

Developer Contributions Team
Planning Strategy Division – Planning Directorate
Ministry of Housing, Communities, and Local Government
Third Floor
Fry Building
2 Marsham Street
London
SW1P 4DF

Submitted by email only: standards106consultation2026@communities.gov.uk

20th October 2026

Dear Sir / Madam.

Re: Standard Planning Agreements for Medium Sized Sites

The Land, Planning and Development Federation (LPDF) welcomes the opportunity to respond to the consultation on the 'Standard Planning Agreements for Medium Sized Sites' consultation. The LPDF strongly welcomes the proposals to introduce standard planning agreements for medium-sized sites and supports the principle of greater standardisation within the planning system. This is something that as a Federation we have advocated for over a number of years now.

The LPDF recognise the important role that planning agreements play in securing the infrastructure, affordable housing and other contributions necessary to support sustainable development. However, the negotiation and completion of these agreements can be a significant source of delay, uncertainty and unnecessary cost in the planning process. These challenges can be particularly acute where similar issues are repeatedly negotiated on a site-by-site basis, despite the existence of established policies and well-understood requirements.

The introduction of standard planning agreements offers an important opportunity to address these issues by reducing unnecessary duplication, streamlining negotiations and providing greater clarity and consistency for applicants, local planning authorities and other stakeholders. We therefore support the direction of travel set out in the consultation and consider that a proportionate, practical approach to standardisation could make a meaningful contribution to improving the efficiency of the planning system and accelerating housing delivery.

Due to our general support and the desire to get standard planning agreements in place and being used as quickly as possible, instead of providing answers to the detailed questions set out in the consultation document, this response

focuses on a few general points the LPDF wish to raise which we believe would make the use of standard planning agreements more effective.

About the LPDF

The LPDF seeks to represent the UK's leading land promoters, home builders and commercial developers. LPDF members support the housebuilding and commercial development sectors by promoting sites through the planning system, providing "shovel ready" land with a planning permission which can facilitate the delivery of infrastructure and serviced land parcels.

The LPDF seeks to actively engage with government on planning, housing and commercial development policy and to educate the wider public on the social, environmental and economic benefits of development through an evidenced based approach.

The LPDF encourages its members to deliver well designed, high quality, sustainable places which deliver a mix of housing types and tenures, commercial spaces and community uses that have a positive social, environmental, and economic impact.

Our key values include:

- Working in a positive and cooperative way with central and local government and key stakeholders, to deliver a planning system capable of supplying the homes and employment space we need.
- Promoting research and an evidence-led approach to policy development.
- Increasing the supply of new homes to meet demand and make home ownership a realistic possibility for all those who aspire to it.
- Ensuring that we build the affordable homes of all types and tenures that this country so desperately needs.
- Delivering new employment space to meet demand from businesses and support economic growth.
- Championing the impact of increased housing delivery on reducing intergenerational unfairness.
- Creating well designed, high quality and sustainable places to live and work.
- Educating and informing about the social, environmental and economic benefits of development.
- Supporting diversity of delivery in the market and championing SME developers.
- Promoting diversity and inclusivity within the sector.

General Comments

The LPDF strongly welcomes the proposals to introduce standard planning agreements and strongly supports the principle of greater standardisation across the planning system. We believe this is a practical and necessary step towards reducing unnecessary negotiation, improving certainty and accelerating housing delivery.

The LPDF wishes to make the following general observations.

1. Standard Section 106 agreements should be mandatory

For the proposed reforms to deliver their intended benefits, the use of the standard Section 106 agreement itself should be mandatory for all sites falling within its scope. Without this requirement, there is a risk that local planning authorities will continue to rely on their own bespoke agreements and established practices, undermining the consistency, certainty and efficiencies that standardisation is intended to achieve.

A voluntary approach would risk perpetuating the very issues these proposals seek to address, with unnecessary negotiation, differing approaches between authorities and avoidable delays continuing across the planning system. The standard agreement should therefore be the default requirement for all single sites, irrespective of size, with departures permitted only where the complexity or specific circumstances of a scheme genuinely justify a bespoke agreement.

Making the standard agreement mandatory, alongside mandatory cascades, would provide a clear and consistent framework for applicants and local planning authorities, reduce unnecessary negotiation and help ensure that the benefits of reform are realised in practice. This is an opportunity to move beyond guidance and establish a standard approach that delivers meaningful improvements to the efficiency of the planning process and the speed of housing delivery.

2. Cascades should be mandatory

For standard planning agreements to deliver their intended benefits, cascades must also be mandatory rather than discretionary. Without a clear requirement to follow the prescribed approach, there is a risk that existing practices and unnecessary negotiation will continue, undermining the efficiencies these reforms are intended to achieve.

This is particularly important in the current market, where Registered Providers (RPs) are facing increasing challenges in investing across sites of all sizes. Effective cascades provide an important mechanism for maintaining deliverability where the original affordable housing tenure or delivery approach proves unviable or impractical.

The LPDF also encourages the Government to consider a broader range of options within cascade mechanisms, rather than relying primarily on off-site provision or commuted sums. In particular, discounted market sale (DMS), including First Homes, should be expressly incorporated into the standard cascade options and play a greater role as an alternative affordable housing tenure where traditional routes of delivery are not viable or achievable.

The LPDF's recent research, [*Discounted Market Sale: The Potential to Support Housebuilding and Homeownership \(August 2026\)*](#), highlights the potential for DMS to help unlock sites where RPs cannot be secured to take on Section 106 affordable housing. DMS offers an alternative delivery route that does not depend on RP investment, while still providing affordable homeownership opportunities and retaining the discount for future eligible purchasers. The research identifies default cascade mechanisms that allow a transition to DMS as a practical means of responding to changing market conditions, reducing delays and supporting housing delivery.

The LPDF therefore strongly recommends that the standard agreements expressly provide for DMS within the cascade process. A more flexible and consistent approach would help ensure that affordable housing obligations remain

deliverable in practice, reduce the risk of sites being stalled by a lack of RP demand and support the Government's wider ambitions for housing delivery.

3. Standard agreements should apply to all single-phase sites, irrespective of size

The LPDF does not consider that the use of standard planning agreements should be restricted to medium-sized sites. The determining factor should be the complexity of the development and the nature of the planning agreement, rather than the number of dwellings proposed.

For example, a single-phase scheme of 100 dwellings on a site in single ownership, requiring only a bilateral agreement, should be just as suitable for a standard template as a scheme of 49 dwellings with the same characteristics. The use of standard agreements should be determined by the simplicity of the site and agreement, not an arbitrary threshold based on dwelling numbers.

We recognise that bespoke Section 106 agreements may remain necessary for larger, more complex schemes, particularly those involving significant infrastructure requirements, multiple landowners or numerous parties. Standardisation should not be an inflexible requirement where the circumstances genuinely warrant a bespoke approach. However, this should not prevent standard templates from being used more widely wherever the circumstances allow.

Extending the approach to all single-phase sites, regardless of size, would maximise the benefits of standardisation, improve consistency and avoid unnecessary distinctions based on dwelling numbers.

4. Implementation should begin without delay

The LPDF believes there is a clear opportunity to make an immediate and practical improvement to the planning process. If the intention is to test the standard templates, consult on their effectiveness and ultimately widen their use, we would question the need to restrict their initial application. Extending their use from the outset to all suitable single-phase sites would avoid unnecessary delays and allow the benefits of standardisation to be realised more quickly.

The templates should provide a consistent and efficient starting point for straightforward agreements, with sufficient flexibility to accommodate genuinely complex or site-specific circumstances. The priority should be to put workable templates into use now, rather than introduce further stages that risk delaying the improvements they are intended to deliver.

Ultimately, the success of these proposals should be measured by their impact on the delivery of homes. Repeated negotiations over routine provisions create avoidable costs, uncertainty and delays for both developers and local planning authorities. Standard agreements, supported by mandatory cascades and applied consistently to simple sites of all sizes, would help remove these barriers and allow parties to focus their time and resources on matters that genuinely require negotiation.

Conclusion

The LPDF strongly supports the proposals and welcomes MHCLG's progress in bringing forward standard planning agreements. Standardisation has been discussed across the industry for some 15 years, and it is important that we now seize this opportunity to turn the principle into practice. The LPDF believes the industry should welcome and embrace these proposals, working constructively with Government to make them a success, rather than allowing the pursuit of a perfect solution to delay progress further.

The LPDF supports MHCLG in taking this work forward and encourages the Government to be ambitious in its implementation. The standard Section 106 agreement should be mandatory for all sites within scope, the use of cascades within Section 106 agreements should also be mandatory, and the use of standard agreements should be extended to all single-phase sites irrespective of size. The standard cascade options should also expressly include discounted market sale, providing greater flexibility to respond to current market conditions and support affordable housing delivery.

While bespoke agreements will remain appropriate for genuinely complex schemes, this should not prevent the wider adoption of standard agreements wherever they are suitable. Having reached this important milestone, the priority now must be to get on and implement the proposals without delay. This is an opportunity to deliver a practical improvement to the planning system, reduce unnecessary negotiation and uncertainty, and help turn planning permissions into much-needed homes more quickly. The LPDF is keen to work constructively with MHCLG and the wider industry to ensure these proposals translate into meaningful improvements in practice.