

# RUSHMOOR BOROUGH COUNCIL RECORD OF EXECUTIVE DECISION



Decision taken by an officer in consultation with a Cabinet member

*(All sections must be completed (mark "N/A" as applicable))*

## DECISION MAKER *(Name and designation)*

Tim Mills, Head of Property and Growth (in consultation with Cllr Keith Dibble, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Planning)

## DECISION AND THE REASON(S) FOR IT

As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, the local requirements list (also known as local validation list) should be reviewed at least every two years. This list sets out what information applicants need to provide when they submit planning applications.

As part of this review, the list has been updated to:

- set out clearly the reason for the request for the information.
- streamline the validation process and reduce the number of extension of time requests.
- reflect changes to national policy and legislation.
- ensure the checklist is accessible to all users.

A public consultation was undertaken between 4<sup>th</sup> February and the 4<sup>th</sup> March 2025. Nine responses were received, and the list was updated where necessary (Appendix A).

This decision approves the publication of the new Local Requirements List.

## DATE DECISION TAKEN

3rd April 2025

## ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

*(Those examined by officers and generated by consultation, etc)*

None

## ANY CONFLICTS OF INTERESTS DECLARED

*(conflict of interests of any executive member who is consulted by the officer which relates to the decision. A note of dispensation should be attached).*

N/A

**Signed**

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of Tim Mills.

**Tim Mills**

(Decision maker)

**Designation: Executive Head of Property and Growth.**

## APPENDIX A

| Name           | Capacity             | Summary of comments  | Summary of Officer response   |
|----------------|----------------------|--|---|
| Alan Firman    | Previous applicant   | No comments to make  | N/A   |
| Ian Lewis      | Planning Agent       | Is the requested information relevant top Householder Applications?                              | Paragraph under Local Requirements section sets out that if the agent feels that the information requested is not relevant, they should submit a statement setting out the reasons for this.<br><b><i>The webpage has been updated to make this more visible.</i></b> |
| Howard Newman  | Member of the public | Rushmoor should not build more housing.  | Response noted. No specific comments in relation to the local validation's checklist consultation.  |
| Damian Hill    | Planning Agent       | Is the requested information relevant to all applications – especially Householder Applications? | Paragraph under Local Requirements section sets out that if the agent feels that the information requested is not relevant, they should submit a statement setting out the reasons for this.<br><b><i>The webpage has been updated to make this more visible.</i></b> |
| Sharon Jenkins | Natural England      | No comment to make.  | Noted.  |
| Mark Herbert   | Farnborough Airport  | Farnborough Airport has reviewed the requirement lists and that we are happy with them.          | Noted.  |

|              |                  |  |   |
|--------------|------------------|--|---|
| Sarahjane    | RAAG             | <p>Advertisement consent should be more explanatory, not just see plan.</p> <p>Parking plans often omit spaces for blue badge holders.</p> <p>Skills &amp; Employment plan should encourage the upskilling or employment for those with a disability.</p> <p>Transport assessments should take into consideration public transport, safety of pavement and road crossings.</p>   | <p><b><i>These comments relate to the contents of documents included in the list, rather than the list itself.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The comments received will be passed on to the relevant team.</i></b></p> |
| David Wilson | Thames Water     | <p>Thames Water support the requirement for utilities statements and sewage/sewerage assessments in particular in the Local Validation Checklist.</p> <p>We support the requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>Wording has been suggested to replace the current wording.</p>   | <p><b><i>These comments relate to the contents of documents included in the list, rather than the list itself.</i></b></p>  |
| Guy Robinson | Historic England | <p>We refer you to our Charter for Historic England Advisory Services (particularly sections 11 and 12) as a clear statement of the information needed to provide informed advice. The charter can be downloaded from our website via: <a href="https://historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/our-planning-services/charter/">https://historicengland.org.uk/services-skills/our-planning-services/charter/</a></p> <p>For the entry on Heritage Statements, we highlight that designated heritage assets in the Borough also include Registered Parks and Gardens.</p> <p>Also, to align with the NPPF, we suggest referring to Scheduled Monuments rather than Scheduled Ancient Monuments.</p> | <p><b><i>Noted</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The list has been updated to include Registered Parks and Gardens.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>The list has been updated to align the wording.</i></b></p>                       |

We encourage the Council to add reference to archaeological desk-based assessment (DBA) in its validation list, outlining in broad terms (informed by liaison with the Council's archaeological adviser) when a DBA is required, and mentioning that further field evaluation may be required.

***Reference has been included for the need to consider an Archaeological DBA and a link added to the Hampshire County Council Archaeology web page for further information.***