

GeoPlace conference 2022 – 10th -11th May

Q&A: From planning to maintenance to demolition, the lifecycle of address and street data

Question	Answer
Do GeoPlace advocate new SN legislation that would be nationally consistent and provide absolute positions about gaps such as sub-building numbering, charging etc.?	Collectively this is our ultimate aim yes
Is the CoP consultation going to SNNOs only or will it also go to custodians?	It will be an open consultation
Most LA's, I believe, street name and number once an application has been received after planning permission has been granted. Whether that is before construction commences or during. This option is not available on the poll	Noted
It would be good to see the consultation regarding Fees and Charges: At the moment different authorities charge for SNN services differently, which dispute with the developers who work in different local authorities at the same time. There should be a standard fees structure throughout the UK (perhaps on a regional basis) which is important similarly as renaming a street or building.	<i>Noted although the Code of Practice purely sets out recommendations as covered in the legislation. It is still to local decision the final structure associated with charging</i>
Why don't VOA send us location information for the records they create with made up addresses? It takes a long time to locate "Concrete building on RAF Newton Site". These records then count against Local Authority in Geoplace reports. Can we have an outcome key for "Made up address cannot be located or linked to a UPRN" these could then be referred back to VOA by Geoplace centrally for VOA to provide the necessary information.	We are working closely with VOA to streamline the process between LLPG - Ctax/NDR - VOA to ensure UPRNs are adopted by VOA at the start of the valuation process rather than matching at the end of the process. One element we are looking at is whether this type of VOA record can be linked to parent UPRN rather than creating a UPRN for each subdivision.

<p>why wont the VOA give us details of change of business They says its GDPR but what business wouldn't want to be known</p>	<p>Noted. We will look into this.</p>
<p>PAF / VOA match is useful. However really frustrating that it is an error. Our experience is mismatch is usually due to PAF and VOA being behind real world. Therefore we have to submit an "exception" / error penalised for meeting LLPG core purpose and reflecting the real world. Could the use of matching tasks generating an "error" be reconsidered? ACI in a warning is helpful but and incorrect "error" is not</p>	<p>Noted. We will look into this.</p>
<p>Rural Authorities face a challenge with lack of change of use for Agricultural outbuildings being converted to residential these circumstances bypass the whole life cycle. We can only find out about these when a vulnerable person moves in and asks for services. What can be done?</p>	<p>This type of development should be subject to planning and building control so should theoretically be know to the authorities. There will be cases where developments are conducted without the authority being aware, but identification through the LLPG process could then be used to help planning and building control enforcement.</p>
<p>We recently had set of candidates form OS for building sites with things like "On A46" and "university campus". They need to be more specific or there's no chance of locating them. Can this be passed on to OS?</p>	<p>Noted. We will look into this.</p>
<p>Appreciate it is aimed at supporting custodians - but concern that inferring data in AddressBase moves it away from LLPG. There as been mention of further additional classifications. Our State codes are null as we don't feel DEC sufficiently defines this fields to be managed in a consistent level. Imputing in AddressBase seems to miss the point and undermine national standardisation Can this be reconsider in how the core LLPG purpose can be improved?</p>	<p>We are working through the process with ACE and the Regional Chairs. One area of discussion is the provision of DTFs to Custodians to allow the importing into LLPGs of updated data by GeoPlace.</p>

<p>The BLPU information only reflects current status. Are there any plans to amend the schema to include full lifecycle information, for example the original build date?</p>	<p>We are looking into this and the implications on the existing DEC. Capturing the original build data for all properties as a huge undertaking. Our focus will be on capturing completion dates on new developments.</p>
<p>Permitted development rights mean we often aren't aware of changes of use - with implications for LLPG data, and authority revenues. What can be done about this?</p>	<p>Noted. We will look into this. Many significant Permitted Developments will require prior approval - capturing this against existing UPRNs is possible although generating new records could be more problematic and an authority may not be aware of developments until local authority services are required. Good integration between LLPGs and key application systems can provide this intelligence.</p>
<p>How we can ensure 1-1 relation between addresses held by VOA and LLPG address data. Should we send UPRN with the address data when we notify VOA? Has VOA committed to adopt UPRN?</p>	<p>This is what we are currently discussing with VOA. They need to be able to hold the UPRN in their system and ideally, they would require a standardised flow of local authority data with UPRNs.</p>
<p>How can we continue to keep up with SNN when we have funding cuts and less staff, due to being classed as revenue and not grant funded?</p>	<p>We are happy to help make the case in your authority. Hopefully the RoI report and the case studies on our website can help make the local business case for maintaining LLPGs.</p>
<p>Am I correct in that AddressBase only holds 'In Use' BLPU state UPRNs? Our BC service is outsourced and they can't access any UPRNs already named and numbered by SNN.... this means they do not use the correct UPRNs for the applications they send back to us. Are there any plans to include addressed UPRNs in AddressBase in the future?</p>	<p>AddressBase contains provisional records where available, so your outsourced BC service should be able to see these if they take the product. You are able to provide a feed of LLPG data to organisations working with your to deliver your core business. We would be happy to discuss details if you'd like to contact us direct.</p>
<p>Is it time to treat Royal Mail as just another delivery company and their reference number (Postcode) as the same level of importance as, say that of Amazon or DPD?</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p>What is GeoPlace's response to What3Words in so far as locating an address and how this overlaps with SNN?</p>	<p>W3W and AddressBase are different solutions to different issues. W3W cannot be used to unambiguously identify a property as there will be several W3Ws for a property. However, W3W is useful for location where there is no obvious feature. SNN is the authoritative, legal process for creating addresses so we don't consider there to be competition between W3W and AddressBase. Some users have been creating cross references between the two systems but we've not seen the outputs from this work.</p>
<p>Geoplace run a postcode algorithm to ensure the correct postcode is applied to LA data - in case there's a disparity. So AddressBase data is cleansed. Could any postcodes that are considered incorrect in the core LLPG data be fed back - so that we can ensure local data is correct?</p>	<p>We can provide a DTF if you want to change this in your LLPG, contact the Helpdesk</p>
<p>Might not be answered today as I'm sure there are more important questions but - should all footpaths coming off of streets have their own USRN? Assuming they'd be type 2 described...</p>	<p>If the footpath was not covered by the street naming and numbering it can have its own USRN, but if it was included in the street naming and numbering (e.g. the first part of the street is carriageway and the second part is footpath) it can share a USRN, but would need different highway dedications and construction records to show the differences</p>
<p>Is the Find My Street going to be updated so that it gives a fair reflection of Public Right of Way Records - they are inputted mainly as 'publicly maintained highway' but they are over private land, so public need to be aware that they are maintained by local authority and the land owner</p>	<p>There is no plan to include Land Registry information on FindmyStreet and GeoPlace do not believe that it impacts the position of Maintainable at Public Expense</p>
<p>Re Charging in SNN CoP - I hope this is allowing those LAs who wish to continue to charge to full cost recovery as per individual policy?</p>	<p>This is still down to local decision</p>

<p>Our SNN Charges are agreed by Members - I would also like to know if fees are set to be the same because this will need to be filtered through to Managers, Heads of Services and Members all of which I doubt will be very happy if the fees are set?</p>	<p>This is still down to local decision</p>
<p>Are the set fees within a LA classed as a Governance process?</p>	<p>This is still down to local decision</p>
<p>Will the final Code of Practice be required to go to our individual Cabinet/Council for approval??</p>	<p><i>This will be your local decision</i></p>
<p>Do we need to respond to SNN consultation?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Once published will the SNN CoP be available to public?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Do we now need to response to SNN consultation?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>I welcome the SNN Code of Practice and have often used the best practice guidance to support the Council's SNN numbering decision to developers who clearly want an address as a "marketing name" which is not unique. Can SNN Best Practice importance be raised at Chief Executive, Senior Managers level.</p>	<p>Yes this will form part of the longer term work we hope to do together</p>