MHCLG Open Data Standards Community - Summary notes of meeting 23/7/25

## Opening & Context Setting

### Why we're here

- Welcome to the Planning Data Specifications Open Standards Community Group.
- This replaces earlier advisory groups and drop-in sessions an open, structured community space.

### Purpose of the community

- To co-create effective, system-agnostic data specifications for the planning system.
- To involve the community in **resolving design issues**, testing, and prioritising next steps.
- Emphasised this is a "**new step**" in government—engaging stakeholders before mandating and legislation.

#### Illustration with Water Standards

- Used a drinking water analogy: We trust water is drinkable because of known standards.
- Point: Standards underpin trust and usability— the same applies to planning data.

### Planning data goals

- The aim is to produce open, reusable, modular data specifications across the entire planning permission process, not just submission forms.
- Specifications are based on existing legislation and policy.

### Development approach

- Working iteratively:
  - Start with working drafts, test and refine.

- Move to candidate status, then mandate as legal standards via legislation.
- Target: Mandating by Autumn 2026.

### Call for engagement

- Need evidence-based feedback.
- Encouraged participants to share what they're working on and flag gaps in participation ("Tell your friends" principle).

## Specification Development Update

### Submissions work

- Published working draft specifications as information models (human-readable).
- Gathered **community feedback** and made substantial improvements:
  - Corrected field types and logic.
  - Added missing fields (e.g. BNG exemption reason).
  - Improved alignment with GLA feedback (e.g. residential units module).

### Declarative Model introduction

- Moving from information models to **declarative models** (machine-readable, rule-based).
- Declarative models specify:
  - Field types and constraints.
  - Code lists.
  - Module logic (e.g. conditional fields).
  - Components for **reusability** and **consistency**.
- Helps with validation, automation, maintenance, and tooling.

### Current state

- Completed:
  - 6 of 21 applications
  - All 82 modules
  - 50 components
  - o 406 fields
- Next: work on code lists, application types, and rationalisation.

#### Request to the community

- Help test the declarative model.
- Provide real and edge-case test data.
- Share how you want to use the specs (e.g. validation, form building).
- Suggest improvements, with evidence.

# 📥 Decisions work (new phase)

- Just starting on specs for planning decisions (i.e. outcomes).
- Decisions data is valuable: helps **connect the process start to end** and supports analysis.
- Kicked off by revisiting the 2022 draft.
- Starting with research and community input before defining models.

#### Ask for support

- Volunteers wanted for research interviews.
- Requests for use cases and fields you rely on.
- A survey will be shared soon.

## Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) Discovery Project

### Project background

- GMCA has MHCLG funding for a **discovery project** on planning application data.
- Working in partnership with the Greater London Authority (GLA) to see if the London Planning Data Hub model can work outside London.

### Scope & collaboration

- Aim is to develop a shared planning data infrastructure with:
  - Local authorities (10 in GMCA)
  - Back-office providers (IDOX and Arcus)
  - Planning Portal
- Working with consultancy Atkins on data storage and dashboarding.

### National Standards Alignment

- Initial plan was to develop a GM-specific schema.
- But because **Salford is an early adopter**, and GMCA needs all 10 authorities aligned, the team decided to:
  - Delay schema development
  - Align closely with national specifications to avoid duplication and delays.

### Project aim

- Build a connector for planning data, with:
  - Open data feed
  - Geospatial fields (via JSON)
  - Dashboard visualisation of planning application data
- Support both local monitoring and national reporting.

• Designed to reduce reporting burden on local authorities.

### Stakeholder engagement

- Engaging a wide range of actors:
  - Back-office vendors
  - Planning Officers Group (POG) as internal GMCA sounding board
- Mapping out who adds/accesses data at different stages of the planning process.

## Digital Planning Register ODP Project

#### Project overview

- Leading work on the Digital Planning Register (DPR) as part of the Open Digital Planning (ODP) stack.
- Goal: a **searchable, publishable planning register** to meet legal requirements and support future functionality (e.g. enforcement).

#### Technical evolution

- Started with a Digital Site Notice prototype using Camden and Lambeth APIs.
- Moved to DPR by reading directly from **BOPS**, the back-office planning system for ODP.

### Data challenge

- Recognised a major legacy data problem:
  - Needed to standardise and ingest data from multiple systems (not just BOPS).
- Led to development of the ODP schema, including a post-submission section.

DPR Tools

- Building a suite of tools called "DPR Tools":
  - Allow mapping/migration of data from any source into ODP schema.
  - Output an **Open API** using MHCLG-compatible standards.
- Goal is not to enforce use of ODP schema, but to:
  - Make it easy to map into it
  - Facilitate migration and interoperability

### Strategic insight

- Acknowledged the "XKCD 927 problem" of proliferating standards.
- Framing ODP schema as a **bridge** between existing formats and MHCLG-approved specifications.
- Aim is pragmatic transition, not a big bang shift.

## Questions and Answers

Dan (Architectural background)

Q: How do these specifications relate to IFC or other design data schemas?

We rely on community to tell us what schemas matter; IFC may be too detailed at this stage.

Now that we're moving to declarative models, it's a good time to start **one-to-one mapping** with existing standards.

Jenny

Q: Has the aim shifted away from other application types like listed buildings and adverts?

No – the updated aim **broadens** the focus from just submission forms to the **whole planning process**, not narrowing it.

Nick

Q1: Will there be a decision schema?

Yes – just starting. Seeking input.

Q2: Why model the change in housing units (delta) instead of capturing existing + proposed?

Agreed – that's a legacy from current forms. Declarative models can shift burden off applicants and ensure accuracy.

Chris

Q: Will you use a more formal declarative language with semantics?

Possibly in future. Current model prioritises usability and tooling; open to suggestions.

Q: Is this based on a known grammar?

Based on the planning.data.gov.uk approach, but could evolve.

Mel

Q: Will building control data also be standardised?

Yes, it's on the roadmap but timing is unknown. We're mapping the broader landscape to prioritise what's next.

#### Chris (on DPR tool presentation)

Q: Are you considering ISO 23386 (linked to construction/BIM interoperability)?

Not yet, but noted and will investigate.