



Government response to the Matthew Taylor Review: Implementation plan

Government response to the Matthew Taylor Review: Implementation plan

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
<p>Recommendation 1: Planning policy (the planning policy statements) should be reviewed by the Government as a body to create a more coherent set, reducing apparent conflicts between interpretations of sustainability, and the means by which competing priorities are assessed, and by doing so aid consistent interpretation and application at the local and regional level.</p>	<p>The Government is already streamlining the planning system, and will review planning policy statements as and when there is a need to change policy. In doing so, we will take the opportunity to assess what more we can do to improve the coherence of the planning policy framework and to make it more user-friendly.</p> <p>The Government reiterates its intention to ‘rural proof’ all relevant domestic policies. Rural proofing is a long-standing commitment by the Government to ensure that all domestic policies take account of rural circumstances and needs. It is a mandatory part of the policy-making process.</p>	<p>10-20</p>	<p>Draft PPS4 <i>Prosperous Economies</i> published in May 2009. Response to this recommendation is set out in part 1 of consultation document (ministerial foreword and introduction).</p>	<p>PPS4 due to be published by the end of 2009.</p>
<p>Recommendation 2: Planning policy (the planning policy statements) should more clearly set out the requirement to take account of all three strands of sustainability in a balanced way, and to have a long term vision of the contribution that planning can make to enhancing sustainability economically, socially and environmentally in each and every community.</p>	<p>The Government is already streamlining the planning system, and will review planning policy statements as and when there is a need to change policy. In doing so, we will take the opportunity to assess what more we can do to improve the coherence of the planning policy framework and to make it more user-friendly.</p> <p>The Government reiterates its intention to ‘rural proof’ all relevant domestic policies. Rural proofing is a long-standing commitment by the Government to ensure that all domestic policies take account of rural circumstances and needs. It is a mandatory part of the policy-making process.</p>	<p>10-20</p>	<p>Draft PPS4 <i>Prosperous Economies</i> published May 2009. Three strands of sustainability are carried throughout draft PPS4, particularly in the Government’s objectives (paragraph 6) and policies EC12.3(1), EC12.3(3), EC12.3(6) and EC21.1</p> <p>NB The paragraphs referred to above relate to draft PPS4. This update will be amended to reflect the final PPS4 paragraphs in due course.</p>	<p>PPS4 due to be published by the end of 2009.</p>
<p>Recommendation 3: The Government should initiate a review assessing the unintended impacts on</p>	<p>Generally agreed. The Government accepts the Review’s recommendation that there may be circumstances in which a community may decide through the LDF process that a</p>	<p>49</p>		<p>The CLG at present are undertaking a review of evidence</p>

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
amenity, wellbeing and bio-diversity of the policy directing development to Brownfield land and how this policy should be developed in the period to 2020.	small brownfield site is best left alone, and that necessary new development should be directed elsewhere.			of housing development on garden land and aim to conclude shortly.
<p>Recommendation 4: Rather than its proposed new planning policy statement limited to eco-towns, or in addition to it, the Government should produce a wider planning policy statement designed to address the practical planning issues concerning the sustainable growth of communities, including new neighbourhoods and community extensions as well as new towns. This should be accompanied by a new design guide to assist local authorities with best practice in neighbourhood/community design building on the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment's work in this area.</p>	The Government does not agree to dispense with the forthcoming PPS on eco-towns, but wants to consult more widely on ways to promote masterplanning.	31-34	Communities and Local Government (CLG) published <i>Rural masterplanning fund prospectus</i> on 26 November 2009.	Announcement of successful bids in early 2010.
<p>Recommendation 5: The Government should review the regulatory burdens and incentives placed upon local planning authorities which focus planning departments on short term delivery targets and development control, to ensure that addressing these short term requirements is more strongly supplemented by support for planning for communities in the longer term.</p>	Generally agreed. We have taken significant steps to reform the planning system, and are now looking to streamline it further: our acceptance of many of the Killian Pretty proposals, and our identification of priorities for action arising from it, is a recent case in point.	63-65	Detailed programme of reform of the planning application process is underway. Measures to allow extension of time to implement permission introduced October 2009. Range of measures published for consultation in July 2009.	Further round of measures to be published in draft by the end of 2009. Subject to outcome of consultation, measures will be finalised early 2010.
<p>Recommendation 6: The Government should continue the work it has already begun, along with partners such as the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment, the Planning Advisory Service and the Planning Inspectorate, to publish guidance on best practice on local development frameworks (LDF). Local strategic partnerships should be encouraged to develop a long term vision for their community which includes its physical shape and sets out plans for</p>	We agree with this recommendation: the white paper <i>Communities in control: real people, real power</i> (the 'community empowerment' white paper) outlines our thinking, and <i>Planning Together: updated practical guide for local strategic partnerships and planners</i> will remind authorities about the importance of their strategic leadership role, working through local strategic partnerships.	35	CLG published <i>Planning Together: updated practical guide for local strategic partnerships and planners</i> on 2 April 2009. Other relevant guidance includes the plan-making manual, setting out best practice on local development frameworks, and chapter four in the white paper <i>Communities in control</i> , which encourages increased community	Recommendation implemented.

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
change and growth in their economic, environmental and social context. LDF core strategies should, as they are intended to do, set out this vision in more detail for the time period which they cover.			participation in both the development of local plans and specific applications.	
<p>Recommendation 7: Guidance relating to a new planning policy statement and the exemplar programme (Recommendations 4 and 10) should support best practice in community engagement in developing plans for new neighbourhoods and community extensions through processes like ‘enquiry by design’ and ‘planning for real’, building on the ideas set out in <i>Towards an Urban Renaissance</i> and more recent experience.</p>	Recommendation 4 is not fully supported but we have established an empowerment fund which includes a ‘community involvement in planning’ theme which seeks to involve communities in housing delivery.	36-38	On 1 April 2009, empowerment fund support was announced for four voluntary sector bodies working on community participation in planning, including Action for Market Towns and Carnegie, who have an interest in involving communities in housing delivery.	Recommendation implemented.
<p>Recommendation 8: Building on the pathfinder programme proposed in Recommendation 10 for master planning new neighbourhoods and community extensions, best practice guidance should be developed to support the necessary partnerships between local authorities, the private sector, regional development agencies and the Housing Corporation/Homes and Communities Agency to deliver these new community developments.</p>	<p>Guidance will be issued independently of any exemplar programmes.</p> <p>The PPS on climate change already addresses issues around the sustainable expansion and regeneration of large and small communities; and further Government guidance will include advice about best practice in community engagement, developing the ideas set out in <i>Communities in control: real people, real power</i>.</p>	39	CLG published <i>Planning Together: updated practical guide for local strategic partnerships and planners</i> on 2 April 2009.	Recommendation implemented.
<p>Recommendation 9: The Government should review with the Housing Corporation/Homes and Communities Agency the role the proposed community infrastructure levy (CIL) can have in supporting the development of community extensions. This might include forward-funding of infrastructure provision with costs recovered from CIL as development takes place, and creating</p>	Generally agreed. The community infrastructure levy (CIL) aims to contribute to the costs of the infrastructure needed to support the development of an area, and this could certainly include the provision of the infrastructure necessary to deliver an extension to an existing settlement. But CIL will not be used to remedy pre-existing deficiencies in infrastructure – unless these are being exacerbated by new development – or to fund general local authority expenditure.	40	A detailed consultation exercise on the Government’s proposals for CIL, which includes draft regulations, was launched for comment in July. Comments were invited on the proposals and draft regulations before 23 October 2009.	CIL regulations to be in force by April 2010.

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
community funds to underpin the long-term maintenance costs of public realm such as green spaces. These issues should be addressed by the Government as CIL is developed.				
<p>Recommendation 10: A pathfinder/challenge fund for an exemplar programme should be set up to develop best practice for local planning authorities in master planning housing and economic growth to create new neighbourhoods and community extensions for their communities – with a focus on rural areas. A competition should be launched, with successful local planning authorities receiving the resources, support and mentoring to help deliver a master plan and create a best practice toolkit for other communities to follow and to inform national policy.</p>	The Government does not agree to dispense with the forthcoming PPS on eco-towns, but wants to consult more widely on ways to promote masterplanning.	31-34	CLG published <i>Rural masterplanning fund prospectus</i> on 26 November 2009.	Announcement of successful bids in early 2010.
<p>Recommendation 11: The Government should review with the Housing Corporation/Homes and Communities Agency the appropriateness of the national target for rural affordable housing in terms of both the numbers required and whether this target is set at the right spatial level to address rural need, in time to inform the next comprehensive spending review.</p>	Generally agreed. We accept the Review's recommendation that we look again at the Homes and Communities Agency's target to confirm its continued relevance in the rural context, in terms both of the numbers required and of the distribution spatially when set against known rural need. The Government will work with the National Housing Federation and other stakeholders to review these targets to inform the next spending review.	41-44, and 52		Work will commence in the new year with stakeholders on the evidence base of need for analysis, to inform the next spending review.
<p>Recommendation 12: The Government and the Housing Corporation/Homes and Communities</p>	Generally agreed. Government is supporting a good practice project which will enable the HCA, among other things, to encourage poorly performing local authorities to 'up their	41-44, and 52	Defra is funding the HCA Rural Affordable Housing project. Launch event held 17 April 2009. The	Defra/HCA research underway into areas identified during the

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
<p>Agency should commit to providing advice and support to local authorities and affordable housing providers to ensure that sufficient numbers of high-quality bids to develop affordable housing are coming forward to achieve the national target for rural affordable housing.</p>	<p>game' on delivery of rural housing.</p>		<p>project had two mid-project events in October. Over 200 delegates attended, many from rural local authorities.</p> <p>The HCA has appointed Rural Regional Champions.</p>	<p>first half of the project as being blockages to development of rural affordable housing.</p>
<p>Recommendation 13: The Government's planning policies should require local planning authorities to work with local communities to consider how the needs (environmental, social and economic) of every settlement or parish in their area can be addressed through the local development framework as it is developed over time, working towards a clear vision of the future for each settlement built on consultation with the people who live there.</p>	<p>We agree with this idea in principle, and the community empowerment white paper outlines our thinking about giving local people and local communities more influence and power to improve their lives. But local planning authorities will need to balance any demand for parish or community plans for each individual settlement with the need to take a strategic view of their area through their LDF core strategies need to cover the whole area supported with area action plans and supplementary planning documents as necessary.</p>	<p>48</p>	<p>Response states our policy on the matter.</p>	<p>Recommendation implemented.</p>
<p>Recommendation 14: The Government should make it clearer that whilst the local development framework (LDF) process may not allocate sites for development in every community, local planning authorities must still address the short and long term needs and vision for each village or parish including for affordable housing, and as appropriate use proactive engagement with the local community in the absence of allocated development to bring forward community-led affordable housing on exception sites to meet identified local needs, supported by clear criteria set out in the LDF.</p>	<p>Generally agreed. PPS 3 makes it clear that local planning authorities are expected to be active housing enablers, and where it is inappropriate to allocate land for development in or close to an existing settlement then seeking out exceptions sites is the alternative way forward.</p> <p>We are discussing with the National Association of Local Councils the ways in which the skills for developing affordable housing could be included in their training programmes.</p>	<p>45-51</p>		<p>Agree with National Association of Local Councils ways in which the skills for developing affordable housing could be included in training programmes.</p>

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
<p>Recommendation 15: The Government and the Housing Corporation/Homes and Communities Agency should develop options for working with local partners (for example local strategic partnerships and registered social landlords) to explore the potential to grant aid (paid against delivery) programmes of affordable housing delivery, including community-led affordable housing on exception sites.</p>	<p>Generally agreed. Even where there is no allocated development land for housing in any village, the Review recommends that local planning authorities must nevertheless engage with the community to bring forward exception sites for residential development, and we certainly agree with this. PPS 3 makes it clear that local planning authorities are expected to be active housing enablers.</p>	<p>41-52</p>	<p>Response states our policy on the matter.</p> <p>Consultation on proposals for incentives for the delivery of affordable housing completed in May 2009.</p>	<p>Government response to the consultation due shortly.</p>
<p>Recommendation 16: To assist local planning authorities in drawing up planning obligations the Government should review and update its model for s106 agreements with particular reference to the delivery of affordable housing on exception sites and local connection/affordability requirements, so that the standard terms set out in the model can be used wherever possible to minimise the need to draft new clauses.</p>	<p>The Law Society's model planning obligation (section 106) agreement has proved to be a useful tool for local planning authorities. The model agreement is intended to be a 'living' document. We will work with the Law Society to update the agreement to reflect the latest good practice.</p>	<p>53-58</p>		<p>Law Society to publish an updated agreement by spring 2010.</p>
<p>Recommendation 17: The Government and the Housing Corporation/Homes and Communities Agency should explore options to help bring forward significantly more affordable homes to meet local need through schemes which allow landowners to nominate someone such as a family member or employee (who meet the local connections and housing need criteria for initial occupation), providing the property is subject to the same section 106 criteria as the developments other affordable homes to be affordable in perpetuity, to meet local</p>	<p>Practitioners' working group to be established, to examine Review's proposals for landowners to have nomination rights for affordable housing units while retaining an interest in their land.</p>	<p>56 & 57</p>	<p>Practitioners' working group established in May 2009, involving representatives from relevant national organisations and rural experts working on the ground to look at recommendations 17 and 18. This was supported by a virtual group open to all. The group met over the next four months to consider the proposals and how they could best be implemented. These considerations have fed into draft guidance, which will be put out to consultation.</p>	<p>Consider responses to consultation paper (due on 18 February 2010) and publish guidance reflecting the views provided in the consultation responses.</p>

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
needs.			Consultation on draft guidance due to be published on 26 November.	
<p>Recommendation 18: The Government and the Housing Corporation/Homes and Communities Agency should look at how schemes in which landowners retain some interest/income can be part of the range of solutions to secure increased release of land for affordable housing in perpetuity – providing the terms (for example, rate of ground rent etc.) are acceptable to the local community to be housed, and do not undermine affordability.</p>	Practitioners' working group to be established, to examine Review's proposals for landowners to have nomination rights for affordable housing units while retaining an interest in their land.	56 & 57	<p>Practitioners' working group established in May 2009, involving representatives from relevant national organisations and rural experts working on the ground to look at recommendations 17 and 18. This was supported by a virtual group open to all. The group met over the next four months to consider the proposals and how they could best be implemented. These considerations have fed into draft guidance, which will be put out to consultation.</p> <p>Consultation on draft guidance due to be published on 26 November 2009.</p>	Consider responses to consultation paper (due on 18 February 2010) and publish guidance reflecting the views provided in the consultation responses.
<p>Recommendation 19: The Government should review, with the Housing Corporation/Homes and Communities Agency, whether non-subsidised models of affordable housing should be more formally recognised and promoted as a method of delivering part of the affordable housing mix.</p>	Generally agreed.	41-52	Response states our policy on the matter.	Recommendation implemented.
<p>Recommendation 20: The Government should anticipate increased interest in community land trusts (CLTs) as a model for affordable housing delivery and draw up guidance on how best to implement this model following the recent review of the CLT pilots, in particular addressing the need for a clear definition of what CLTs are, and broad rules on how they operate, without removing the</p>	Generally agreed. Like the Review, we see an enhanced role for community land trusts, and a definition was included in the Housing and Regeneration Act 2008. We are currently considering the response from the UK CLT Network to our consultations last year, on CLTs generally, and on shared ownership and leasehold enfranchisement and the designation of 'protected areas'.	54	<p>Government published its response to the consultation on CLTs in August. The response outlined the Government's support for the CLT model.</p> <p>On 1 April 2009 empowerment fund support was announced for four voluntary sector bodies working on community participation in planning, including Action for</p>	Recommendation implemented.

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
structural flexibility that they currently enjoy which allows specific arrangements to be responsive to the needs of particular areas.			Market Towns and Carnegie, who have an interest in involving communities in housing delivery.	
<p>Recommendation 21: The Government should examine the options for trialling planning rules limiting change of use of full time homes to part time occupation (as second homes or holiday lets), in one or more of the national parks.</p>	The Government does not agree that it is appropriate or desirable to seek to limit the occupation or ownership of second homes.	77-81		
<p>Recommendation 22: A clear message should be voiced, through the new <i>PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Development</i> and a Government statement of intent, that rural economies have an important contribution to make to regional and national economies as well as urban economies and that all types of business and enterprise can be appropriate for rural areas, subject to assessment of impact based upon local circumstances and conditions (social, economic and environmental).</p>	Generally agreed. The Government accepts the Review's recommendations for promoting rural economic development. The Government has said in the rural strategy and elsewhere that we want a countryside which can shape its own future, with its voice heard by Government at all levels, and in which people have access to the jobs and services they require. We see the Review's recommendations as being particularly helpful in this context.	21-27	<p>Draft PPS4 <i>Prosperous Economies</i> published May 2009.</p> <p>The role of rural economies is highlighted in the ministerial foreword and part 1 introduction, and paragraphs 3 and 6 of the draft PPS. Policy 9.2 also reiterates that subject to protecting the countryside, the policy applies as much to rural areas as it does urban ones.</p> <p>NB The paragraphs referred to above relate to draft PPS4. This update will be amended to reflect the final PPS4 paragraphs in due course.</p>	PPS4 due to be published by the end of 2009.
<p>Recommendation 23: The Government should undertake work to draw together, clarify and consolidate national policy to ensure consistency with regards to economic development, through the review of planning policy statements and planning policy guidance as a whole as proposed in Chapter 1 (Recommendation 1).</p>	Generally agreed. The Government accepts the Review's recommendations for promoting rural economic development. The Government has said in the rural strategy and elsewhere that we want a countryside which can shape its own future, with its voice heard by Government at all levels, and in which people have access to the jobs and services they require. We see the Review's recommendations as being particularly helpful in this context.	21-27	<p>Draft PPS4 <i>Prosperous Economies</i> published May 2009, recognises that rural areas also have an important contribution to make to the regional and national economy and that clearly that there is no such thing as a separate 'rural economy'.</p> <p>NB The paragraphs referred to above relate to draft PPS4. This</p>	PPS4 due to be published by the end of 2009.

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
			update will be amended to reflect the final PPS4 paragraphs in due course.	
<p>Recommendation 24: The consultation paper on the new <i>PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Development</i> recognised that not all development in rural areas can be accessed by public transport and should not be refused simply on this ground, a change in emphasis which this Review very much supports. This new message should be retained in the final planning policy statement, and early action taken to ensure it is reinforced in the development and application of regional and local plans. This would help remove a significant barrier to rural economic development, including the re-use of disused farms or farm buildings, subject to proper assessment of the impact on economic, social and environmental sustainability.</p>	<p>Generally agreed. The Government accepts the Review's recommendations for promoting rural economic development. The Government has said in the rural strategy and elsewhere that we want a countryside which can shape its own future, with its voice heard by Government at all levels, and in which people have access to the jobs and services they require. We see the Review's recommendations as being particularly helpful in this context.</p>	<p>21-27</p>	<p>Draft PPS4 <i>Prosperous Economies</i> published May 2009, EC12.3(5) supports economic development away from rural centres if it is the most sustainable location.</p> <p>NB The paragraphs referred to above relate to draft PPS4. This update will be amended to reflect the final PPS4 paragraphs in due course.</p>	<p>PPS4 due to be published by the end of 2009.</p>
<p>Recommendation 25: The new <i>PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Development</i> should make a clear statement that decisions involving the loss of existing employment sites in rural areas and the identification of new sites should be based on evidence addressing the supply of employment sites and premises in that community to ensure economic, social and environmental sustainability of the area is protected and enhanced.</p>	<p>Generally agreed. The Government accepts the Review's recommendations for promoting rural economic development. The Government has said in the rural strategy and elsewhere that we want a countryside which can shape its own future, with its voice heard by Government at all levels, and in which people have access to the jobs and services they require. We see the Review's recommendations as being particularly helpful in this context.</p>	<p>21-27</p>	<p>Draft PPS4 <i>Prosperous Economies</i> published May 2009, EC12.3(6) require local planning authorities to assess the impact on employment sites if an application would result in their loss to other uses.</p> <p>NB The paragraphs referred to above relate to draft PPS4. This update will be amended to reflect the final PPS4 paragraphs in due course.</p>	<p>PPS4 due to be published by the end of 2009.</p>

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
<p>Recommendation 26: The final version of <i>PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Development</i> should retain current policy advice to local planning authorities to “take account of the changing spatial working patterns that advances in information and communication technologies allow, such as live/work units or the use of residential properties for home working” and further encourage the collection of data on home workers to provide a local evidence base to inform business support.</p>	<p>The Government has looked again at the issues surrounding home-based working, particularly in social housing. We are working with the National Housing Federation to encourage housing associations, when introducing new tenancies, to reflect the NHF’s model tenancy agreement which permits home-working, and we want housing associations to seriously consider any tenant’s requests to have this opportunity incorporated into their existing tenancy agreement.</p> <p>We agree that rural enterprise hubs and live/work units can have a part to play in the economy. We intend to seek funding to encourage, with rural development agencies and regional planning bodies, the establishment of one or more working examples so that we can identify and disseminate best practice.</p>	<p>28 & 29</p>	<p>Draft PPS4 <i>Prosperous Economies</i> published May 2009. EC4.1(6) says local authorities, through their local development frameworks, should (in rural areas taking account of the need to protect the countryside) facilitate new working practices such as live/work or the use of residential properties for home working</p> <p>NB The paragraphs referred to above relate to draft PPS4. This update will be amended to reflect the final PPS4 paragraphs in due course.</p>	<p>PPS4 due to be published by the end of 2009.</p>
<p>Recommendation 27: The new <i>PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Development</i> should encourage local planning authorities to take a more supportive approach to planning applications for workspace extensions to the home (subject to impacts such as scale, noise and disturbance) and policy supporting home-based work should be incorporated into local development frameworks.</p>	<p>We agree that rural enterprise hubs and live/work units can have a part to play in the economy. We intend to seek funding to encourage, with rural development agencies and regional planning bodies, the establishment of one or more working examples so that we can identify and disseminate best practice.</p>	<p>28 & 29</p>	<p>Draft PPS4 <i>Prosperous Economies</i> published May 2009. EC4.1(6) says local authorities, through their local development frameworks, should (in rural areas taking account of the need to protect the countryside) facilitate new working practices such as live/work or the use of residential properties for home working.</p> <p>NB The paragraphs referred to above relate to draft PPS4. This update will be amended to reflect the final PPS4 paragraphs in due course.</p>	<p>PPS4 due to be published by the end of 2009.</p>
<p>Recommendation 28: The Government should recognise and support the growing opportunities home-based work can provide for economic participation by affordable housing tenants and work with trade bodies such as the</p>	<p>Generally agreed. The Government has looked again at the issues surrounding home-based working, particularly in social housing. We are working with the National Housing Federation to encourage housing associations, when introducing new tenancies, to reflect the NHF’s model tenancy agreement, which permits home-working, and we</p>	<p>28 & 29</p>	<p>The National Housing Federation has provided clarification via their website to emphasise that their standard leases allow for homeworking.</p>	<p>The Federation will also be providing information on this in their monthly bulletin magazine to</p>

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
National Housing Federation, to promote with affordable housing providers the use of tenancy agreements that do not prohibit home-based working (subject to impacts such as noise and disturbance).	<p>want housing associations to seriously consider any tenant's requests to have this opportunity incorporated into their existing tenancy agreement.</p> <p>We agree that rural enterprise hubs and live/work units can have a part to play in the economy. We intend to seek funding to encourage, with rural development agencies and regional planning bodies, the establishment of one or more working examples so that we can identify and disseminate best practice.</p>		<p>The Federation's briefing for members on home working can be found here: http://www.housing.org.uk/default.aspx?tabid=288&mid=835&ctl=Details&ArticleID=2568</p>	members.
<p>Recommendation 29: The regional development agencies and regional planning bodies should support the further development of both rural enterprise hubs and live/work units. An exemplar programme should be set up in one or more interested regions to identify best practice and further test the practical issues relating to these enterprise hubs and live/work units in rural areas.</p>	<p>We agree that rural enterprise hubs and live/work units can have a part to play in the economy. We intend to seek funding to encourage, with rural development agencies and regional planning bodies, the establishment of one or more working examples so that we can identify and disseminate best practice.</p>	28 & 29	<p>CLG is contributing to the funding of a project by the Live/Work Network to gather best practice on hub facilities that support the activities of home-based businesses in England as part of the low carbon economy. The project will seek to explore the potential for workhubs as a future element of the infrastructure of sustainable low carbon communities in both urban and rural contexts.</p>	<p>The research will be used to advise agencies such as the Homes and Communities Agency on the most effective ways to help support the creation of new exemplar hub facilities, as suggested in the Taylor Review.</p>
<p>Recommendation 30: The Government should promote the consistent use by regional and local planning bodies of the standard 'rural/urban definition' in the collection and research of housing and economic data – to ensure consideration of rural circumstances; to better identify their needs; and to set and monitor the delivery of housing and economic development targets.</p>	<p>Generally agreed. We agree with the Review that regional and local planning bodies should use the Government's 'rural/urban definition' (which is a National Statistic). Both Defra and CRC proactively support and promote the use of the urban/rural definition and local authority classification by policy makers and delivery bodies at all levels.</p>	66 & 67	<p>Conference on 19 May launched revised rural proofing toolkit and emphasized importance of mainstreaming rural policy across government and using the rural/urban definition.</p>	<p>Recommendation implemented.</p>
<p>Recommendation 31: The Government should conduct a review of the regional spatial strategies' (RSS) rural impacts, to draw lessons regarding the impact of mainstreaming rural policy and how the RSSs have addressed rural policy issues and needs, to inform the</p>	<p>Generally agreed. We also agree with the Review that it will be important to maintain an overview of the rural impacts of the regional spatial strategies as they come into force, and that it will be important to share good ideas and practice wherever possible.</p>	68 & 69	<p>Research has been commissioned.</p>	<p>Final report to be published shortly.</p>

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Parag raph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
development of the new single regional strategies.				
Recommendation 32: The Government should clarify the legal position regarding the weight to be given to emerging development plan documents.	We agree with the Review.	71		Advice on plan-making will be published and updated on the CLG plan-making manual.
Recommendation 33: The Government should continue to work with its partners, including The Planning Inspectorate, to improve dissemination of best practice and provide more detailed guidance on evidence gathering to support both plan making and decisions on planning applications, including greater clarity over what constitutes an appropriate evidence base.	Generally agreed.	69 & 70	<i>Examining Development Plan Documents: Learning from Experience</i> was published by the Planning Inspectorate in September 2009.	Advice on plan-making will be published and updated on the CLG plan-making manual.
Recommendation 34: The Government should investigate the viability of establishing an agreed national database of local housing markets/affordability, possibly funded through local planning authority (and potentially developer) subscriptions, and examine the potential for adding local authority data on housing need.	The Government does not fully agree with this recommendation, but the National Housing and Planning Advice Unit are commissioning research to identify housing market areas, and to assess functional housing market areas against any current definitions used in regional and sub regional planning.	75 & 76		NHPAU research on defining broad functional housing market areas is on schedule. It is due to complete in March 2010.
Recommendation 35: The Government should encourage regional planning bodies and local planning authorities to work together to underpin their decisions on housing and economic development in both their development plans and planning applications with a clear and robust evidence base.	Generally agreed.	69 & 70	On 12 November 2009 Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction (LDEDC) Bill received Royal assent.	Consultation undertaken on draft policy statement on regional strategies with a view to publishing final version early 2010.
Recommendation 36: The Government should explore ways to build on the position it has taken in the latest PPS12 (paragraph 4.16 " <i>local authorities should explore and exploit opportunities for joint working on core</i> ")	Generally agreed.	70	Joint working has already been promoted by the Department and guidance has been published in PPS12 to this end. Joint working has been incentivised through the housing and planning delivery	We are considering research into the benefits of sharing costs with a view to further promoting this approach.

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
<p><i>strategies</i>) to encourage joint working/joint appointments between local planning authorities (perhaps within housing market areas) to share costs of specialist staff, expertise and capacity.</p>			<p>grant. In 2008-09 each local planning authority that signed up to joint working on the production of a development plan document were awarded £37,000.</p>	<p>Research expected by May 2010.</p>
<p>Recommendation 37: The Government should introduce an element in housing and planning delivery grant specifically to incentivise the delivery of affordable housing, which the Government has already committed to consult on later this year.</p>	<p>Will shortly be consulting on an element to incentivise affordable housing.</p>	<p>55</p>	<p>The Government published for consultation proposals for changes to the housing and planning delivery grant in May 2009 which included an element to incentivise the delivery of affordable housing. The Government is currently considering the responses to the consultation.</p>	<p>Government response to the consultation is due to be published shortly.</p>
<p>Recommendation 38: The Government should clarify the flexible approach in <i>PPS3: Housing</i> concerning the development site size threshold at which a percentage of affordable housing may be required (<i>"The national indicative minimum site size threshold is 15 dwellings"</i>) to make clear that the driver in deciding thresholds and percentages must be evidence of local need and viability, and not the indicative minimum, especially in those areas where many or most developments may be on sites below 15 and good opportunities for affordable housing otherwise lost.</p>	<p>Generally agreed, although the Government also considers that local planning authorities are still discovering the full potential of their room for action within PPS3.</p>	<p>55</p>	<p>We continue to remind local authorities of the 'indicative' nature of the threshold.</p>	<p>To be achieved through ongoing liaison with local planning authorities.</p>
<p>Recommendation 39: The Government should update its best practice guidance in relation to setting thresholds and affordable housing percentages and negotiating these with developers.</p>	<p>Generally agreed.</p>	<p>55</p>		<p>HCA viability toolkit due to published by early 2010.</p>
<p>Recommendation 40: The Government should update its model s106 agreement for affordable housing to assist local authorities negotiate affordable housing contributions and to avoid unnecessary and expensive local variation.</p>	<p>The Law Society's model planning obligation (s106) agreement has proved to be a useful tool for local planning authorities. The model agreement is intended to be a 'living' document. We will work with the Law Society to update the agreement to reflect the latest good practice.</p>	<p>58-60</p>		<p>Law Society to publish an updated agreement by spring 2010.</p>

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
<p>Recommendation 41: The Government should clarify what is appropriate and communicate the importance of a strong pre-application partnership between developers/business and local planning authorities – and re-examine the framework of incentives and requirements for local planning authorities to encourage pre-application discussion.</p>	<p>Generally agreed. We agree with these recommendations which overlap with a recommendation in the Killian Pretty Review that, among other things, a more consistent approach to charging for pre-application discussions and negotiations by local authorities would be helpful. We intend, therefore, to give more guidance generally to authorities about this aspect of their work to help spread best practice, in the context also of clarifying for them how the community infrastructure levy and s106 do and do not overlap.</p>	<p>82</p>		<p>Draft proposals to strengthen pre application engagement will be published for consultation by end of 2009 as part of package of measures to implement Killian Pretty Review.</p>
<p>Recommendation 42: The Government should urgently clarify the relationship between the community infrastructure levy and affordable housing, especially in relation to private developments with s106 obligations for affordable housing.</p>	<p>We will be introducing regulations and proposals throughout this year as we introduce the community infrastructure levy (CIL), and provide more details about its interaction with s106 contributions.</p> <p>We have committed to explore with the social housing sector how a significantly reduced rate of CIL for affordable housing development might be specified in regulations, and draft CIL regulations will be subject to full public consultation later in the year. An important aspect of this will be to establish a clear definition of what is meant by 'social housing' for these purposes.</p>	<p>58-60</p>	<p>A detailed consultation exercise on the Government's proposals for CIL, which includes draft regulations, was launched for comment in July. Comments were invited on the proposals and draft regulations before 23 October 2009.</p>	<p>CIL regulation to be in force by April 2010.</p>
<p>Recommendation 43: To maximise affordable housing delivery the Government should exempt affordable housing from the CIL.</p>	<p>We have committed to explore with the social housing sector how a significantly reduced rate of CIL for affordable housing development might be specified in regulations, and draft CIL regulations will be subject to full public consultation later in the year. An important aspect of this will be to establish a clear definition of what is meant by 'social housing' for these purposes.</p>	<p>58-60</p>	<p>A detailed consultation exercise on the Government's proposals for CIL, which includes draft regulations, was launched for comment in July. Comments were invited on the proposals and draft regulations before 23 October 2009.</p>	<p>CIL regulation to be in force by April 2010.</p>
<p>Recommendation 44: Following recent changes to planning fee structures for larger developments, the Government should examine further use of enhanced fees for an enhanced service and further use of developer contributions for the costs of negotiating s106 agreements and drafting legal agreements – some local planning authority s106 officers are already entirely financed this way.</p>	<p>Generally agreed. Overlaps with Killian Pretty Review recommendations.</p>	<p>82</p>	<p>No further action to be taken in terms of the enhanced service, but will be taken into account in the development of the quality of planning service indicator.</p>	<p>Development of a new quality of planning service indicator is currently underway which will include consultation and pilot studies with local planning authorities.</p>

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
<p>Recommendation 45: The Planning Inspectorate should make their <i>Inspectors' Handbook</i> and updates readily available on the internet (on the Planning Inspectorate website and on the Planning Portal).</p>	<p>The Planning Inspectorate has already published some of this advice on their website to assist appellants and local planning authorities. We are actively discussing with the Planning Inspectorate the publication of further chapters, and devising a new format.</p>	83	<p>Following agreement, four chapters have recently been published. We are actively discussing with the Planning Inspectorate the publication of further chapters in a new format.</p>	<p>A pilot exercise is underway and publication of the three pilot exercise chapters is expected by 2010.</p>
<p>Recommendation 46: The Planning Inspectorate's internal systems should be updated to allow much simpler cross referencing by Inspectors of similar cases to aid consistent decision taking, and this search facility extended to the public.</p>	<p>The Planning Inspectorate has already published some of this advice on their website to assist appellants and local planning authorities. We are actively discussing with the Planning Inspectorate the publication of further chapters, and devising a new format.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate is investigating the use of information arising from geographical plotting of related casework to aid consistency, and examining the possibility of delivering a 'search by topic or policy theme' function either through its existing electronic casework system or, more likely, by being built into the requirements for any replacement system.</p>	84	<p>High level initiation strategy work underway in 2009-10 on a business case for a replacement electronic casework system.</p>	<p>A feasibility study is underway to investigate the potential for delivering an internal 'search' system, concluding by spring 2010.</p>
<p>Recommendation 47: The Advisory Panel on Standards (APOS) should be asked to look specifically at Inspector training to ensure appropriate measures are being taken to keep Inspectors sufficiently up to date with both policy and practice.</p>	<p>APOS's most recent annual report confirms the positive progress in the quality of the training programme and that the panel will continue to monitor training.</p>	85	<p>Assisted APOS in preparation of their 15th report published in October (covering 2008-09).</p> <p>APOS's 15th report confirms significant advances in the provision of training and notes that the training plan provides an effective and efficient programme of education. The panel will continue to monitor training.</p> <p>Inspector training events delivered in 2009-10.</p>	<p>During 2010-11 assist APOS with preparation of their 16th Annual report (covering 2009-10).</p>
<p>Recommendation 48: The Government should re-examine the applicability of the present Code for Sustainable Homes and Building Regulations for affordable housing in locations where there is not mains gas</p>	<p>Generally agreed, but we will be considering the applicability of standards to affordable rural housing when we consult this year on planned amendments to the Building Regulations and the Code for Sustainable Homes to be introduced in 2010.</p>	61 & 62	<p>The consultation on proposed changes to Part L in 2010 was published on 18 June 2009 and closed on 17 September 2009.</p>	<p>Planned amendments to the Building Regulations will be introduced in 2010. We will also take this into</p>

Taylor Review Recommendations	Government response summarised	Paragraph Nos.	Milestone delivered	Milestone to deliver
availability to ensure they do not make such schemes inappropriately expensive to deliver.				account in the consultation on amending the Code for Sustainable Homes.

Published by the Department for Communities and Local Government, November 2009.

© Crown Copyright, 2009.

Product Code: 09PD06166

ISBN: 978 1 4098 2043 7