

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy)
<p>Persimmon Homes and McCarthy and Stone (Developments) Ltd; LPC; Fairview New Homes; ORCC; Atkins Consultants Ltd; Bellway Homes; Timbmet Limited; J. Godwin; R. White; J. Mensah; Churchill Retirement Living Ltd; David Wilson Homes; Martin Grant Homes Ltd; Pinecrest Land and Property Ltd; House Builders Federation; Inventures; Oxfordshire County Council; Cherwell District Council; UKAEA; Great Western Park Consortium.</p> <p>BACKGROUND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2.15 and 2.16 the Council should acknowledge that the draft plan is still a draft. SPG should be based upon adopted rather than emerging policy. • In 1.2, the affordable housing policies in the emerging Local Plan are the subject of unresolved objections and this should be referred to in the introduction. • Draft guidance appears to be too prescriptive in several areas and goes far beyond the policies set out in Circular 6/98. • SPG inadequately responds to changes with the Regional Housing Boards, Regional Housing Strategies and Housing Corporation's partnering of Housing Associations and suggests that extensive redrafting is required. • Should policies and paragraphs be changed in the Local Plan, the SPG should be changed to reflect the Local Plan wording. • Wholeheartedly agree with concept and aims and expectations. • Objection to the principle of promoting SPG when it is known that new guidance is being issued to supersede Circular 6/98. • The Council's approach seeks to completely disregard the important provisions of Circular 6/98 (re size thresholds and Footnote 9) and focused purely on need which is wholly unacceptable. • Note the Council's acceptance that there will have to be a degree of flexibility when assessing individual schemes. Applying targets would risk making development unviable and inhibit housing development. • There is a growing acceptance that the need for all types of housing should be considered when drawing up housing targets, not just affordable housing. (2.10) • Disappointed that SPG does not recognise that sheltered housing development represents a much needed provision of specialist accommodation and should be exempt from the requirements to provide affordable housing. Urge VWHDC to adopt similar policy to other local authorities that do not require affordable housing contributions from such sites. • 2.14 needs to explain the practical limitations of a 40% resolution as a material consideration as the basis for the determination of a planning application. • In 2.7, cannot rely on 50% affordable housing figure in Oxfordshire Structure Plan as it is not definite yet, so need to remove reference to it. 	<p>This has been taken into account in the revised SPG para 2.4. The revised SPG is based on policy H16 as recommended to be changed by the local plan Inspector.</p> <p>The Inspector's report on the objections to the local plan has been published.</p> <p>The SPG has been revised in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations for policy H16 which brings it into line with Circular 6/98.</p> <p>The SPG has been extensively redrafted and these points taken into considerations.</p> <p>This is referred to in para 2.4 of the revised SPG.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Circular 6/98 will only be superseded when PPS3 is issued by government until then it remains government guidance. The Council cannot wait until the Circular is replaced.</p> <p>This has been covered by the local plan Inspector and the policy and this SPG have been revised accordingly.</p> <p>The revised draft SPG contains a new section on viability – see para 6.8 in particular.</p> <p>This is accepted and should be covered in the future by the government's approach to balancing housing markets. However, this SPG is about affordable housing and should not be widened at this stage.</p> <p>The Council considers that private sheltered housing schemes should provide an element of affordable housing and has successfully negotiated it.</p> <p>This paragraph in the first draft of the SPG has been deleted from the revised draft as it is now out of date and not relevant.</p> <p>This was also the view of the local plan Inspector. The local plan and SPG have been changed accordingly.</p> <p>Since then the Housing Needs Survey has been updated</p>

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that policies relate to Housing Needs Survey in 2001 which is out of date and very little reliance can be placed on its findings. Its methodology is not necessarily in accordance with best practice. Survey should be updated before take forward SPG. Basis upon which 40% target is recommended in 2.11 is not disclosed in SPG. Basis upon which the Council decided to raise target to 50% affordable housing whilst lowering qualification thresholds is unclear. Recommendations should be based on sound estimates of deliverability of targets rather than assertion that house prices have continued to rise. 2.12 quotes figures which do not appear to correlate with figures quoted in the Council's HSSA return. 2.14, Councils should not feel tied to the findings of their consultants and should not take up positions which should be adopted through the local plan process without consultation and consideration of the effects on developers' financial viability. The figure of 18-19,000 dwellings in RPG9 is a regional figure for overall affordable housing provision, not just for provision through the planning system. Provision through Section 106 agreements plays a relatively minor role. 	<p>and considered by the local plan Inspector who considered it justified 40% affordable homes.</p> <p>This paragraph is now out of date and has been deleted.</p> <p>The revised SPG is based upon the Inspector's recommendation to change the target to 40%.</p> <p>This paragraph is now out of date and has been deleted from the revised SPG.</p> <p>This issue of viability was discussed extensively at the local plan inquiry. A new section on viability has been added to the revised SPG.</p> <p>Noted Provision of affordable housing through S106 agreements is the most significant way affordable homes are now delivered.</p>
<p>IMPLEMENTATION</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final sentence of 3.1 should be replaced with one that reflects the Council will back developers' bids for funding and if necessary will negotiate to achieve reduced quantity of affordable housing or housing of different tenures. Concern at 3.1 as would appear to give developers/landowners a 'get out clause' to reduce the overall number of affordable housing if grant funding is not forth-coming. 	<p>This has been taken into account in para 6.8 of the revised SPG.</p> <p>The Council has accepted that the economics of a site may be such that it is not always possible to secure the overall % and tenure split that the Council would prefer.</p>
<p><i>Definition of Affordable Housing</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.2 should be amended to more precisely define what is regarded as affordable. Definition of affordable housing in 3.2 is inconsistent with that in Circular 6/98. Should be amended. Definition of affordable housing does not make the point that affordability should be defined with reference to the relationship between housing costs and incomes. 	<p>By referring to the types of affordable housing to be provided immediately after the definition clarifies what the Council means by affordable housing. The relationship between incomes and house prices/rents is referred to in para 2.2 of the revised SPG.</p>
<p><i>Proportion of Affordable housing</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The references to the Rural White Paper in 3.3 does not support the 50% target. Quote the SPG is referring to is misinterpreted. Reference should be deleted. RPG9 seeks that affordable housing should come from all sources of supply which would include 100% affordable developments initiated by RSLs and other affordable housing providers rather than exclusively from Section 106 sites. Reference to RPG9 in 3.3 should be deleted. Council appears to be attempting to adopt policies which seem to require provision of more affordable 	<p>Para 3.3 in the original draft SPG is not included in the revised SPG.</p> <p>The revised SPG makes no reference to RPG9. The revised SPG acknowledges that RSLs can develop sites just for affordable dwellings.</p> <p>The SPG is consistent with the Local Plan paras 6.6-6.8 of the revised SPG cover viability in more detail.</p>

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy)
<p>housing than Council has demonstrated a capacity to fund or develop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be better if the Council's ambitions for affordable housing from section 106 sites were more realistically deliverable and more solid guidance as to its reasonable expectations. • Replace "Fordham Associates ... July 2001" with "A target of 40% affordable housing was adopted for development control purposes in July 2001". • Support for asking 50% affordable housing on all sites above the threshold. It is ambitious but well reasoned and documented and clearly stated. • Believe a contribution of 50% affordable housing from any site, given probable absence of social housing grant, is excessive and will lead to development schemes not coming forward. • Using 'evolving custom and practice' to increase figure to 50% is very unscientific and not based on local circumstances. • Feel 3.3 requires clarification, in particular what will be the requirement where no subsidy is available. There appears to be some confusion between 3.3 and paragraphs 3.24 and 3.25. • Increase to 50% not supported by "a clear and up to date assessment of local need for affordable housing" as required by Circular 6/98. evidence gathered is flimsy and may not reflect an increase in affordable housing. • Suggested target for affordable housing should be maintained at 40% until more detailed survey evidence becomes available. • In 3.4, delete sentence "evidence supplied must be capable of independent verification". Such evidence will often involve the disclosure of commercially sensitive information. Will the Council take independent RICS advice on these aspects or rely on the developer to make their claims? • Debatable as to whether contamination should be considered an 'abnormal' cost. Developers should take such costs into account when making offers for land. Recommend that actual rather than projected costs of decontamination be taken into account. • Delete the word 'normally' from the last sentence of 3.4. • Developers may take undue advantage of reference to "serious contamination problems" to justify a reduction in the affordable housing threshold. • Expectation is that any abnormally high development costs should be reflected in the price the developer pays for the land. • List of 'standard development costs' are by no means standard in many cases. Delete final sentence of 3.4. • To say abnormal site costs will not include the factors listed in 3.4 will render many urban sites non-viable, simply because the returns are not there either for the landowner or the developer to make it worthwhile • Suggested include 'which may include planning obligations for infrastructure works and contributions' after 'high infrastructure costs in relation to the size of development' in 3.4. 	<p>The SPG has been changed to reflect the Inspector's recommendations on the Local Plan.</p> <p>The words were in para 3.3 of the original SPG: this paragraph is no longer included in the revised draft.</p> <p>Noted, but the Inspector at the local plan inquiry did not accept the 50% target.</p> <p>The SPG has been revised to 40% in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations on the local plan.</p> <p>The local plan Inspector did not accept that 50% was justified and the SPG has been revised accordingly.</p> <p>The overall amount secured will depend on the economics of individual sites and what they can reasonably fund.</p> <p>The housing needs Survey was updated in 2005 and was in accordance with the government's best practice guidelines.</p> <p>The Inspector has accepted that 40% is appropriate and the SPG has been revised to take that into account. This is not appropriate. It is necessary to ensure the policy is being rigorously and fairly applied. All evidence will be confidential to the Council and any external professional advice deemed necessary to verify the evidence submitted.</p> <p>Actual costs will be taken into account, but these may be more than could have been realistically foreseen when the site was purchased.</p> <p>Agreed. This has been changed (para 6.7 of the revised draft).</p> <p>This justifies the 'open book' approach.</p> <p>Agreed. This is set out in para 6.7 of the revised draft.</p> <p>These factors should be taken into account when the developer agrees on the purchase price of the land.</p> <p>The alternative value of the land will be taken into account which will be important for urban sites, see para 6.6 of the revised draft.</p> <p>This will be taken into account in the assessment of viability as set out in para 6.6 of the revised SPG.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.7 of the revised SPG refers to standard development costs being reflected in the price paid for</p>

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to land values in 3.4 is unhelpful, misguided and should be deleted. <p><i>Size of sites</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that no viability study has been undertaken in respect of the sites allocated in the draft local plan. • Local Plan describes a large number of smaller villages as having a lower order of services and according to Circular 6/98 such sites are not suitable for affordable housing. • Decisions should be on a site by site basis and attempts of the Council to pre-judge the outcome of negotiations is unhelpful. • The case for introducing a lower threshold has not been made, is contrary to government guidance and is not based upon reliable evidence. There are no exceptional local constraints that justify this reduction. Threshold should be raised to that set out in Circular 6/98. • If new thresholds and targets for provision of affordable housing are not accepted by the Inspector 3.5 and 3.6 should be varied to reflect the adopted policy. • Welcome 3.8. • In 3.8, treating two sites that are adjacent as forming part of a greater whole is unacceptable in circumstances where land may be in separate ownership. Should be amended to clarify this will only apply where adjacent sites are owned or to be developed by the same developer. • 3.8 needs to be expanded to make it clear that this matter will be approached in a reasonable way and not simply used to either extract excessive requirements from developers or as a means of preventing the development of otherwise reasonable development sites. • Not acceptable to consider adjoining sites as a matter of course as there may be no prospect of any adjoining sites coming forward for development. • If Council can demonstrate there is a specific policy requirement for comprehensive development on a basis wider than the application site and if it can demonstrate it is taking necessary action to facilitate this, then considering adjoining sites may be acceptable. • The last comment of 3.9 not only appears to pre-judge site- specific negotiations but also risks conflict with the site suitability criteria in Circular 6/98. It should be deleted. <p><i>Off site and commuted payments</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The basic principles of off site delivery and provision of commuted sums can be laid out in the Local Plan. • Final sentence of 3.10 could be more positively worded to provide greater clarity and to establish a sensible criterion for the exceptional cases. • Would be helpful if 3.11 reflected the fact that the level of off site provision should be based on the amount of provision that the developer would have to provide on site. • Support for land rather than commuted sums in 	<p>the land. This is reasonable.</p> <p>It is for applicants to demonstrate why a site is not viable with the affordable housing sought.</p> <p>Policy H16 of the Local Plan applies to all settlements with less than 3000 people, not just those listed in policy H10 or H11.</p> <p>Decisions will be on a site by site basis, but common objectives need to be established.</p> <p>The thresholds have been changed to those recommended by the Inspector which are consistent with C6/98.</p> <p>The SPG has been revised to take account of the inspector's recommendations on the local plan.</p> <p>Noted. This is para 4.2 in the revised draft SPG.</p> <p>The word 'normally' gives sufficient flexibility to cover this point.</p> <p>The Council's expectations are not excessive, and should not prevent the development of otherwise reasonable sites.</p> <p>In which case the proviso will not apply.</p> <p>It is not acceptable to subdivide a site into two parts which each fall below the size threshold where affordable housing can be sought.</p> <p>The last sentence of para 3.9 of the original draft has been deleted. (This is now para 4.3)</p> <p>This is too detailed for the local plan and is more appropriate for the SPG. This principle was recognised and supported by the local plan inspector.</p> <p>The exceptional circumstances are covered in para 6.10 of the revised draft.</p> <p>Para 6.11 of the revised draft covers this point.</p> <p>Noted</p>

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy)
<p>3.11.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.12 should reflect the difference between open market land value and the value of land for affordable housing. • The formula for the calculation of commuted sums suggests the developer and landowner will have to provide a sum equivalent to the cost of the dwelling less the value of the mortgage services by the rent i.e. what they would have paid if no grant were available. This is wholly unacceptable and will make schemes unviable. • Include in 3.12 second sentence "Housing Corporation target rent levels at the point of first let". • Welcome the acceptance in 3.10 to 3.12 to off site provision and financial contributions in lieu of on site provision. The level of financial contribution should not however be at such a high level as that set out in 3.12. • Objection to the prescriptive nature of the calculation in lieu of social housing for rent. Should be considered on the individual circumstances of each site. <p><i>Types of social housing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 3.14, would you wish to clarify that this relates to schemes that benefit from public subsidy? • In 3.15, should you assume no more than 50% sales to ensure viability? Not sure the relevant Housing Corporation target rent levels are applicable. • 3.15 seems to suggest that a distinction is being made between shared ownership housing controlled/owned by RSLs and those controlled/owned by others. • 3.16, question whether all such provision needs to be made in perpetuity. • 3.17, pleased to see 'quality', this should also apply to shared ownership properties. • Seeking a definition for 'good quality housing' in 3.17. Suggest all essential items in the Housing Corporation Scheme Development Standards. • Figure of 60% is overly restrictive in 3.17. Quite possible to meet part of identified local housing need by delivering housing at a higher percentage rate of market value. • Unclear whether Council proposes homes being sold at 60% of open market value to the owners, or whether the homes would be sold through equity share in which case rent would be payable on the unsold equity. 3.17 needs to clarify what type of housing is being referred to. <p><i>Tenure mix</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to the specification of tenure mix. Circular 6/98 and PPG3 state that the prescription of tenure should be avoided. Request that the specification of tenure is deleted. • Agree with 3.18. • If Housing Corporation Social Housing Grant is made available their preference would normally be for 1/3 rent, 1/3 shared ownership and 1/3 key 	<p>It should reflect the cost of providing the equivalent benefit on another site.</p> <p>The government expects affordable housing to be funded through the substantial increase in the value of land when it is permitted for housing. This SPG is consistent with that approach.</p> <p>This seems an unnecessary addition.</p> <p>It is only reasonable that where the Council accepts a commuted sum in lieu of affordable dwellings, it receives the amount necessary to provide the housing on another site.</p> <p>Viability of a site is always a matter that will be taken into account.</p> <p>Social housing for rent is not always provided with public subsidy (para 3.3 in revised draft).</p> <p>The reference to Housing Corporation target rent levels will help ensure the rented element of shared ownership dwellings are affordable (para 3.4 in revised draft). (3.15 has been renumbered 3.4 in the revised draft). No distinction is being made between RSLs and other providers.</p> <p>(Para 3.16 is 3.5 in the revised draft.) It is accepted that this could refer to 'the long term' rather than 'perpetuity'. (Para 3.17 is 3.6 in the revised draft.) Quality is a specific issue for low cost or intermediate market housing</p> <p>Intermediate market housing need not have to meet SDS standards. This may be an unnecessary requirement that may hinder the achievement of other objectives. New housing always has a premium that makes it more expensive than an equivalent older property. For flexibility 'about' 60% has been added to the revised SPG (para 3.6). Intermediate market housing is owned outright by the occupier of the property.</p> <p>To ensure that housing is available to all income groups in the area, it is necessary to specify that social rented housing is secured through S106 agreements. Draft PPS3 refers to tenure being specified.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The greatest need in the district is for social housing for rent. The SPG should reflect this.</p> <p>The SPG seeks 30% social rented properties on a site and developers cannot be obliged to provide a higher proportion than this.</p>

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy)
<p>worker. The 30% and 20% tenure mix does not comply with this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Great concern that tenure mix refers to at least 30% being for rent, as in effect this could easily rise to 50%. Re-word to state 30% with a ceiling of 35%. Objection to precise figures for on site provision for social housing for rent, shared ownership and other tenures. Precise mix depends on individual sites, this should be clarified. <p><i>Key Worker Housing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Precise nature of key workers and the special measures taken to ensure that they are adequately housed are housing management and nominations issues and have no relevance to planning and should not be included in the SPG. Delete 3.19. The reference to the Housing Corporation definition in 3.19 is inappropriate in this context. The appropriate level of key worker housing provision should be clearly identified in the plan, informed by local needs assessments. Key worker housing policies should recognise that provision should cater for people already living in the district and those working in the district. Special recognition needed for employees key to support local area and have to be 'on call' or able to respond quickly in emergencies. A broad definition of key workers would be welcomed by local affordable housing providers who would have greater flexibility to house them in their schemes. A cascade mechanism for nominations which linked funding for each scheme should be part of SPG. The Council could provide an expanded list of public and private sector professional compared with the Key Worker Living definition or set an appropriate income threshold. <p><i>Supported Housing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome the inclusion of reference to supported housing in 3.20. Such provision should be seen as at least equal in priority to affordable housing provision. <p><i>Size of dwellings</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The table in 3.21 could contain another column showing the supply of properties of each type becoming available for re-letting as this determines rate at which those in need can be housed. Seek greater flexibility in the approach when considering the size of units to be provided in any development. It will depend on a combination of site suitability and economic viability. Support for the recognised need for more, smaller dwellings. 3.21 should be reworded to encourage flexibility of sizes and types of affordable housing based. <p><i>Financial considerations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local plan states that households should not have to spend more than 30% of their net income on housing costs. Some households can pay more than 30% on housing costs and still have enough residual income. The last sentence of para 3.22 	<p>Paras 5.2 and 5.3 of the revised draft are not worded as precise requirements and para 5.3 states that the precise mix will be determined at the time of the planning application.</p> <p>Key workers are a nationally recognised group of people often in need of affordable housing and it is appropriate that they are mentioned in the SPG (see para 3.7 in the revised SPG which was formerly para 3.19) and taken into account in the assessment of housing need. The SPG recognises they are not a separate tenure group and they may need to access the different affordable housing tenures depending on individual circumstances. Key workers are not a separate tenure group. The allocation of affordable dwellings to particular people is not a matter for the SPG. This is a matter for the housing allocation policy, not the SPG.</p> <p>This is a matter for the housing allocation policy, not the SPG.</p> <p>Accepted. The Council agreed a definition of key workers in February 2006, this has been incorporated into para 3.7 of the revised SPG. Details nominations are not matters that should be covered by SPG.</p> <p>The definition of key workers refers to income levels.</p> <p>Noted (para 3.20 is 3.8 in the revised SPG).</p> <p>The availability of relets has been taken into account in the size of dwellings listed in para 5.4 of the revised SPG.</p> <p>The size of units is important as they must be appropriate for the needs of people in the district.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Para 5.4 of the revised SPG refers to the size and type of dwellings as a 'general guide' that will 'normally' be sought i.e. it is not prescriptive.</p> <p>Up to date government guidance does not contain a reference to the 30% figure, nevertheless it is accepted practice and should be retained as a general guide in relation to households on the lowest incomes. The SPG has been amended accordingly (para 6.1 of the revised SPG).</p> <p>There are no plans to phase out target rent levels. If they are phased out they are likely to be replaced by a similar indicator. If they are not, the SPG will be revised.</p>

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy)
<p>should therefore be deleted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 3.22, may need to consider additional wording to cover situations where Housing Corporation targets do not apply or where they have been phased out. • In 3.22, the other element of the target rent formula is the estimated average local income levels. • Does the Council have any view as to what an “affordable service charge” is or wish to provide a guide as to how it would be calculated? • In 3.23, suggested that the formula for intermediate rent setting or a clearer statement for its assessment is needed. • Council will have to support any application made by developers for public subsidy. • Unusual stance for Council to require that evidence that public subsidy has been applied for is capable of independent verification since the council will decide whether to support bids for funding. • Need to establish that is it the contribution sought from developers (not amount of affordable housing) that should remain fixed irrespective of the availability of grant. Circular 1/97 requires all developers to be treated in a fair manner. • 3.25, good to see this spelt out. • The funding of affordable housing as outlined in 3.1, 3.2, and 3.24 would benefit from more detailed explanation. The requirement for cross subsidy of the affordable housing has a substantial impact upon land values. • In 3.26, suggest replacing ‘serviced land’ with ‘fully serviced land’ and specifically state what it means. • In 3.26, worth noting that rental schemes and some shared ownership schemes may still require some element of subsidy at Housing Corporation rent formulae. • Welcome the encouragement of innovative financial mechanisms to secure such provision. It would be appropriate to assess whether such provision is required in perpetuity. • References to a financial appraisal should make clear that landowners/developers would not be expected to release commercially sensitive information to the Council. • An appraisal would cover all aspects of the site and would need to be considered comprehensively rather than affordable housing contributions in isolation. SPG should be clearer on this point. 	<p>Target rents are assessed taking local incomes into account.</p> <p>As each case will be different it is not possible to give a guide as to how this should be calculated.</p> <p>Accepted, see para 6.2 in the revised SPG.</p> <p>It is known that this is the case at the present time.</p> <p>This has been taken into account in the revised SPG in para 6.6.</p> <p>The viability assessment (if it is necessary) will help to ensure that applicants are treated in a fair manner and that the affordable housing funded by the developer is the maximum that can reasonably be achieved within the economic constraints of the site.</p> <p>Noted. This refers to the letter from the Housing Corporation and is para 6.4 of the revised SPG. This has been set out in more detail in Section 6 of the revised draft.</p> <p>Accepted. This has been changed in the revised SPG (see para 6.5 of the revised draft).</p> <p>Accepted. This has been incorporated into para 6.5 of the revised draft.</p> <p>Policy H16 of the Local plan requires that all affordable dwellings should be provided for the long term. See also paras 7.1-7.3 of the revised SPG.</p> <p>If developers say they cannot fund the affordable dwellings then they will need to demonstrate this to the Council. Any information provided will be treated as confidential. This has been covered in para 6.6 of the revised SPG.</p>
<p><i>Ensuring the future of affordable housing</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagree with the statement in 3.27 “under current Government regulations...by the tenant”. Believes those settlements listed on the Statutory Instruments are exempt from the Right to Acquire on all new-build properties. • In 3.27, note that only former tenants of the District Council have a preserved RTB. The Right to Acquire excludes homes in rural areas as well as those built specifically for the elderly. • Implication in 3.27 and 3.28 is that Council will be extremely reluctant to consider any other form of affordable housing provision other than delivery by RSLs, which is not realistic as non-RSLs can bid for SHG. • By adopting a more reasonable and flexible approach, working with a wider range of partners 	<p>The Vale is not a designated rural area where the right to buy or right to acquire has been removed. However, there are some limited exceptions to this and the words ‘in general’ have been added to para 7.1 of the revised SPG.</p> <p>Tenants have the right to acquire special accommodation for the elderly if the property has two or more bedrooms.</p> <p>Para 3.2 is now 7.2 in the revised SPG and has been revised to refer to approved development partners ie not just RSLs.</p> <p>The approach set out in the SPG is reasonable. It establishes clear targets and objectives, but recognises that in some cases, where it can be clearly demonstrated,</p>

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy)
<p>will the Council get anywhere near its targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stipulation of 10 years minimum for initial lets might not be in keeping with the Housing Corporation's expectation so may wish to check. SPG should make clear that Council will support any applications for social housing grant from a housing provider selected by the developer that can demonstrate its ability to manage and maintain affordable units in the long term. Will the Council market and keep a register for nominations to support shared ownership and the SPG in future. <p>3.29 derives an unreasonable burden which is mostly unlikely to be acceptable to our funders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest replace 'Housing Association' references to 'Registered Social Landlord'. 	<p>a different solution may be negotiated. This is justified by the level of need in the district and that the Council maintains a comprehensive housing register.</p> <p>Accepted. This has been changed – see second sentence of para 7.2 of the revised draft SPG.</p> <p>Since the initial SPG was drafted, the Council has introduced a choice based lettings scheme which has encouraged people interested in shared ownership housing to register for housing.</p> <p>It is not clear why the requirement that intermediate properties should be offered to people on the housing register or people approved by the Council is unreasonable. This will ensure the properties provided in accordance with policy H16 of the local plan are occupied by those who are in most need of it.</p> <p>Agreed. This has been changed in the revised draft.</p>
<p><i>Design issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the high design standards expected by the Council. Pepper potting will be different in each case depending on the nature of the site and requirements of the management company. Until such complex issues have been adequately researched the matter of pepper potting should be deleted from the SPG. The lifetime homes standard has no status as far as town and country planning legislation is concerned. May be appropriate to seek to negotiate with developers for a proportion of dwellings to be built to lifetime homes standards, 10% of all affordable homes is excessive and unwarranted. Welcome reference to Lifetime Homes and comment that many RSLs are requiring that most of their properties are able to meet these standards. Would be helpful to include reference to achieving BRE Ecohomes Standards of 'very good' in 3.30. Objection to the specification that all social housing must be built to meet the Housing Corporation's Scheme Development Standards. Concern that looking for all affordable housing to be built to Housing Corporation Scheme Development Standards, do not think this should be the case unless Social Housing Grant provided. Current reference to compliance with SDS only refers to 'social housing' and does not include 'shared ownership' etc. Should this be changed? 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Pepper potting is a factor that derives from policy H16 of the local plan. It was accepted by the Inspector and should not be deleted. It is acknowledged that it will be implemented differently according to the character of each site.</p> <p>This derives from policy H15 of the local plan and should be reflected in the SPG.</p> <p>This derives from policy H15 of the local plan. The words 'at least' 10% have been deleted in accordance with the Inspector's recommendations for policy H15 of the local plan (para 5.5 of the revised SPG). Noted.</p> <p>Accepted. This has been included in para 5.5 of the revised SPG.</p> <p>To be eligible for Housing Corporation grant and management by an RSL meeting these standards is an essential pre-requisite. The 10% of intermediate units to be provided may not need to be developed to SDS standards, but it depends on the type of property and proposed tenure.</p> <p>Accepted. However housing which does not benefit from Housing Corporation Social Housing Grant does not need to be built to SDS standards. Paras 5.5 and 6.9 of the revised SPG has been changed to reflect this.</p>
<p><i>Phasing of delivery</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it possible to include in 3.32 that the completed affordable housing units must be completed before more than 50% of the private housing for sale is occupied. If developer provided completed dwellings rather than the land, this method would be phased to reflect the even distribution of affordable dwellings 	<p>This would not be appropriate on large sites that will take a number of years to complete. (This matter is now covered in 7.5 of the revised SPG)</p> <p>Agreed. Para 7.5 of the revised SPG refers to this.</p>

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Summary of Representations	Observations of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy)
<p>throughout the scheme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to the requirement that where land is being transferred to an RSL the Council will normally require this to occur before the first open market dwelling is occupied, as individual site circumstances need to be taken into account. • Developer would not be in a position to sell the land directly to the Registered Social Landlord before the first open market dwelling is occupied because if they have not had the opportunity to build the foundations there would be a VAT implication, unless the section 106 clearly stated that the land was to be provided at £0. <p><i>Additional information</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Needs Survey and Housing Strategy Statement are not available at the Council's website as stated in 5.1. • May be useful to include website for Joseph Rowntree Foundation in 5.4, www.jrf.org.uk • Helpful if in section 5 developers were advised to make contact with the County Council's Developer Funding Team to discuss potential infrastructure works and contributions associated. 	<p>Para 7.5 of the revised SPG refers to the transfer being linked to the phases of development on large sites. Individual circumstances will be taken into account at the time of the planning application.</p> <p>The SPG states that fully serviced land should be transferred at nil cost (para 6.5 of the revised SPG).</p> <p>These documents are now available on the Council's website.</p> <p>Agreed. This has been included in the revised SPG at para 9.4.</p> <p>Agreed. This has been included in the revised SPG at para 9.5.</p>