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Summary

During 2014-15, the Scottish Government has worked with several local authorities to test a framework for aligning planning permission with roads construction consent (RCC). This summary provides a review of findings to date and proposes actions. *Creating Places* contains more detail of the policy and research background.

As part of work to implement *Designing Streets* a structured approach to align roads construction consent (RCC) with planning permission was developed. Testing this collaborative ‘framework’, by reflecting it against live cases in four local authorities (Aberdeen City, Dundee, Renfrewshire and the City of Edinburgh), indicates that it can:

- provide consistency;
- give earlier certainty for applicants; and,
- (by allowing a 2-stage option) be flexible to suit local practices.

The framework has subsequently been refined to represent good practice in support of *Designing Streets*. However, to overcome difficulties in demonstrating shorter timescales (and efficiency savings), it is proposed that timescales for determining RCC (stage 1) could be the same as those in planning. This should embed internal consultation that results in clear decisions in parallel.

Therefore this next step to set parallel time periods would contain more pro-active targets to check against. It would further test integrated working and signing-off RCC (stage 1) in parallel with planning. *It would also carry forward the action within the Joint Housing Delivery Plan for Scotland to ‘improve timescales and processes associated with development consents’.*

Information on test cases follows, for a more detailed text report see page 12.
### ALIGNING CONSENTS

**June 2015 Project Summary – TEST CASE A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive points on process and Aligned Consents (AC)</th>
<th>Comments on remaining barriers and challenges to better practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant agrees that approach can lead to a commercial advantage of the certainty of having RCC sign-off at planning stage. As well as potentially getting on site earlier this can mean less risk for Design &amp; Build contractors who may be bidding for work. To achieve this sign-off, a positive, consistent and (where necessary) recorded pre-application dialogue is important.</td>
<td>The biggest risk can be uncertainty due to discontinuity (a change of officers who do not concur with a previously agreed position).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The AC framework should lead to consistency across LAs in implementing DS. (But applicant at present reports critical experience with other authorities where formal pre-application enquiries can take weeks, consultees are involved late, and discussions on roads require initiation by consultants.)</td>
<td>There is concern about lack of assurance given to pre-app discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAs are default in this LA, so including RCC agreed dates in the standard template for PAs would help to align consents.</td>
<td>Comments on street lighting and refuse still too late. Emergency services even later (after building warrant).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAs and Scottish Water (SW) have different run-off rates. SW approval letters are elusive, leaving uncertainty for all.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Applicant view is that this a straightforward phase when considering roads consent with only a single new connection made in this phase (client considers they have other projects with more complex roads matters). The wider scale Designing Streets (DS) matters (walkable neighbourhoods, public transport, connections to wider networks) have been resolved in area masterplanning. PAN submitted in December 2014 but detailed application is now due summer 2015 |  |

| Applicant signed up for the first Processing Agreement (PA) with this local authority (LA) and confirmed that one will be used here. |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B-Plan of street network (masterplan)</th>
<th>Project notes reflected against the AC framework...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW shows ‘movement’ network. For B-Plan guidance see Designing Streets and its toolbox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Can see Commercial advantage, especially in D&B procurement route of RCC sign-off**
ALIGNING CONSENTS
June 2015 Project Summary – TEST CASE B1

A new community of 3,000 homes, of which around a quarter will be affordable, with ancillary community, retail and employment space. Development framework (DF) adopted as supplementary guidance in June 2014. Contributions agreed for facilities including schools and a health centre, as well as contributions towards a strategic transport fund.

Lead developer is responsible for setting context, producing branding for the new community, and co-ordinating infrastructure design, planning and delivery. Land ownership is split with two other parties.

PPiP approved in Oct 2014 (subject to Section 75 agreement). At the same time the detailed consent for initial phases of infrastructure (including new roads, and realignment of an existing road) submitted for planning. This is now been approved and issued. Applications for the first 2 phases of housing (approx. 500 units) will go to Committee once the PPiP has been issued.

### Positive points on process and Aligned Consents (AC)

Significant and staged detailed pre-app discussion took place at every level of design with regards to planning. There was plenty engagement with officers on the wider strategic matters of utilities and infrastructure including from roads offices.

Encountered good examples where local authority (LA) directors organized resolution on crucial junction design that is essential part of getting the PPiP, therefore resolving a critical matter specified in condition (MSC) timeously.

LA committed to 2-stage process for all projects from now. However, this major project entered the system before the present LA guidance was issued and the current commitment was set. Therefore it is being monitored during a time of practice transition within the LA.

### Comments on remaining barriers and challenges to better practice

A perceived issue has been that as design progresses into detail and closer to checking roads construction consent (RCC) matters the constructive dialogue ceases. This has led to some pressing uncertainty, that could affect street alignment and, potentially, require a revision to the agreed planning layout.

Some lack of co-ordination between roads and planning, as well as within roads department, has given rise to conflicting views and a re-examination of matters thought already approved. Timescales have been extended. There’s been limited continuity with different case officers involved for different parts of the process.

RCC application was submitted concurrently with the development framework (April 2014) but remains outstanding. However, to balance this point of view, LA indicates submissions for RCC can be premature and contain insufficient information for determination.

### B-plan of main street network (development framework – all phases)

Good early engagement on strategic matters including from roads.

### Project notes reflected against the AC framework

In practice applicant felt processes not run in parallel due to uncertain views from roads officers on proposals deemed acceptable at PPiP.
### ALIGNING CONSENTS

**June 2015 Project Summary – TEST CASE B2**

Development framework (DF) of this project adopted as supplementary guidance in 2013. It is a very significant extension of several thousand new homes, together with community uses, retail, business and school facilities to contribute to the city.

600 homes are being proposed in the first detailed phases that will be accessed from existing roads to the east. This has been driven, at least in part, by restrictions on truck road access in the short term.

The present status is that matters specified in conditions (MSC) of the masterplan approval are being progressed.

A processing agreement (PA) is being agreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive points on process and Aligned Consents (AC)</th>
<th>Comments on remaining barriers and challenges to better practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The experience of running consents in parallel is producing good signs in respect of:</td>
<td>LAS should raise the importance of street design as a contribution to placemaking and recognise pre-app discussions as vital to reach successful outcomes. However, agreeing innovative design take time and sub-optimal outcomes arise because pressure to reach agreement and move to delivery phase takes priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater certainty of outcomes for planning permission and roads construction consent (RCC) (anticipated);</td>
<td>Key issues:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working relationship with local authorities (LAs);</td>
<td>- Restricted material palette (fear of maintenance costs steers designs away from a palette wide enough to illustrate hierarchy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Efficiency savings related to time or expense;</td>
<td>- The omission of street trees (that appear to be near unadoptable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better quality of built outcomes (anticipated);</td>
<td>- Difficulty in sharing space between vehicle/ non-vehicle users</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater clarity of what information is required.</td>
<td>- Problems in mounting lighting on buildings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The applicant agrees that approach can lead to earlier engagement and improved certainty but the key is insist on detailed RCC input by sitting down with planning and roads officers together. Overall it should result in council colleagues listening to one another.

Key issues:

- Restricted material palette (fear of maintenance costs steers designs away from a palette wide enough to illustrate hierarchy)
- The omission of street trees (that appear to be near unadoptable)
- Difficulty in sharing space between vehicle/ non-vehicle users
- Problems in mounting lighting on buildings
- Technical reports can mean extreme scenarios become determinate – thus placemaking can be harmed. Non-technical staff reluctant to intervene. Must be a balanced approach to risk, recognising ‘you can’t have it all’
- More guidance for safety/accessibility auditors is essential.

### B-plan of street network (development framework – all phases)

YELLOW shows ‘movement’ network.
For B-Plan guidance see Designing Streets and its toolbox

### Project notes reflected against the AC framework...

![Diagram showing project notes reflected against the AC framework](image-url)
ALIGNING CONSENTS
June 2015 Project Summary – TEST CASE C

The project is for around 30 homes on brownfield land within the suburbs. The client aims for homes at mid-market affordable prices that exhibit a good level of energy efficiency. Planning was submitted in late 2014, then withdrawn and re-submitted in February 2015.

Applicant’s first experience of process of applying for RCC. They cited that negotiations had resulted in an increase of around 50% in length of new road to be provided compared to their initial estimate (although this estimate may have been deficient in some aspects of Designing Streets). This scale of project means the impact of providing any roads or utilities infrastructure beyond a ‘minimum’ significantly affects viability as additional costs are shared amongst only 30 homes.

A detention basin for surface water drainage will need to be constructed to allow connection to the local stormwater network.

Positive points on process and Aligned Consents

The single stage framework corresponds to the established practice that the local authority (LA) follows (RCC normally follows on from planning consent within a few weeks)

Applicant verified that commercial advantage could stem from getting on site faster by gaining planning/ RCC together (but in this case applicant experience did not initially reflect LA aim of integrated practice). Applicant also can see that the cost of employing earlier resource (engineer) should pay-off in less to-ing and fro-ing.

‘Would have been good to have known more upfront.’ Therefore applicant is positive on publishing the framework that sets out responsibilities of LA officers. Result should be that applicants can demand earlier input & committed feedback.

Comments on remaining barriers and challenges to better practice

Despite ‘theory’, practical experience was somewhat different. Meetings held over 18 months with planning but lack of ‘roads’ involvement until end of this process led to planning application withdrawal and re-submission 9-10 weeks later.

Applicant had to make allowance for future connections by designing scheme on neighbouring land (not theirs) to prove future connectivity. Applicant believes future-proofing of connectivity could be instigated by the LA then carried out in collaboration with interested commercial partners.

Adoption of SUDS basin plus attitudes towards integrating SUDS elements due to perceived risk to unsupervised children remain unresolved.

B-plan of street network (site plan in context)

Partly due to inexperience, or lack of clarity in guidance, connections to future sites were not allowed for at outset

Within pre-app discussions there should be an earlier focus on resolving strategic design of drainage and utilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL AUTHORITY A</th>
<th>LOCAL AUTHORITY B</th>
<th>LOCAL AUTHORITY C</th>
<th>LOCAL AUTHORITY D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative points</strong>&lt;br&gt;Aligning consents&lt;br&gt;lAs in implementing&lt;br&gt;Driver 2:</td>
<td><strong>Positive practice:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Approach in&lt;br&gt;Aligning consents agreements</td>
<td><strong>Positive practice:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Approach in&lt;br&gt;Aligning consents agreements</td>
<td><strong>Positive practice:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Approach in&lt;br&gt;Aligning consents agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Officers</td>
<td>Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test case applicant&lt;br&gt;PAN 14/xxx (x1214)&lt;br&gt;Submission delayed – anticipated xx0715.</td>
<td>Test case applicant&lt;br&gt;FUL xxx PPP/PPD px0714&lt;br&gt;xxx det pdg xx0514 (drag&lt;br&gt;rev xx1214)&lt;br&gt;xxx det pdg xx0714</td>
<td>Test case applicant&lt;br&gt;FUL xxx PPP/PPD granted&lt;br&gt;xx1013-xx0215&lt;br&gt;xxx MSC pdg xx0515</td>
<td>Test case applicant&lt;br&gt;PAN...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin-tracking of roads and planning is attempted as part of 'one-door' approach. Revised CC1 form, very similar, will be used for stage 1 approval/sign-off.</td>
<td>The 2-stage framework is a 'loose fit' against, but it depends on who is contacted in LA. Parallel enquiries initiated by consultants can draw some confidence on potential approval from pre-app discussions.</td>
<td>Framework seems logical. It might make more commercial sense to sometimes submit for full (i.e. single stage) RCC to fix layout at same time as planning.</td>
<td>Single stage framework corresponds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusting consents in implementation&lt;br&gt;LA's and planning officers together&lt;br&gt;Front loading the process&lt;br&gt;Drivers to get on site faster with RCC stage 1. But test case did not meet theory of integrated practice.</td>
<td>Yes, but only if joined up thinking means LA can give 'a single voice' &amp; firm agreement. RCC remains undetermined (submitted early for stage 1)</td>
<td>Established single stage where RCC given in parallel with planning. When roads consented given with detailed planning (in effect within around 4 weeks) conditions attached such as final design of traffic signals.</td>
<td>LA to test use of CC1 form including a more formal mechanism for stage 1 sign-off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Commercial advantage of certainty of RCC sign-off at planning stage – get on site earlier and/or less risk for D&amp;B contractors.</td>
<td>Yes, but only if joined up thinking means LA can give 'a single voice' &amp; firm agreement. RCC remains undetermined (submitted early for stage 1)</td>
<td>Yes - commercial advantage/benefit of getting on site faster with RCC stage 1. But test case did not meet theory of integrated practice.</td>
<td>Co-operative approach between roads &amp; dev. planning evident in large projects with design codes that address site constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing to develop culture of dialogue on roads and street design during pre-app</td>
<td>Another LA’s approach was preferred because they had the same individual offering planning comments and dealing with RCC.</td>
<td>Their experience with other LA on large scale project is more accurately reflected in the '2-stage model'</td>
<td>Yes - if framework sets out responsibilities of LA officers (client's first experience of process of applying for RCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Another LA’s approach was preferred because they had the same individual offering planning comments and dealing with RCC.</td>
<td>Their experience with other LA on large scale project is more accurately reflected in the '2-stage model'</td>
<td>Yes - if framework sets out responsibilities of LA officers (client's first experience of process of applying for RCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low quality of some submissions. This is suspected to relate to consultant fee regime and it makes certainty harder to achieve.</td>
<td>In effect not parallel process. Roads comments often well behind – a problem because street alignment is critical. Limited co-ordination in LA leadership leads to gaps in dialogue on detail RCC matters. This creates uncertainty that can affect agreed layout or alignment.</td>
<td>Some applicants use feedback given in refusal to alter design and re-submit within 12 months - a 'free-go', under Fees Regs. But not encouraged because reasons for refusal can be more fundamental.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development management (DM) has a reactive workload so continuity of discussions can get lost.</td>
<td>Planning matters tend to get resolved but limited engagement from roads on detail (due to low resource) can lead to revising issues thought resolved earlier. Pre-app discussions still lack status. No positive signs with utilities yet</td>
<td>Despite 'theory', practical experience was somewhat different. Meetings held over 18 months with planning but lacked 'roads' presence until end of process. This lead to withdrawing application, and re-submission 9-10 weeks later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available skills/resource can count against twin-tracking. Discontinuity due to change of experience with other LA: formal pre-app enquiries take weeks; consultants involved late; discussions on roads need initiation by consultants.</td>
<td>Available skills/resource can count against twin-tracking. Discontinuity due to change of experience with other LA: formal pre-app enquiries take weeks; consultants involved late; discussions on roads need initiation by consultants.</td>
<td>LA feels they are sometimes pressured to take too great a role in leading agents or developers on street design matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To achieve better AC: positive, consistent and (where necessary) recorded pre-application dialogue is important.</td>
<td>To achieve better AC: positive, consistent and (where necessary) recorded pre-application dialogue is important.</td>
<td>Wider understanding and experience in applying DS principles is key.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. In the process of adopting 2-stage approach.</td>
<td>Yes. In the process of adopting 2-stage approach.</td>
<td>Yes. In the process of adopting 2-stage approach.</td>
<td>Yes. In the process of adopting 2-stage approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary 080715</strong></td>
<td><strong>Summary 080715</strong></td>
<td><strong>Summary 080715</strong></td>
<td><strong>Summary 080715</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test Case</strong></td>
<td><strong>Test Case</strong></td>
<td><strong>Test Case</strong></td>
<td><strong>Test Case</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAs</strong></td>
<td><strong>LAs</strong></td>
<td><strong>LAs</strong></td>
<td><strong>LAs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RCC</strong></td>
<td><strong>RCC</strong></td>
<td><strong>RCC</strong></td>
<td><strong>RCC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QA</strong></td>
<td><strong>QA</strong></td>
<td><strong>QA</strong></td>
<td><strong>QA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alignment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alignment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alignment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive points:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive points:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive points:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive points:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driver 1:</strong> Can approach lead to earlier engagement and improved certainty?</td>
<td><strong>Driver 2:</strong> Can AC framework(s) lead to consistency across LAs in implementing DS?</td>
<td><strong>Driver 2:</strong> Can AC framework(s) lead to consistency across LAs in implementing DS?</td>
<td><strong>Driver 2:</strong> Can AC framework(s) lead to consistency across LAs in implementing DS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive points:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive points:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive points:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive points:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driver 3:</strong> Aligning consents approach in practice: Negative points.</td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Main points on Aligning Consents:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes on Quality Audit (QA) summary template</td>
<td>Positive on the use of Sg’s 'QA summary template' as a standard form tracked alongside the planning application</td>
<td>QA template should allow: - overview of all audits - track decisions with shared summary - link to explicit guidance (e.g. bin ferry access)</td>
<td>QA template could assist in balancing burden of risk/responsibility, e.g. What is a tolerable level of safety, or appropriately maintainable material? If QA requested (Sg suggestion: use QA template as shared record between all parties, so 'baton' of design can be picked up later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further notes on 'Process', including Processing Agreements (PA)</td>
<td>Notifications of planning: RCC should be aligned.</td>
<td>Comments on street lighting and refuse still too late. Emergency services even later (after warrant).</td>
<td>Poor quality 'too early' submissions related to fixed fees for consultants that encourages 'extras'. Section 75 negotiations cause delay and discontinuity on roads matters. Encourages PAs for major developments for clarity on timescale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further notes on 'Guidance'</td>
<td>Street Design Guidance is still draft. It refers to 2-stage process and QA.</td>
<td>Detailed list for stages 1 and 2 are sent out – this is an early exemplar/ model for information submission requirements. Work on a 'materials palette', acceptable for adoption is ongoing.</td>
<td>Uncertain on the availability of guidance upfront.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further notes on 'Confidence' (i.e. matters of design quality, balance or risk that restrict compliance with DS or innovation)</td>
<td>Developers cite 'marketability' / avoidance of rat runs to avoid resolution of street design matters upfront. There's a reluctance to embrace 'structure' aspects of DS and proposed cul-de-sac developments continue.</td>
<td>LA's and Scottish Water (SW) have different run-off rates. SW approval letters are elusive, leaving uncertainty for all.</td>
<td>Working towards DS outcomes, means detailing takes longer to complete. Risk aversion encountered from LAs: - Very restricted material palette - Trees near unacceptable - Sharing space between vehicle/ non-vehicle users is difficult - Mounting lighting on buildings is difficult - Technical reports can mean extreme scenarios become overall determinate. Non-technical colleagues reluctant to intervene. Consultants readily take on audits or reporting but there are too many.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TEST CASE SUMMARY 080715 (continued)**

**LOCAL AUTHORITY A**

**LOCAL AUTHORITY B**

**LOCAL AUTHORITY C**

**LOCAL AUTHORITY D**
ALIGNING PLANNING PERMISSION AND ROADS CONSTRUCTION CONSENT (RCC)
Framework - showing submission steps for applicants and decision steps for local authorities

Jan 2016
Framework timeline – two stage

Timeline...

...Pre-application discussions...

Briefing

Concept or strategic design

Integrate urban design & street design

Prepare parallel submissions

RCC Stage 1

Planning permission + fixed street layout

RCC Stage 2

Roads Construction Consent granted

Local Authority (LA):
Clearly set out submission requirements alongside any local street guidance

Applicant:
Ensure RCC information meets LA’s stage 1 submission requirements

Local Authority:
If acceptable, validate RCC submission and confirm parallel time periods for determination. If unacceptable, say RCC submission will not be progressed

Applicant:
Ensure detail meets LA’s stage 2 submission requirements

Or...
an alternative framework timeline – single stage with concurrent RCC granted, but allows for conditions

...Pre-application discussions...

Briefing

Concept or strategic design

Integrate urban design & street design

Prepare parallel submissions

Planning permission + RCC granted

A fixed street layout

Resolve technical roads & street details

Discharge Conditions on matters related to planning or roads consent

Construction, adoption

Applicant:
Ensure detail meets LA’s stage 2 submission requirements

Local Authority:
If acceptable, validate RCC submission and confirm parallel time periods for determination. If unacceptable, say RCC submission will not be progressed

Local Authority:
If acceptable, validate RCC submission and confirm parallel time periods for determination. If unacceptable, say RCC submission will not be progressed

Local Authority:
If acceptable, validate RCC submission and confirm parallel time periods for determination. If unacceptable, say RCC submission will not be progressed

 ALIGNING PLANNING PERMISSION AND ROADS CONSTRUCTION CONSENT (RCC)
Framework - showing submission steps for applicants and decision steps for local authorities

Jan 2016
Framework timeline – two stage – with detail on staged design-based information

Timeline...

...Pre-application discussions...

Briefing

Concept or strategic design

Integrate urban design & street design

Prepare parallel submissions

RCC Stage 1

Planning permission + fixed street layout

RCC Stage 2

Roads Construction Consent granted

STREET STRUCTURE

Pedestrians and cyclists
Connections to wider networks
Connections within a place
Block Structure
Walkable neighbourhoods
Public transport
Context and character
Orientation

STREET LAYOUT

Achieving appropriate traffic speed
Junction types and arrangements
Streets for people
Integrating parking
Emergency & service vehicles

Traffic Generation

Street Use:
Pedestrians
Cyclists
Inclusivity, accessibility & equality
Visual quality

Road alignment
Junction layout
Tracking
Visibility
Landscaping
(Safety audit stages 1 & 2)

STREET DETAIL

Drainage
Utilities
Planting
Materials
Reducing clutter

ALIGNING PLANNING PERMISSION AND ROADS CONSTRUCTION CONSENT (RCC) (not annotated)
Framework - showing submission steps for applicants and decision steps for local authorities, plus information on aspects of design

Jan 2016
ALIGNING PLANNING PERMISSION AND ROADS CONSTRUCTION CONSENT (RCC) (annotated)
Framework - showing submission steps for applicants and decision steps for local authorities, plus information on aspects of design

Jan 2016
1. Testing the structured approach, or ‘framework’, to align planning and RCC

In 2014, an ‘aligning consents’ framework was published as a benchmark to review practice against. Planners and roads officers in Aberdeen, Dundee, Edinburgh and Renfrewshire participated; and applicants’ experience across these local authorities (LAs) has been recorded. Feedback has allowed comparison between test cases, indicating the following:

- This structured approach can lead to earlier engagement and to a commercial advantage from earlier certainty. But pre-application discussions must positively include and record (where appropriate) decisions about roads. Certainty is dependant on the confidence that comes from receiving a consistent ‘single voice’ on street design matters.

- This framework can be flexible to local circumstances; and lead to consistency across LAs in implementing Designing Streets (DS). Armed with this framework, applicants can request earlier feedback on proposals. In use this should raise expectations across LA boundaries.

- By allowing a 2-stage approach in many cases, it can reflect sensible progression in design development i.e. street layout is agreed (frozen) at the planning stage; and street details can follow later.

- Other tools should be deployed to support aligned consents Where new streets are proposed, Processing Agreements should include agreed dates related to RCC. The Quality Audit template (in the Designing Streets toolbox) offers potential to be used to track and record shared decisions, as well examine the balance of risk and responsibility.

An applicant who thought the framework loosely corresponded with their experience noted its potential to help gain the ‘commercial advantage of certainty of RCC sign-off at planning - to get on site earlier’.

Therefore the framework has been received positively and its potential to streamline the process has been reinforced. However capturing measurably shorter timescales (and efficiency savings) has not been possible. This is partly because projects are of a scale where several factors, not only road matters, influence decision making. But in all, gaps remain between good practice intentions and applicants’ experience.

2. Next Steps

We’ve updated the framework in response to testing. We’ve kept some flexibility to allow for variation in processes (e.g. a 2-stage approach or, if an LA prefers, a full RCC could be given concurrent with planning, that allows for conditions), but the framework should mean applicants know what to expect

An applicant said: ‘It would have been good to have known more upfront.’

A further step aims to address difficulties in reaching certainty on RCC decisions. This would shift the emphasis from a reactive approach towards a proactive one by proposing that target RCC time periods could be the same as those in planning. Local authorities would follow the aligned consents model then volunteer to commit to trialing parallel time periods. As long as the information is insufficient and validated, the local authority would then set parallel determination, or sign-off, dates for RCC (either ‘stage 1’ or ‘full’) as follows:

- within 4 months for major applications, or 2 months for local; and within 1 month of detailed planning decision; or,
- as agreed by applicants/agents and local authority planning and roads officers in a signed processing agreement.

The responsibility on the part of a developer or agent would be on producing a quality of information that ensures their application meets minimum submission requirements.

Reflecting on their experience, an applicant said: ‘there really does need to be upfront timelines for approving RCC once they have confirmed an application meets their minimum requirements’.

To balance this view, one local authority said that the ‘quality of submissions…can be deficient as well as the quality of the design within the information’. They suspect this relates to payment agreements with consultants that have a low fixed fee to RCC submission, then the hourly rate beyond encourages ‘extras’. Their opinion is that ‘some developers put in a full RCC too early’.

3. Backstop

If planning applications are not determined there is a right of appeal to either Scottish Ministers or a local review body. RCC decisions also have a right of appeal to Scottish Ministers (Transport Scotland Roads Policy Team) but there is not a parallel appeal process because the Roads (Scotland) Act does not contain powers to allow for appeals on non-determination of RCC applications. Therefore, during any pilot, the procedure to determine RCC applications (at least up to stage 1) within parallel time periods to planning would remain voluntary.

4. Deploy other tools to support aligned consents

a) Promote the inclusion of RCC ‘agreed dates’ in Processing Agreements. Some projects are complex or large, perhaps having development frameworks or masterplans that are split into phases with each part containing detailed Matters Specified in Conditions (MSC). For these, processing agreements should be used to set out and agree appropriate dates for road matters. Therefore a longer turnaround period could be agreed upfront.

b) The tests so far have shown that the Quality Audit approach can assist in tracking and recording shared decisions, as well examining the balance of risk and responsibility. The template in the Designing Streets toolbox (and SCOTS’ National Roads Development Guide) should be used to support better processes and outcomes

c) Other tools: Street Technique, Local Guidance template and Street Detail case studies; are all relevant in supporting aligned consents.
5. Stakeholders

a) What can planning and local authority roads officers do?

- Set submission requirements for RCC, split into stage 1 and stage 2 (Aberdeen City Council’s requirements are an example checklist) and be open to clarifying these requirements during pre-application discussions.
- Record dialogue during pre-app and share with applicants where agreed as appropriate and helpful to build design certainty.
- Agree internal consultation protocols between planning and roads officers so clear joint decisions are given.
- Commit to trialling target time periods and, where processing agreements are used, include RCC milestones.

b) What can applicants or agents do?

- Ensure your submitted information shows an integrated design (refer to aspects within Designing Streets covering: urban design & engineering; landscape & utilities); and is of sufficient quality to meet submission requirements.

c) What we (Scottish Government) are doing:

- Continue to work with local authorities who integrate planning and roads well, and applicants, to test parallel time periods.
- An ongoing development that supports this work is The Joint Housing Delivery Plan for Scotland (June 2015) that contains an action to ‘improve timescales and processes associated with development consents’. Work to measure performance on aligning planning permission with RCC aims to achieve this action.

d) Others:

- Utilities and statutory agencies should ensure that:
  - their guidance supports integrated street design; and
  - expertise is available to constructively input and provide clear written decisions, where necessary, within target time periods for both planning and RCC.

6. Underlying risks/ challenges

- Availability of resources within LAs.
- Expertise and confidence in understanding the whole of Designing Streets within all parties, including local authority officers as well as agents and consultants.
- Risk aversion across several parties related to design conflicts (e.g. vehicles vs pedestrians).
- Risk/ perceived additional cost of maintaining elements seen as innovative or non-standard.
- Utilities, for example some resistance to adopt certain SUDS elements.
- Resources to monitor timescales.
- Planning can be affected by many factors other than roads, so defining impact on planning timescales, from roads matters only, remains challenging.
- Different legislative frameworks behind planning and roads consents, including regulations on appeals, fees and notifications.

7. Timeline

Mid-2015: Seek commitment from LAs to test RCC timescales with. Define monitoring parameters.
Autumn 2015: Continue to promote approach to both roads officers and planners and other stakeholders.
Late 2015: Maintain monitoring with LAs. In addition, consider drafting a standard feedback questionnaire for LAs give to applicants.
End of 2015: Review progress against the defined action within Joint Housing Delivery Plan. 2015-16: In addition, consider recruiting some applicants/ agents/ LA officers to become ‘change champions’ to promote good practice of parallel submissions and consents. Role would include promotion of the AC framework, recording RCC determination timescales and deploying other tools in support.

For more information please contact Stuart Watson, sm.watson@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
STAGE 1 ROADS CONSTRUCTION CONSENT SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Unless otherwise agreed with the Roads Authority, all new applications for Stage 1 RCC consent must include the following information and formats:

1. Form CC1, including billing address, in paper and pdf.
2. Form CC2, for all Section 21 (Construction Consent) applications and Section 56 (without neighbourhood notification), in paper and pdf.
3. One paper copy and one electronic copy (.pdf format and win-zipped as necessary) of drawings which must include the following :-
   a. A location plan.
   b. Layout plans of carriageways, footways, verges, parking areas, cycle paths, retaining walls, bridges and earthworks showing:
      1. Horizontal and vertical geometry of the road alignment and junctions, with profile, contours, cross sections and longitudinal sections.
      2. Dimensioned visibility splays at road junctions, accesses etc. and analysis of forward visibility.
      3. Interfaces with adjacent development/roads sites.
      4. Vehicular access points to properties including driveway gradients.
      5. The location of Structures (eg. Bridges, culverts etc) and their indicative elevation.
      6. Pedestrian facilities
      7. Public transport facilities
      8. Cycling facilities
      9. Safety barriers and other vehicular and pedestrian barrier proposals
   10. Adoptable areas. Consideration must be given to the access requirements necessary, at a future date, to effect any repairs to the kerb, kerb haunch and road box.
   11. Details of any car parking proposed for adoption

12. A drawing outlining the proposed drainage arrangements including SUDs treatments and a 1 in 200 year plan showing flooding path extents. Outline drainage proposals and the extent of the adoption must be agreed by Representatives of Scottish Water and Aberdeen City Council.

13. Swept path analysis for refuse collection vehicles including bin locations or collection points. Other swept path analysis may be required by the Roads Authority's Representative dependent on the nature of the development.

Note: the standard refuse collection vehicle used by ACC is 11m, 3 axle.
A 250mm minimum clearance is required from the edge of the proposed adopted carriageway.

14. Any walls, fences or buildings adjacent to shared surfaces, carriageways or in visibility splays.

15. The Proposed Materials palette
16. Principles to be adopted in the street lighting design
17. Preliminary details of locations of trees and street furniture including landscaping
18. Proposals for the location of utility services

   c. Quality audit proposals.

Unless otherwise agreed with the Roads Authority, the Stage 1 RCC assessment process will not progress until the complete package of information listed above has been submitted.

STAGE 2 ROADS CONSTRUCTION CONSENT SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

Unless otherwise agreed with the Roads Authority, all new applications for Stage 2 RCC consent must include the following information and formats:

1. A formal request for the RCC to be progressed to RCC Stage 2
2. Form RB1, for all qualifying housing schemes and works within the existing adopted road, in paper and pdf.
3. One paper copy and one electronic copy (.pdf format and win-zipped as necessary) of drawings which must include the following :-
   a. Location plan.
   b. Layout plan of carriageways, footways, verges, parking areas, cycle paths, retaining walls, bridges and earthworks showing:
      1. Detailed structures proposals (eg. Bridges, culverts etc)
2. Kerbing layout including pedestrian crossing points, cycle crossing points, tactile paving, bus facilities, driveways and intermediate restraint.

3. Drainage drawing including existing and proposed location of all road gullies, drainage design with discharge points, location of manholes and detail of any SUDS measures. Example: swales, soakaways, bunds & detention basins etc. Drainage layout and design must be agreed by Representatives of Scottish Water and Aberdeen City Council.

4. Design calculations for drainage systems including Gully spacing and SUDS measures.

5. Construction details, dimensions and the material details.

6. Street lighting proposals. These should be designed to comply with BS 5480-1:2012/EN 13201 with relevant Health and Safety and Risk Assessments, Road Lighting Design Classification details based upon ADT's and related Environmental and Statutory Nuisance Assessments.

   a) An additional drawing is required which should show Isolux contours and results for the appropriate Lighting Design Class.
   b) Submitted drawings must be to scale.
   c) An additional drawing is required which should show Isolux contours and results for the appropriate Lighting Design Class.
   d) Calculation report should be included indicating Average and Minimum Illuminance and Uniformity or Average Luminance, Uniformity and Threshold Increment, dependent on Design classification. It should also include details as to how the Maintenance factor was calculated.
   e) Electrical circuit diagram should be included on the drawings with cable calculation sheets submitted indicating voltage drop, impedance, calculation of cable size and MCB rating.
   f) A full electrical test to be carried out on completion and certificates provided.

7. Signage and road markings.

8. Detailed signalised junction and pedestrian crossings where appropriate.

9. Structural design calculations – Retaining wall, Bridges, culverts etc.

10. A soil report should be provided giving test results, in accordance with BS1377, which will include but not limited to, laboratory CBR, Particle Size Distribution and Moisture Condition Value. The locations for these tests will be agreed with the Roads Authority's Representative. Applicants should note that further testing may be necessary. AIP (Approval in Principle) application where appropriate for structures.

11. SEAF (Strengthened Earthwork Appraisal Form) where appropriate.

12. Details of the use of materials included in the materials palette.

13. Detailed location and types of vehicular and pedestrian barrier.

14. Details of how the quality audit outcomes are to be implemented.

15. Schedule of proposed road safety audits.

16. Road construction details associated with utility services.

4) Any proposed alterations to the design approved in the Stage One RCC including:

   a) Horizontal and vertical geometry of the road alignment and junctions, with profile, contours, cross sections and longitudinal sections.
   b) Dimensioned visibility spays at road junctions, access etc.
   c) Vehicular access points to properties including driveway gradients.
   d) Adoptable areas. Consideration must be given to the access requirements necessary, at a future date, to effect any repairs to the kerb, kerb haunch and road box.
   e) Swept path analysis for refuse collection vehicles including bin locations or collection points. Other swept path analysis may be required by the Roads Authority's Representative dependant on the nature of the development.
   f) Any walls, fences or buildings adjacent to shared surfaces, carriageways or in visibility spays.
   g) The Proposed Materials palette.
   h) Location of trees, street furniture including landscaping.

The submission of an incomplete package of information is likely to result in delays to the consent process.
Annex B - Processing agreement template (with RCC included). Editable version of template available from Planning and Architecture Division, Scottish Government

<Council Logo>

This processing agreement between <Council> and <Applicant> aims to identify the key milestones in the planning application process and sets out the information required to process the application. This processing agreement is not legally binding.

Site Address:

Brief description of proposal:

Decision: Subject to the achievement of the timetable set out in this document, including provision of all necessary information by the applicant and consultees, the application will be referred to the appropriate committee of the Council no later than <DATE>.

References to Implementing Designing Streets added in RED July 2015 update
Annex B - Processing agreement template (with RCC included). Editable version of template available from Planning and Architecture Division, Scottish Government

### Pre-application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key meeting dates</th>
<th>&lt;Date&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receipt of proposal of application notice</td>
<td>&lt;Date&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further pre-application discussions required?</td>
<td>&lt;Date&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA Screening and Scoping Opinion</td>
<td>&lt;Date&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Liaison with consultees**
- Outline what liaison is required with consultees at this stage.
- Summarise iterative engagement with roads/transport within LA and statutory consultees (Scottish Water/SEPA) on drainage/flood management.

**Information Requirements**
- Type
- Date due
- Date received
- Plans of street layout with sufficient technical information to drive considered feedback on RCC Stage 1 matters
- Completed Quality Audit summary using template

**Information to aid demonstration of compliance with Designing Streets:**
- <First stage Roads Construction> (RCC stage 1) design elements to be prepared in parallel with planning information.

**Other consents required**
- <if relevant, include any roads construction consent matters such as 'Section 7' agreements>

**Issues to be dealt with by legal agreement**
- <if relevant, include any roads construction consent matters such as 'Section 7' agreements>

### Application

**Regular liaison meetings**
- <who> <dates> or 'every <x> weeks on <day> at <time>.'
- <Dates for internal consultations on RCC matters with roads officer/engineer>

**Agreed Target**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Submission through the e-planning portal**
- Y/N

**Neighbour Notification**
- From <date> to <date>

**Advert in press**
- <date>

**Consultation with statutory consultees**
- Including matters related to RCC
- Who
- Start date
- End date
- Scottish Water
- SEPA

**Consultation with non-statutory consultees**
- Who
- Start date
- End date

**Circulate draft conditions and legal agreements for comment**
- <date>

**Committee report to be finalised/signed by Head of Planning**
- <date>

**Committee site visit**
- <date>

**Committee meeting**
- <date>

**Notification to the Scottish Ministers (if required)**
- <date>

### Post Application

**Legal Agreements**
- Draft Heads of Terms <date>
- Preparation of draft legal agreement <date>
- Conclusion of legal agreement <date>

**Discharge of Conditions**
- Conditions to be dispensed by <Elements required for Second stage Roads Construction (RCC stage 2), before starting on site> <date>

**Signed** On behalf of <Council>
**Signed** On behalf of <Applicant>