3). The Council remains concerned about the loss of employment land and buildings. Employment land in villages is a scarce resource, which helps maintain them as sustainable places. The loss could harm firms, and increase pressure for greenfield development. Policies in successive development plans have sought to protect this resource. The changes to permitted development rights undermine the ability of the Council to do this. The addition of a prior approval to consider loss of the most strategically important office accommodation would help, particularly with preserving the science parks close to Cambridge, but would not address the issue of a gradual loss in villages. The addition of light industrial and storage uses adds concerns about the suitability of these buildings for conversion. A prior approval process would not be sufficient to test this. If light industrial uses are added, a low floorspace threshold should be
	Proposal B: Creating new homes from sui generis uses Proposes new permitted development right for launderettes, amusement arcades/centres, casinos and nightclubs, which were in that use at the time of the 2014 Budget, to change to residential use (C3).	Unlikely to be significant.	
	Proposal C: Office to residential permitted development rights Government proposes making a permanent permitted development right for change of use from office to residential from May 2016 (at the end of the current temporary period). Does not apply to listed buildings, but can be done in conservation areas. Prior approval will continue to consider the impact of the proposed development in relation to highways and transport, flooding and contamination. Additionally prior approval will now consider the potential impact of the significant loss of the most strategically important office accommodation.	Potential loss of rural office buildings. SCDC Local Plan policies seek to protect employment land. Since its introduction last year take up has been limited, with only 3 cases.	

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
			<p>imposed, as these would most likely be the more suitable buildings for conversion.</p> <p>Conversions could impact on the remaining users of a site, hindering their ability to continue to use sites for employment. A prior approval issue to consider this is vital.</p>
	<p>Proposal D: Extensions to dwellings</p> <p>Introduced new permitted development rights for householders in May 2013, increasing the size limits allowed for single storey rear extensions on dwelling houses. It is proposed that these permitted development rights be made permanent.</p>	<p>To date there have been 53 prior approval applications through the neighbour consultation scheme. Full impacts are not known.</p>	<p>No significant objection, although the prior approval scheme has introduced complexity.</p>
	<p>Proposal E: Increasing flexibilities for high street uses</p> <p>We propose that the retail offer is strengthened by incorporating into a revised wider A1 use class the majority of financial and professional services currently found in A2.</p> <p>Government proposes to make changes to the GPDO 1995 to remove the existing permitted development rights to the A2 use class.</p> <p>Betting shops are proposed to remain in the A2 use class and pay day loan shops added, and both will not benefit from the flexibilities.</p> <p>Proposes that permitted development rights will enable the change of use to the wider retail (A1)</p>	<p>SCDC Local Plan policies seek to protect village shops.</p> <p>Potentially easier to change use within the new wider A1 use class – greater potential for loss of village shops without testing through a planning application.</p> <p>May help protect shops if it is harder to change use to betting shop or pay day loan shop.</p> <p>Potential impact on the variety of services and facilities in villages. SCDC Local Plan policy seek to protect village facilities.</p>	<p>Support flexibility for the high street. However, there is a particular concern for villages where they may have only one or two convenience shops meeting local needs. Successive Development Plans have included policies seeking to protect these shops. Greater flexibility undermines the ability of the Council to do this.</p> <p>The Government should consider what can be done to protect and support village shops.</p>

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	<p>class from betting shops and pay day loan shops (A2), restaurants and cafés (A3), drinking establishments (A4), and hot food takeaways (A5).</p>		
	<p>Proposal F: Supporting a broader range of uses on the high street</p> <p>Proposes to introduce a new permitted development right for the change of use from existing A1 and A2 use classes, and some sui generis uses to restaurants and cafés (A3).</p> <p>Does not apply to listed buildings, but can be done in conservation areas.</p> <p>The right will apply a size threshold of 150 m² to focus on smaller premises.</p> <p>Prior approval in form of a neighbour notification scheme, which would allow those immediately adjacent to make representations in respect of local amenity (noise, odour, traffic, hours of opening).</p> <p>The right will provide safeguards where the retail premise is a local service, or its loss will have an adverse impact on the shopping area.</p>	<p>Potential loss of rural shops to cafes. SCDC Local Plan policies seek to protect village shops. More of an issue in rural areas where it could lead to loss of vital local shop.</p>	<p>See response to Proposal E above.</p>
	<p>Proposal G: Supporting the diversification of leisure uses on the high street</p> <p>Proposes that a new permitted development right is introduced to enable the change of use from A1, A2 and some sui generis uses to assembly and leisure (D2) without the need for a planning application.</p> <p>Does not apply to listed buildings and within</p>	<p>Potential (but unlikely) loss of village shops to leisure uses - cinemas, music and concert halls, gyms and swimming pools.</p>	<p>See response to Proposals E above.</p>

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	<p>conservation areas.</p> <p>The right will exclude any size restriction.</p> <p>Prior approval will continue to consider the impact of the proposed development in relation to highways and transport, flooding and contamination.</p>		
	<p>Proposal H: Expanded facilities for existing retailers</p> <p><u>Supporting retail facilities</u> Proposes to build on existing permitted development rights and allow erection of small, ancillary buildings which could facilitate 'click and collect' services.</p> <p>Does not apply to listed buildings and within conservation areas.</p> <p>Buildings should not exceed 4m in height, have a cumulative gross floorspace of 20m², or be erected within 2m of a shop's curtilage boundary.</p> <p>Prior approval to consider design, siting and external appearance.</p> <p>Also proposes to make it easier for retailers to increase their back of house loading bay capacity, allowing them to store more goods for home delivery and 'click and collect'. The size of an existing loading bay cannot increase by more than 20%.</p> <p><u>Mezzanine floors</u> Proposes to increase the limit to allow retailers to build a mezzanine floor and welcome views on what</p>	<p>Could be implemented by shops in the district.</p>	<p>Support, in principle, measures to help shops compete with on-line retailers. This proposal has the potential to aid their viability through additional footfall and enables them to provide an increasingly valuable service to the local community.</p> <p>The Council is concerned there could be potential issues with (lack of) space and possible impact on available car parking, traffic generation and disturbance, or impact on residential amenity. These are not addressed in the proposed prior approval process.</p> <p>The proposal for prior approval to consider design, siting and external appearance of any new structure introduces another list of prior approval issues for one specific type of development, adding to complexity.</p>

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	size would be appropriate. This will give greater opportunity for retailers to make best use of their existing premises and to diversify their retail offer to support the town centre.		
	<p><u>Maximum parking standards</u> Government wishes to understand whether more action is needed to tackle on-street parking problems. We want to understand whether local authorities are stopping builders from providing sufficient parking space to meet market demand. We also want to ensure that local authorities in their Local Plans have properly reviewed their parking policies and brought them up to date.</p>	New Local Plan includes designed approach to car parking rather than maximum standards, which should enable to address issues on a case by case basis.	No comment.
	<p>Proposal I: Permitted development right for the film and television Industries</p> <p>Proposes to introduce a new permitted development right to allow for commercial filming and the associated physical development on location. The right will be for a maximum of 9 months in any rolling 27 month period and will includes prior approval.</p> <p>Does not apply to listed buildings and within conservation areas.</p> <p>These proposals will work independently of the existing general permitted development rights for temporary use Part 4, Schedule 2, Class B. We will amend Part 4 to ensure those rights cannot be added to the time limit proposed for the new filming right.</p>	Likely to be limited impact on SCDC.	No comment.
	Proposal J: Solar PV panels for commercial properties	The scale proposed would effectively mean solar panels on commercial properties would be	Support, in principle, proposals to help address climate change.

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	<p>Government proposes to introduce a new permitted development right to support the installation of photovoltaic panels on non-domestic buildings with a capacity up to one megawatt.</p> <p>Does not apply to listed buildings or and with conservation areas.</p> <p>Prior approval to consider the siting and design.</p>	permitted development.	Concerned that the consultation proposes prior approval for siting and design, but not appearance.
	<p>Proposal K: Extensions to business premises</p> <p>The rights to build larger extensions were initially introduced for a three-year period, and the Government committed to keep them under review to determine whether they should be extended. To maintain that flexibility for businesses Government proposes to make these permitted development rights permanent.</p>	May help businesses meet their aspirations but could be contrary to the 'character and scale' clause in Local Plan policy.	<p>Support the principle of enabling businesses to meet their aspirations. However, in a rural area, business premises in villages need to be carefully controlled to minimise adverse impacts on their rural communities.</p> <p>This is not proposed as a prior approval process, therefore there is potential for impact on residential amenity or other impacts to take place without being tested.</p>
	<p>Proposal L: Permitted development rights for waste management facilities</p> <p>Proposes to introduce permitted development rights for those waste management facilities currently 'sui generis', by enabling the carrying out of operations for the replacement of any plant or machinery and buildings on land within the curtilage of a waste management facility and which is ancillary to the main waste management operation.</p>	A matter for the County Council as Waste Management Authority.	No comment.
	Proposal M: Equipment housings for sewerage undertakers	A matter for the County Council as Waste Management	No comment.

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council Authority.	Council's Proposed Response
	<p>Proposes that a permitted development right equivalent to that for water undertakers should apply to sewerage undertakers. This would allow sewerage undertakers to carry out the installation of a pumping station, valve house, control panel or switchgear house into a sewerage system.</p>	<p>Authority.</p>	
<p>Section 3 Improving the use of planning conditions</p>	<p>Issue 1: a tendency of local planning authorities to impose too many conditions at the decision making stage</p> <p>It is vital to ensure that conditions are only imposed where they meet the six tests in the NPPF. It is also important to have effective dialogue between the local planning authority and the applicant about how conditions will impact on the planned delivery of the development. Particular care is needed when using a pre-commencement condition.</p> <p>Issue 2: local planning authority delays in discharging conditions</p> <p>Government has already taken action aimed at addressing delays and costs. The NPPG must be considered by the LPA each time they take a decision to grant planning permission subject to conditions.</p> <p>Government now propose to go further:</p> <p><u>Deemed discharge for certain types of conditions where the local planning authority does not make a timely decision</u></p>	<p>Potential impacts on the way the LPA would use planning conditions.</p>	<p>South Cambridgeshire District Council is aware of the need to deal with conditions in a timely manner. It seeks to work cooperatively with applicants, to deliver the best outcome. The Local Planning Authority also uses conditions only when they are necessary.</p> <p>It is noted that deemed discharge would only apply where instigated by the applicant. This would allow a process of cooperation to continue where it is to the benefit of both parties.</p> <p>In some circumstances a deemed discharge system could actually slow the planning process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It could lead to more refusal of planning applications, and more appeals. Particularly if evoked where the LPA feels the quality of submission is not sufficient for discharge.

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	<p>Failure to discharge conditions with minimum of delay does not in reality give the applicant an 'implementable planning permission'. We are seeking enabling powers in the Infrastructure Bill to introduce a 'deemed discharge'.</p> <p>We are seeking views on whether an exemption should apply to all the conditions requiring discharge in the planning or only to those conditions that relate to the reason for the exemption.</p> <p>We propose that a deemed discharge would only be activated by the applicant serving a notice on the LPA, rather than applying automatically.</p> <p>We propose that the applicant's option to notify the LPA they intend to treat the condition as discharged would be available any time after the expiry of six weeks from the day after the application to discharge the condition was received by the LPA. The LPA would have two weeks to respond.</p> <p>We also propose that the deemed discharge would not apply to the approval of details for outline planning permissions required by reserved matters.</p> <p>The deemed discharge will not impact on the ability of the LPA to act early to seek the views of third parties.</p> <p>We propose to amend regulation 16 to reduce the time limit for return of the fee from 12 weeks to 8 weeks, beginning on the date on which the authority received the request.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It could lead to an LPA delaying granting consent until issues with the potential to be addressed by condition are largely resolved, to avoid risk of failing to discharge complex conditions quickly. This may not be in the interest of the applicant, who wants to secure the certainty of a permission as quickly as possible. • Discharging conditions is dependent on receiving sufficient quality of submissions from applicants. Imposing time limits, and shorting periods for the return of fees may encourage refusals, rather than encouraging the LPA to work to resolve the issue with the applicant and help them to improve their submission. <p>If implemented it should not apply to conditions that are key to safety or environmental impact, such as flood risk management.</p>

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	<p><u>Sharing draft conditions with applicants for major development before a decision is made.</u></p> <p>Propose to amend the Development Management Procedure Order to require that LPA share a draft of the proposed conditions with an applicant before making a decision for all major developments.</p> <p>A potential approach is to require a LPA share draft conditions at least 10 working days before permission is granted. Alternatively, five working days. We also propose some flexibility by allowing a different period to be agreed in writing between LPA and applicant.</p> <p>We are also interested to hear views on what approach should be taken where a LPA needs to change, or add to, the draft conditions after they have been shared with the applicant.</p> <p>Government is keen to hear views on what more could be done to ensure that conditions that require further action to be undertaken by an applicant before an aspect of the development can go ahead are used appropriately and that the timing is suitable and properly justified.</p>	<p>SCDC already generally seeks to share conditions in advance with applicants for major developments.</p>	<p>South Cambridgeshire District Council already seeks to share conditions in advance, as there are benefits to all parties.</p> <p>However, imposing a specific regulation could actually cause delay. If a consent was ready to be issued, but the time for sharing conditions had not been met, it could lead to the LPA delaying the decision in order to comply with the regulation. If the time limit was applied to any changes to those conditions, this would be compounded.</p>
<p>Section 4: Planning application process improvements</p>	<p>Part A – Statutory consultee involvement in the planning application process</p> <p>The purpose is to review the legislative requirements themselves, with the intention of removing or modifying the regulations to tackle instances of unnecessary consultation. Reducing such unnecessary regulatory burdens would allow</p>	<p>Changes to procedures, relatively minor.</p>	<p>Support the Government's aim of removing unnecessary burden on statutory consultees to enable them to focus their resources and expertise where they can add most value.</p> <p>Concern that the removal of 2km</p>

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	<p>statutory consultees to focus their resources and technical expertise on those applications where they can add most value to the decision-making process and other activities such as strategic planning.</p> <p><u>Environment Agency</u> We are not proposing to alter their consultation arrangements until decisions have been made regarding the commencement of Schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 which establishes an approval mechanism for sustainable drainage systems.</p> <p><u>Health and Safety Executive</u> We do not propose to alter the requirements for LPAs to consult the H&SE, which are being considered more broadly in the context of implementing the Seveso III Directive (2012/18EU).</p> <p><u>Natural England</u> Remove 2km consultation zone around SSSI.</p> <p>Retain requirement for Natural England to be consulted on proposed developments "in or likely to affect a site of special scientific interest".</p> <p><u>Highways Agency</u> Change requirement to consult to: 'Development, other than minor development, likely to result in an adverse impact on the safety of, or queuing on a trunk road.'</p> <p><u>English Heritage</u> Introduce a new consultation requirement for</p>		<p>consultation zone around SSSI will add to complexity and uncertainty.</p>

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	<p>registered battlefields.</p> <p>Remove the need to notify EH of applications for planning permission affecting the setting of Grade II (unstarred) listed buildings.</p> <p>The notification requirement reduces the current requirement to those applications which have potential for greatest impact on character and appearance of conservation areas.</p> <p>Adds requirement to Notify EH of local authorities' own applications for planning permission for relevant demolition in conservation areas</p> <p><u>Secretary of State</u> EH's own applications for listed building consent for properties of any grade in its ownership, guardianship, under its control or of which it is the prospective purchaser shall be determined by the LPA rather than the Secretary of State (except applications affecting Grade I and II* listed buildings and Grade II (unstarred) listed buildings involving demolition).</p> <p><u>Other heritage related consultations</u> We do not propose any material changes to the arrangements to notify the National Amenity Societies on certain listed building consent applications and to consult the Garden History Society on planning applications affecting registered parks and gardens.</p>		
	<p>Further measure to streamline statutory consultation arrangements</p>		<p>Proposals can change significantly from the pre-application stage.</p>

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	<p><u>The value of pre-application engagement</u> We are exploring how an existing flexibility within the Development Management Procedure Order could be used to encourage more meaningful pre-application engagement, while reducing unnecessary consultation at the application stage. Specifically, we are considering whether pre-application discussions could be used to encourage greater use of the power for statutory consultees already have to indicate that they do not wish to be consulted on applications.</p> <p><u>Exemptions from the requirement to consult</u> We are considering how pre-application discussions could provide the 'trigger' for statutory consultees to invoke the existing discretionary power not to be further consulted on an application.</p> <p>Where a statutory consultee was satisfied that it had no further comment to make on a scheme, it could choose to issue an applicant with a confirmation that it did not wish to be consulted. Such a confirmation could then accompany the subsequent planning application and act as the 'article 16(1)(c) notice' advising the LPA not to consult the statutory consultee. If the scheme changed since the notice was issued, consultation would take place as normal. Similarly, if the particular circumstances of the case meant that a statutory consultee was not comfortable issuing an article 16(1)(c) notice following pre-application discussions, it would not have to.</p>		<p>Changes to the consultation arrangements would need to be carefully applied to ensure only in cases where there is no possibility of further issues arising were statutory consultees consulted only at the pre-application stage.</p>

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	<p><u>Considerations for implementation</u></p> <p>We do not believe a change to the Development Management Procedure Order is required in order for this flexibility to be used more frequently. However, we are interested in what practical changes need to be made to facilitate more frequent use of this existing discretionary power.</p> <p>We consider that this point could be clarified in planning guidance. In addition, we could amend the 1APP form so that where an article 16(1)(c) notice accompanies a planning application, the applicant would be asked to confirm that the letter related to the same development as proposed in the application.</p> <p>We also envisage that a statutory consultee's confirmation that it did not wish to be consulted would be time-limited. The confirmation would need to require submission of the planning application within a reasonable period (such as six months).</p>		
	<p>Part B – Proposal to notify railway infrastructure managers of planning applications for development near railways</p> <p>We propose that local planning authorities (LPA) should notify railway infrastructure managers of all planning applications where any part of a proposed development is within 10 metres of a railway. We consider that this requirement should be in the form of notification by the LPA, which would require an amendment to the Development Management Procedure Order.</p>	Changes to procedures, relatively minor.	No comment.
	Part C – Consolidation of the Town and Country		Support the proposed consolidation

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	<p>Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010 and measurement of the end-to-end planning process</p> <p>The Town and Country Planning Development Order 2010</p> <p>The original order has now been amended several times. In the interests of clarity and certainty we propose to consolidate these amendments to produce a single order.</p>		<p>of amendments to the Town and Country Planning Development Order 2010 into one single order to provide greater clarity and certainty.</p>
	<p>Measurement of the end-to-end planning process</p> <p>Government is keen to improve the information it has about the total time it takes for developments to be delivered including the pre-application and post-permission stages so that we can more accurately measure the time it takes to deliver development. Government is keen to hear views on how other stages, outside of the determination period, could be measured without adding unnecessary burdens or distracting from the delivery of development.</p>	<p>Potential for additional monitoring requirements.</p>	<p>Support the Government's intention to improve the information it has about the total time it takes for developments to be delivered including the pre-application and post-permission stages so that we can more accurately measure the time it takes to deliver development.</p> <p>However, this could add additional work to the monitoring of applications. It also needs to be clear that not all stages of the development process are within the gift of the LPA to control (e.g. timing of submissions for discharging conditions).</p>
<p>Section 5: Environmental Impact Assessment Thresholds</p>	<p>Environmental Impact Assessment Thresholds</p> <p>Government is concerned that too many development proposals which are not likely to give rise to significant environmental effects are being subject to the more onerous requirements of the</p>	<p>Could significantly reduce the number of application subject to EIA.</p>	<p>Support the Government's proposal to amend the requirements for Environmental Impact Assessments to reduce the onerous and unnecessary burden on smaller developments and those outside of</p>

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	<p>European Directive. It is considered likely that this is leading to unnecessary delays in the delivery of new homes and jobs in local communities.</p> <p>Projects outside of sensitive areas and which fall below the new thresholds because they are not considered likely to give rise to significant environmental effects within the meaning of the European Directive, will not need to be screened. They will however continue, as appropriate, to be subject to the strong environmental protection provisions of the NPPF and other relevant environmental legislation.</p> <p>Raise the screening threshold for industrial estate development</p> <p>Proposes raising the screening threshold to five hectares. Having considered the Schedule 3 criteria, we do not consider that industrial estate development of this scale, which is outside sensitive areas, is likely to give rise to significant environmental effects within the meaning of the Directive.</p> <p>Raise the screening threshold for urban development projects</p> <p>We propose to raise the screening threshold for the development of dwelling houses of up to five hectares, including where there is up to one hectare of non-residential urban development.</p> <p>Our objective is to move closer to the existing</p>		sensitive areas.

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	indicative threshold for 'likely significant effects' for housing of 1,000 dwelling units (around 30 hectares at average density).		
Section 6 Improving the nationally significant infrastructure planning regime	<p>Development Consent Orders</p> <p>Making a non-material change</p> <p>We propose to amend the 2011 Regulations so the applicant is required to publicise and consult on their application rather than Secretary of State. This would allow preparations for the publication and consultation to be undertaken by the applicant while preparing their application. The notice could then be published and sent out to fulfil the consultation duty at the same time as the application is submitted to the Secretary of State. (If taken forward, some further minor amendments to the regulations on publicising the application and the duty to consult would be needed, together with guidance for applicants.)</p> <p>Making a material change</p> <p>Government is proposing to make a series of amendments to the procedures for making material changes to consents to make the process for handling a change simpler and quicker than that for handling a full application and proportionate to the nature of the change being proposed.</p> <p>Government is proposing to amend the 2011 Regulations covering the duty to consult on a proposed application. The applicant would be required to consult those persons who could be</p>	<p>The A14 Improvements are going to be proposed through a DCO application.</p> <p>Changes proposed seek to simplify the application process, and will have limited impacts on SCDC.</p>	No comment.

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	<p>directly affected by the change proposed if consent for the change was given.</p> <p>Government proposes to remove the requirement to prepare a statement of community consultation where an application is being proposed for a material change.</p> <p>Government proposes to remove the current requirement for formally publicising proposed applications in advance of them being made.</p> <p><u>Need to hold an Examination</u> Government is proposing that the 2011 Regulations should be amended to provide for a new regulation that allows the Secretary of State not to hold an examination into an application for change if he considers that one is not necessary. Where the an examination is not required, it is proposed there be an opportunity for anyone who has made a relevant representation to submit further representations before the Secretary of State reaches a decision on the application.</p> <p><u>Safeguards</u> Government has included an amendment to 2008 Act in the Infrastructure Bill which would provide a power to refuse to determine an application for material change if the Secretary of State considers that the development that would be authorised as a result of the change should properly be subject to a full application for development consent.</p> <p><u>Guidance on procedures</u></p>		

Section	Government's Proposed Change	Impact on South Cambs District Council	Council's Proposed Response
	<p>It is not proposed to undertake any formal consultation on draft guidance, but the Government would welcome further views on the issues that the guidance should cover.</p> <p>Streamlining the consenting process</p> <p>Government wishes to offer developers more choice over how they seek approval to build nationally significant infrastructure projects, by streamlining the way in which they can apply for consents.</p> <p>Government proposes to streamline arrangements so that ten more non-planning consents can be included within just one nationally significant infrastructure planning application process instead of requiring separate applications to be submitted to different consenting bodies.</p>		