

Subject: Clause 20 Infrastructure Bill

From: James Caird

Date: 09/07/14 10:55

To: stacey.frier@english.heritage.org.uk

CC: David Kincaid <southeast@ihbc.org.uk>, Mike Brown <mike.brown54@hotmail.co.uk>, Bob Kindred <bob.kindred@bobkindred.demon.co.uk>, =?UTF-8?B?Ik8nUmVpbGx5? =?UTF-8?B?LCBTZcOhbiI=? <director@ihbc.org.uk>

BCC: james@caird.org.uk

Dear Stacey

Clause 20 of the Infrastructure Bill was discussed at Monday's meeting of the IHBC Policy Committee and I have been asked to respond to you on behalf of the Institute.

The IHBC shares English Heritage's concerns about Clause 20. While we understand the Government's concerns about the need to make sure that under-resourced LPAs do not impede much-needed development through the obstructive processing of post-consent matters, we agree with English Heritage that Clause 20 is an over-reaction to the problem. It creates a very unsatisfactory route to dealing with local planning matters that has the potential to become exploited by developers to evade local and national interests of acknowledged importance. In doing so it runs against the Government's programme of putting more planning power in the hands of local communities.

We agree with the English Heritage view that the measure could be narrowed to deal with obvious cases of abuse of power or process.

We would be pleased, therefore, if you would add our name to the list of concerned bodies for onward transmission to Baroness Andrews and her submission to the Grand Committee.

Yours

James Caird

--

James Caird
Consultant Consultations Co-ordinator
IHBC

Glebe House
Caynham
Ludlow
SY8 3BN

01584 876141
07971 085090