

**NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**CABINET – 18 JANUARY 2011**

Title of report	<b>AFFORDABLE HOUSING DELIVERY – SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT</b>
Key Decision	<p>a) Financial (N)  b) Community (Y)</p>
Contacts	<p>Councillor Matthew Blain  07979 852069  <a href="mailto:matthew.blain@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">matthew.blain@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Director of Services  01530 454555  <a href="mailto:steve.bambrick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">steve.bambrick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p> <p>Senior Planning Officer  01530 454684  <a href="mailto:emma.bentick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk">emma.bentick@nwleicestershire.gov.uk</a></p>
Purpose of report	To consider further advice in respect of affordable housing before considering the comments received to the consultation on the updated draft SPD and to determine the Council's response
Reason for Decision:	Before adopting a Supplementary Planning Document it is necessary to consider all representations made in response to the draft document (Regulation 18(4) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 as amended by the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2009.
Strategic aims	Sustainable Communities
<p>Implications:</p> <p>Financial/Staff</p> <p>Link to relevant Corporate Action Team</p> <p>Risk Management</p> <p>Equalities Impact Assessment</p>	<p>Allowed for within existing budgets</p> <p>Housing Place Shaping</p> <p>Failure to address the issue of affordable housing will mean that the Council will not deliver on one of the Council's priorities to 'Provide decent and affordable homes'.</p> <p>Equality issues are addressed as part of the Sustainability Appraisal that has been undertaken for the SPD.</p>

Human Rights	None discernible
Transformational Government	The adoption of the SPD will create a strong policy framework which will support the delivery of more efficient services and associated decision-making process.
Comments of Head of Paid Service	The report is satisfactory
Comments of Section 151 Officer	The report is satisfactory
Comments of Monitoring Officer	The report is satisfactory
Consultees	A wide range of individuals and organisations in accordance with Council's Statement of Community Involvement including Parish Councils, a range of house builders, estate agents and their representatives. A full list of the consultees is appended to this report. In order to comply with Regulations 17 and 18, a Statement of Consultation and the SPD Matters were published alongside the consultation on the draft Retail SPD. A summary of the consultation responses to the Draft Retail SPD are attached to this report.
Background papers	Strategic Housing Market Assessment Affordable Housing Viability Study All available at <a href="http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/evidence_base">www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/evidence_base</a>  Adopted Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document Available at <a href="http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/supplementary_planning_documents">www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/supplementary_planning_documents</a>
Recommendation	<p><b>(i) THAT THE STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION, THE SPD MATTERS AND THE SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES (AS OUTLINED IN APPENDIX A) ON THE DRAFT UPDATED SPD BE NOTED;</b></p> <p><b>(ii) THAT THE UPDATED SPD BE AMENDED AS OUTLINED IN APPENDIX A;</b></p> <p><b>(iii) THAT THE SPD BE FORMALLY ADOPTED</b></p>

## 1 BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Council adopted its Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in October 2007. Since the publication of the SPD the Council has been progressing with the preparation of a Core Strategy as part of its Local Development Framework (LDF) for which additional evidence base documents have been produced. This includes a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and an Affordable Housing Viability Assessment.
- 1.2 In order to take account of this new evidence the Affordable Housing SPD is proposed to be updated.

- 1.3 A six week consultation on proposed changes to the SPD was carried out from 9<sup>th</sup> August to 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010. The consultation document was sent to all of the contacts on the Council's LDF database which includes Parish Councils, developers, estate agents, housing associations and interested individuals. The responses to the consultation are detailed in Appendix A. A copy of the draft SPD is available in the Member's Room.
- 1.4 The purpose of this report is to consider these responses in more detail and to seek member agreement to formally adopt this document.
- 1.5 Before considering the updated SPD in more detail it is appropriate to clarify what is meant by the term affordable housing. This is defined in Appendix B of PPS3 (Housing) as:
- “social rented and intermediate housing, provided to specified eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Affordable housing should:*
- meet the needs of eligible households, including availability at a cost low enough for them to afford, determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices; and*
  - include provision for the home to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or if these restrictions are lifted, for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision”.*
- 1.6 The term intermediate housing further defined in Annex B of PPS3 as including *‘Housing at prices and rents above those of social rent, but below market price or rents, and which meet the criteria set out above. These can include shared equity products (e.g. HomeBuy), other low cost homes for sale and intermediate rent.’*
- 1.7 Thus the term affordable housing does not refer to just social housing as is often mistakenly thought but is broader in definition and can include forms of low cost housing for sale, although PPS3 clarifies that this does not include low cost market housing.

## **2 NEW EVIDENCE**

- 2.1 The publication of the then Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3) in November 2006 (it should be noted that a new PPS3 was published in June 2010 however, most of the advice was unchanged) prescribed a new way in which evidence about housing markets was to be drawn together to inform the development of policies on housing and to make decisions on planning applications. PPS3 states that “Local Development Documents...should be informed by a robust, shared evidence base, in particular, of housing need and demand, through a Strategic Housing Market Assessment”.
- 2.2 Whilst the Housing Needs Assessment, which was undertaken in 2005/06 and informed the current SPD, was largely concerned with identifying the need for affordable housing, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) is more interested in the whole housing market and how it operates.
- 2.3 The Leicester and Leicestershire SHMA was published in December 2008 and covers the eight local authorities of Blaby, Charnwood, Harborough, Hinckley & Bosworth, Leicester, Melton, North West Leicestershire and Oadby & Wigston, which were designated as a Housing Market Area (HMA) by the Regional Housing and Planning Board in 2004.
- 2.4 In addition to the SHMA, Paragraph 29 of PPS3 states that in formulating policies on affordable housing Local Planning Authorities should have regard to economic viability. PPS3 states the following:

*“In Local Development Documents, Local Planning Authorities should:*

*Set out the range of circumstances in which affordable housing will be required. The national indicative minimum site size threshold is 15 dwellings. However, Local Planning Authorities can set lower minimum thresholds, where viable and practicable, including in rural areas. This could include setting different proportions of affordable housing to be sought for a series of site-size thresholds over the plan area. Local Planning Authorities will need to undertake an informed assessment of the economic viability of any thresholds and proportions of affordable housing proposed, including their likely impact upon overall levels of housing delivery and creating mixed communities". (Para 29)*

- 2.5 The Council appointed consultants, The Three Dragons & Roger Tym and Partners, to undertake an Affordable Housing Viability Study for North West Leicestershire District Council, Oadby and Wigston Borough Council, Leicester City Council, Blaby District Council and Harborough District Council. The Viability Study was completed in September 2009 and provides information and evidence to inform policies on affordable housing.
- 2.6 The Viability Study provides advice on the most ambitious yet achievable and viable target(s) and threshold(s) for affordable housing which fully reflect the availability of a range of finance towards affordable housing and reflects priority infrastructure needs, in line with PPS3.
- 2.7 The findings of the Viability Study have been subject to consultation with the development industry (including housing associations) as part of the preparation of the Council's Core Strategy, as this sector is most directly affected.
- 2.8 It should be appreciated that securing affordable housing as part of new housing developments is a matter of negotiation taking into a range of relevant factors. The SHMA and Viability Assessment provide robust evidence on which to use as a basis for targets for different parts of the district.

### **3 CONSULTATION**

- 3.1 Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004 states that in preparing an SPD a Consultation Statement should be drawn up. This Statement is required to set out the names of any persons whom the Authority consulted on in connection with the preparation of the SPD, how they were consulted and a summary of the main issues raised and how these issues were addressed in the SPD. The Consultation Statement is appended to this report and this satisfies Regulation 17 (1) (b).
- 3.2 The draft SPD was initially formally published in August 2010 for a six week consultation period from the 9<sup>th</sup> August 2010 to 20<sup>th</sup> September 2010. In order to ensure that all the various legal requirements and regulations which govern SPDs were complied with the Draft SPD was re-consulted on for a four week period from 8<sup>th</sup> November 2010 to 8<sup>th</sup> December 2010.
- 3.3 The process for producing an SPD requires that there be adequate opportunity for public consultation and for proper consideration of the feedback. The consultation process was undertaken and included:
  - Consultation with those individuals and stakeholders on the Council's database.
  - Documents made available in the Council Offices in Coalville and in the District's libraries
  - Press release issued and notices published in the Derby Telegraph and Leicester Mercury
  - Consultation advertised on the Council's website on the Planning Policy Homepage

- 3.4 A Sustainability Appraisal of the draft SPD was also undertaken, which sought to identify the likely economic, environmental and social effects of the SPD and to ensure that the SPD complies, as far as possible, with the principles of sustainable development. The Sustainability Appraisal was also consulted on for the same time period as the SPD via the methods detailed above.
- 3.5 25 responses were received as part of this consultation exercise and before formally adopting the SPD, it is necessary to consider all of these representations and to agree any changes. The responses to the draft SPD together with officer's comments are included at Appendix A of this report. This satisfies the requirements of Regulation 18 (4) (b). A copy of the draft SPD is available in the Member's Room.
- 3.6 It should be noted that in order to comply with regulation 17 (1) (b), it is also necessary to list all those who were consulted on the Draft SPD and how they were consulted. This information is detailed within Appendix A and forms part of the Statement of Consultation.
- 3.7 In summary, the SPD recommends that:
- The site threshold for seeking affordable housing is proposed to be reduced from 15 to 5 dwellings across the District with the exception of Coalville, Ashby and Castle Donington which will remain at 15 dwellings. This is a reduction in some parts of the District from the current district-wide threshold of 15 dwellings and is below the national minimum threshold.
  - The targets for seeking affordable housing as part of new housing developments is proposed to be 20% in Coalville (currently 30%) and Ibstock (currently 40%) and 30% elsewhere in the District (currently 40%).
  - A range of house types and tenures be sought as part of developments;
  - That commuted sums be accepted in lieu of on-site provision only in exceptional circumstances.
  - This SPD proposes that the design of affordable housing should meet any guidance set out in the forthcoming Design SPD once it is adopted, the Ourplace© standards and the national Code for Sustainable Homes standards. This would be applicable at the time of planning permission.
- 3.8 As noted above a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of the draft SPD was published at the same time as the draft SPD. No comments were received in respect of this. However, in view of the comments in response to the draft SPD the SA was reappraised and changes incorporated in the final SA
- 3.9 In addition, it should be noted that in the final SPD some minor changes have been made to the text for clarity.
- 3.10 Subject to Members approving the changes suggested, it is recommended that the SPD is formally adopted. Once adopted, in order to comply with Regulation 19, the Council will make available the Statement of Consultation, the SPD and the Adoption Statement.
- 3.11 In terms of the implementation of the principles in the document it is proposed that all of the key principles will come into force on the date of adoption with the exception of Key Principle AH2 – Thresholds. If Cabinet are minded to agree to the proposed revised thresholds it is proposed that Key Principle AH2 come into force six months after the date of adoption of the SPD. Any planning applications that are registered before the date that AH2 comes into force will subject to the Threshold targets in the current SPD (adopted October 2007).

## Regulation 17 and 18 Statement and Summary of Responses to the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document



### Statement of Consultation

#### **Draft Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document**

Consultation statement prepared in accordance with Regulation 17 (1) (b) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

**1. Name of Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

Affordable Housing

**2. Purpose of SPD**

The Affordable Housing SPD covers all of North West Leicestershire and updates the existing SPD as a result of new information regarding the need for affordable housing and the viability of providing affordable housing as part of new general market housing developments. The SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

**3. Persons/groups/bodies consulted in connection with preparation of SPD**

Internal consultation was undertaken with the Council's Affordable Housing Enabler.

It must be noted that the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment and its findings were consulted on in December 2009/January 2010 as part of the preparation of the Core Strategy. The responses from the consultation were reported to the Cabinet meeting of the 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2010.

**4. How were people consulted?**

Regular meetings and discussions took place with the Affordable Housing Enabler throughout preparation of the draft SPD.

In regards to the consultation on the viability assessment developers and housing associations on the Council's database were emailed a link to the document and the consultation questionnaire which set out three specific questions.

**5. Summary of the main issues raised in those consultations**

In regards to the internal consultation on the draft SPD the following issues were raised.

- How rural affordable housing is referenced
- Consistent approach to monitoring of affordable housing completions

- The management of on-site provision of small numbers of affordable dwellings versus commuted sums
- Removal of PPS3 density requirements
- Revocation of the East Midlands Regional Plan
- Inclusion of Design Standards

In relation to the consultation on the viability assessment that was undertaken as part of the Core Strategy the following responses were received.

**Question 1 – Do you consider that the methodology used is appropriate and if not why not?**

Generally no objections to the methodology used. However there is some concern regarding the baseline figures used in respect of:

- Potentially underestimated infrastructure contribution of £4,000 per dwelling. Experience suggests it will be higher, particularly when account is also taken of the need to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes and carbon neutrality targets.
- Concern as to how the costs of construction have been arrived at and the lack of transparency has meant that the figures have not been able to be audited.
- Concern that developer profit has been set at 15% as this is the same level of profit the Three Dragons used for assessments carried out during the housing boom.
- No allowance appears to have been made in the viability study for land financing costs.
- Concern regarding the inconsistency in the identification of sub-markets in the viability study and those identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.
- The viability assessment only represents a snapshot in time and viability is too complicated for a one-size-fits-all approach.

Support for the recommendation in the viability assessment that the delivery of affordable housing on large sites will need to be considered on a site by site basis.

**Question 2 – Which of the options regarding Affordable Housing targets/percentages (set out in Para 6.17) is most appropriate and why?**

There was a no clear preferred target, although it was noted that the assessment only represents a snapshot in time, any targets would need to be flexible for the whole plan period.

There was some support for the 3 way or 4 way split target as it reflects the evidence of varying viability across sub-markets within the district, albeit that it represents an oversimplification of the nature of sub-markets within the District. However, another respondent suggests that a District wide single percentage target of 30% to be the most appropriate option to pursue, it would be inappropriate for the target to be any more prescriptive.

**Question 3 – Which of the Affordable Housing threshold options (set out in Para 6.22) is most appropriate and why?**

There was only one response to this question. It was suggested that lower thresholds may result in developers submitting schemes below the threshold to avoid having to make any provision. The modelling work demonstrates that the outputs are very sensitive to variations in the assumptions used. As such, it is vital that the assumptions used in establishing policy are credible in order that realistic thresholds are set.

**6. How have those issues been addressed in the SPD?**

The comments received were taken into account when preparing the draft SPD. Formal consultation on the Draft Affordable Housing SPD will then follow.



**Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document  
Retail Supplementary Planning Document  
Consultation Drafts**

**Statement of SPD Matters**

Notice of the publication of two draft Supplementary Planning Documents and their accompanying Sustainability Appraisals for public consultation in accordance with Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

The Council has issued a Retail Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

The Retail SPD covers the centres of Ashby, Castle Donington, Ibstock, Measham and Kegworth and provides guidance on how the Council will determine planning applications for change of use applications for shops and other service uses in these centres.

The Affordable Housing SPD covers all of North West Leicestershire and updates the existing SPD as a result of new information regarding the need for affordable housing and the viability of providing affordable housing as part of new general market housing developments.

The draft SPDs, along with their accompanying Sustainability Appraisal Reports and Consultation Statements, will be the subject of a four-week consultation from Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> November 2010 to Wednesday 8<sup>th</sup> December 2010.

These documents will be available for inspection during normal opening times at the main reception at the Council Offices, Coalville between 8:45am and 5pm Monday to Friday.

A copy will be available in the District's public Libraries at their normal opening times.

The documents will also be available on the Council's website:

[http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/planning\\_policy](http://www.nwleics.gov.uk/pages/planning_policy)

Representations on the draft SPDs should be sent by post to:

Planning Policy  
North West Leicestershire District Council  
Council Offices  
Whitwick Road  
Coalville  
LE67 3FJ

Or by email to: [planning.policy@nwleicestershire.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@nwleicestershire.gov.uk)

All comments will be public information. Please note that representations should be received no later than 5pm on the 8<sup>th</sup> December 2010. If you wish to be notified of the adoption of these SPDs then please state the address at which you wish to be notified.

If you have previously commented on the SPDs your comments will still be valid and there is no need to send them again. However, if you wish to add to any previous comments please send them to the Council via the methods detailed above.

## Statement of Consultation

### List of consultees advised by email

Age Concern England	Mr Robinson	Woodhouse Parish Council (A Irving)	Firstplan (Kate Matthews)
Ancient Monuments Society	Ms Andrews	Alliance Planning (Julian Wooderson)	Fisher German (Kay Davies)
Ashby de la Zouch Endowed Schools Foundation (Alan Turland)	Nigel Hughes	Andrew and Ashwell (Melissa Ward)	Fox Bennett (Thomas Mayes)
Ashby Town Centre Partnership (Emily Todd)	Norton Robinson	Andrew Granger & Company (Rupert Harrison)	GL Hearn (Jessica Sparkes)
British Waterways (Helen Edwards)	Paul Andrew	Andrew Granger and Co Ltd Chrt'd Survys (Andrew Granger)	GL Hearn (Lee-Ann Wickes)
British Wind Energy Association (Gemma Grimes)	Paul Pugsley	Andrew Martin Associates (Caroline Chave)	Gough Planning Services (R A Gough)
Campaign for Real Ale Limited (Mike Banner)	Philip Preece	Arlington Development Services, Arlington Securities Plc (Richard Cutler)	Greendale Court (Sue Walker)
Castle Donington and District Volunteer Bureau	Richard Holt	Armstrong Burton Planning	GVA Grimley (Craig Alsbury)
Central Networks (E-on) (Roger Bedford)	Rick Hockney	Atisreal (Katy Walker)	Hallam Land Management (Paul Burton)
Council for British Archaeology	Roland Browning	Johnathan Harbottle (Chartered Surveyor & Chartered Town Planner)	Hallam Land Management (Richard Walters)
Country Land and Business Association (Helen Woolley)	Ruth Cox	Boyer Planning	Harlow Bros Ltd (Robert Harlow)
CPRE (Derbyshire) (Chris Barker)	Sue Colledge	Bryan Wolsey Planning Ltd (Bryan Wolsey)	Harris Lamb Chartered Surveyors (James Hollyman)
CPRE (Leicestershire) (Joyce Noon)	Tom Redfearn	Cadeby Homes Ltd	Hayward Exclusive Homes Ltd
Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	Trevor Armston	Castle Donington Community Appraisal Group (Peggy Beddoe)	Heaton Planning (Jenna Pollack)
English Heritage (Ann Plackett)	Wallis Hart	Cerda Planning (Victoria Lane)	Henry Boot Developments Ltd
Freight on Rail (Philippa Edmunds)	Broxtowe Borough Council	CgMs (Chris Hicks)	Hepher Dixon (Peter Dixon)
The Coal Authority	Derbyshire County Council (Brian Smart)	CgMs (Setareh Neshati)	Holmes Antill (John Holmes)
Greenpeace UK	Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group (Roger Yarwood)	CT Planning (P Kreuser)	Howkins and Harrison LLP (James Collier)
Guide Association UK	Derwent Living (Paul Casey)	Stewart Ross Associates	Iceni Projects (Alison Coster)
Leicestershire Constabulary (Wayne Worsdale)	East Midlands Development Agency (Julie Tanner)	Chris Thomas Ltd - Outdoor Advertising Consultants (Chris Thomas)	Iceni Projects (James Waterhouse)
Leicestershire Wildlife Trust (Michael Jeeves)	East Midlands Development Agency (Steve Harley)	Colliers CRE (Adam Pyrke)	ID Planning (Alistair Flatman)
National Farmers Union (East Midlands Region) (Paul Tame)	East Midlands Regional Assembly (Mandeep Dhadwal)	David Lock Associates (Stefanie Goedecke)	Indigo Planning Limited (Alastair Willis)
Natural England East Midlands Region (Rachel Hoskin)	Eastern Shires Housing Association Ltd (Anthony Riley)	De Montfort Property Co Limited (Graham Everitt)	The Home Builders Federation (Tim Watton)
The Garden History Society	The Planning Inspectorate (Tanya Clinton)	Savills (L &P) Ltd (Jonathan Morgan-Smith)	John Church - Planning Consultancy Limited (John Church)
The Georgian Group	Environment Agency (Geoff Platts)	Savills (Nick Grace)	Maximus (Jon Hickton)

RSPB (Colin Wilkinson)	Erewash Borough Council	Scott Wilson Ltd (Simon Betts)	Jones Day (D Pacilly)
Rural Community Council (Leicestershire and Rutland) (Diana Cook)	Highways Agency (Geoffrey Wise)	Sigma Planning Services (Christopher Hough)	JS Bloor Homes Ltd (Measham) (Nick Wilkins)
Rural Community Council (Leicestershire and Rutland) (John Moores)	Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council (Sally Ann Smith)	Signet Planning (Paul Stone)	JS Bloor Ltd (Measham) (David Joseph)
The National Forest Company (Simon Evans)	Nottingham City Council (Karen Shaw)	Signet Planning (Robert Gilmore)	King Sturge (Elle Cass)
The National Trust East Midlands Regional Office (Alan Hubbard)	Nottingham City Council (Paul Tansey)	Smith Stuart Reynolds (Jane Gardner)	Lambert Smith Hampton (Claire Norris)
Sport England (East Midlands Region) (John Berry)	Nottinghamshire County Council (Suzanne Moody)	Smith Stuart Reynolds (Simon J Smith)	Landmark Planning (Jonathan Weekes)
St David's Vicarage (John Stevenson)	NWLDC (David Boyson)	Stansgate Planning Consultants (Miranda Rogers)	Marron's Solicitors (Morag Thomson)
Stephenson College (Jane Foster)	Rushcliffe Borough Council (Phil Marshall)	Strutt & Parker (Richard Foxon)	The Loughborough Gospel Hall Trust (Roland Wilson)
The Scout Association	South Derbyshire District Council (Ian Bowen)	Tapton Estates (Richard Needham)	McDyre and Co (B C McDyre)
The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings	South Derbyshire District Council (Kevin Exley)	The Tyler-Parkes Partnership (Helen Winkler)	Mono Consultants Limited (Carolyn Wilson)
The Theatres Trust (Rose Freeman)	Appleby Magna Parish Council (Karen Stirk)	Development Land and Planning Consultants Ltd (Matthew Hard)	Morgoed Estates Limited (Jonathan Roberts)
UK Coal Ltd (C Ball)	Ashby de la Zouch Town (Parish) Council (Colin Gay)	Dialogue Communicating Planning (Sebastian Hanley)	Nelson Bakewell (Simon Benison)
UK Rainwater Harvesting Association (Roger Budgeon)	Ashby Woulds Town Council (Andrea Robinson)	DPDS Consulting Group (Alf Plumb)	NorthCountry Homes Group Limited (Paul Stock)
Adele Snook	Austrey Parish Council (Anita M Allsopp)	Leith Planning (Shan Dassanaikie)	Paul and Company (Wendy Sockett)
Alan Main	Bagworth and Thornton Parish Council (A Hurdley)	DPDS Consulting Group (Diane Bowyer)	Peacock and Smith (Malcolm Walker)
"Bev"	Belton Parish Council (Angela Severn-Morrell)	Drivers Jonas Deloitte (Fiona Brereton)	Peatfield Associates (Stephen Peatfield)
Brian Dincombe	Breedon on the Hill Parish Council (Gill Simkiss)	DTZ Piedad Consulting (Mark Jackson)	Pegasus Planning Group (Andy Kitchen)
C T & E M Stevenson	Castle Donington Parish Council (Fiona Palmer)	E J Gray Associates (Edward Gray)	Pegasus Planning Group (Gary Lees)
Chris Bentley	Clifton Campville with Thorpe Constantine Parish Council (Helen Elliott)	Fairgrove Homes (Dan Stack)	Pegasus Planning Group (Haydn Jones)
Chris Tandy	Coleorton Parish Council / Worthington Parish Council (S Cowin)	FallowBond Limited (John Bredaws)	St. Modwen (Mike Timmins)
Douglas Hart	Ellistown and Battleflat Parish Council (Sara Cowin)	Persimmon Homes (North Midlands) (Gareth Hankin)	Peter Diffey and Associates (Peter Diffey)
Ellen Senior	Hartshorne Parish Council (R Smith)	Persimmon plc (Kate Tait)	Peter Storrie Consultants (Peter Storrie)

Fiona Thorn	Hathern Parish Council (Mrs M A Spencer)	Tom Redfern Consultancy (Tom Redern)	RPS - Planning Transport and Environment Ltd (General)
Glenn Freeman	Heather Parish Council (Jan Shepherd)	Trent Barton (Jeff Counsell)	Savills (Michael Burrow)
Ian Meller	Hemington and Lockington Parish Council (G Cameron)	Trent Barton (Keith Shayshutt)	
Jenny Toal	Ibstock Parish Council (Alan Young)	Turley Associates Limited (Ben Frodsham)	
Jim Abbott	Kegworth Parish Council (Lesley Pendleton)	Turley Associates Limited (Matthew Sheppard)	
Jonathan Blaza	Kingston on Soar Parish Council (Richard Parrey)	United Biscuits (Mike Ball)	
Margaret Montandon	Long Whatton & Diseworth Parish Council (Douglas Maas)	Walton & Co (Vicki Richardson)	
Michael Daly	Measham Parish Council (Dawn Roach)	Ward Design (Collette Beattie)	
Michael Specht and Rita Webster	Normanton le Heath Village Meeting (Alan Cooper)	White Young Green (Chris Palmer)	
Michele Ward	Oakthorpe, Donisthorpe, Acresford Parish Council (Lindsay Swinfield)	Williamson Design and Implementation Ltd (P R Williamson)	
Mr & Mrs A Baker	Overseal Parish Council (J E White)	Wincanton (Simon Ramsell)	
Mr & Mrs Roland Campbell	Packington Parish Council (Rosie McConachie)	Bagshaws (Malcolm Gale)	
Mr Alan Cooper	Ravenstone with Snibston Parish Council (Helen Daniels)	Barton Willmore (Stuart Field)	

## **Statement of Consultation**

### **List of consultees advised by letter**

Mrs D Fransman and Mr K Clifford	Ms Catherine Jamieson	Church Commissioners for England	Leicestershire Learning and Skills Council
Ms Heather McAtter	Mr TH Heath	Civil Aviation Authority	Forestry Commission
The Freight Transport Association Ltd	Mr Robert Hepwood Miller Homes Limited - East Midlands Region	Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment	Mrs M Patrick
Mr W G Perkins	Webbir New Homes Ltd	Commission for Racial Equality	Mr C Kong
The Woodland Trust	Barrett (East Midlands)	The Crown Estate Office	Mrs Janet Hodson JVH Town Planning Consultants Ltd
Mr Mike Harris Balfours	Mr John Coleman William Davis Ltd	Disability Rights Commission	Mr Trevor John Wells
Gino Siani DBK Back Forward Thinking	Mr Rob Foers Leicester City Council	CMB Support	Mrs Brenda Shape
Mr Neil Adie De Montfort Housing Society Ltd	East Midlands Tourist Board	The Gypsy Council	Mrs D K Murby
Fch Housing and Care,	Mr Simon Evans Clarke Homes Limited	Help the Aged	Miss Joanna Bridges Stanton under Bardon Parish Council
Leicester Housing Association	Wimpey Homes Midlands East	National Playing Fields Association,	Mr E J Hatshorn Nailstone Parish Council

Mr Andrew Wall Housing 21	Jelson Ltd	The Rail Freight Group	Mrs Cullen Shackerstone Parish Council
Audrey Chaplin Wallbrook Housing Association	Crest Nicholson (Midlands) Ltd	EWS	Mr T Graham, Twycross Parish Council
The Manager J A Ball New Homes	Mr Chan Kataria East Midlands Housing Association	Arriva Buses Midlands	Thrumpton Parish Council
Walton Homes Ltd	Peveiril Homes	Cresswell Coaches	Ratcliffe on Soar Parish Council
Ms Kate Benford FBP	Redrow Homes Midlands Ltd	Kinch Buses,	Mr Richard Parrey, Kingston on Soar Parish Council
Mr and Mrs Parker	Mr Brian Pallett Donington Park Leisure Ltd	Macpherson Coaches	Sutton Bonington Parish Council
Mr Michael Bennion	Mr Tony Rivero Network Rail Property	Paul James Coaches,	Mrs A Mitchell, Shardlow and Great Wilne Parish Council
Mr John Tilly H.M. Railway Inspectorate	Mr Jon Hockley East Midlands International Airport	Paul S Winson Coaches	Mrs M Tomlison, Aston on Trent Parish Council
Ms D A Love	Mr J Feeney	Mr Martin Gage	Mrs C Scott, Weston on Trent Parish Council
Katherine M Cohoon	Mr Tim Wagstaff	Mrs Elizabeth Vos	Mr F N Hill, Melbourne Parish Council
Whitwick Historial Group	Mr Mike Allen	Mr Peter Foster	Mrs V Cove, Calke Parish Meeting
Mr Harper	Helen Woolley Country Land and Business Association	Mr Martin Carroll	Mrs M South Smisby Parish Council
Leicestershire & Leicester City Learning Parntership	Mr Mike Kaye Derby City Council	Mr Brian Trueman	Mrs C Litherland Woodville Parish Council
Mr Nick Baseley Ian Baseley Associates	Stephen Kitchen and Co	Mr Adrian Read	Mr R Smith, Castle Gresley Parish Council
Karen Tate Brian Barber Associates	Mr Darren Cutler Harris Lamb Planning Consultants	Ms Jane Evans	Mrs C Busnston Ticknall Parish Council
Mr Peter Bailey	Felicity Wye Malcolm Judd and Partners	Mr Dolan Mobile Operators Association (MOA)	Mrs J Nicklin Netherseal Parish Council
Mrs Claire Phillipson	David Wilson Homes	British Energy	Mrs Joanne Bridgen Newton Regis Parish Council
Mr F Davenport	Mr Richard Dunnett Stoneleigh Planning	ScottishPower,	Mrs S Cheshire Breaston Parish Council
Mr Peter Thorpe	Mr Marcus Sharpe TRANSCO	World Wide Fund for Nature	K H Johnson Sawley Parish Council
Mr Peter Lambert	Mr Allan J Walker, Hugglescote and Donington le Heath Forum	Countryside Agency	P R Williamson Williamson Design and Implementation Ltd
Mr Richard Aldridge	Mr Tony Lovett Staffordshire County Council	Npower Centre	Mr Tim Barrett Redbank Manufacturing Company Ltd
Mr Tom Mayes Fox Bennett	Mr Mark Williets Advantage West Midlands	Mr Andrew Wharton Severn Trent Water Ltd	Mrs Elaine Ward
Ms Kate Benford Marrons	Mr Alistair Blane Leicestershire County and Rutland PCT	Mr Andy Williams Countrywide Homes Ltd	Mrs Pamela Bradshaw
Mrs B Harrison	Mr Patrick Davis SUSTRANS	Mr Ben Hooton DTZ Pieda Consulting	Mr David Reed
Leona Mellis Knight Frank	Hallam Land Management	Mr Gerry Keay South West Industrial Properties	Councillor S D Sheahan Health Forum

Mr Alan Barker	Morag Thomson Marron's Solicitors	Mr Philp Thompson The Planning Bureau Limited	Mr Robert Orr
Mr J Ball	Mr Peter Storey	Mr Peter Hill	Ashby de la Zouch Library
Linda Leonard	Shoosmiths Solicitors	Mr Neil Lucas Drivers Jonas	Castle Donington Library
Miss C E Draycott	James Bailey Planning	Mr and Mrs J Barnett	Ibstock Library
Mr Radfarn	Lichfield District Council	Mr Mike Ballantyne The Heart of the National Forest Foundation	Kegworth Library
Mr Mark Fisher The Lawn Tennis Association	East Staffordshire Borough Council	Ms Gwyneth Tseng	Measham Library
Mr Gavin Pratt	Mr J Toon	Mr John Bayliss J and W Investment Ltd	David Price
Mr S M Poultney S M Poultney & Son	North Warwickshire Borough Council	Thringstone Community Centre,	Dr Andrew Simmonds, Leicestershire County Council
Mr Nick Bromhead	Mr D S R Watson Rae Watson, Development Surveyors	The Victorian Society	Mr James McKay Kegworth and District Gardening Club
Mrs Josie Jackson	Mr John Colburn Planning and Urban Design	The Twentieth Century Society	J M Boardman
Mr Christopher Worman	Lichfield Planning	Mr Graham Walley History and Natural Environment Team,	Mr Stephen Birkinshaw Government Office for the East Midlands, Planning and Transport Team
Lee-Ann Wickes GL Hearn	Mr Terry O'Brien Brian Barber	Mr Mandeep Dhadwal East Midlands Regional Assembly	Mr Martin Prosser
Health and Safety Executive	Antony Aspbury Associates Ltd	Ms Christine Hooker CPRE Derbyshire Branch	Mrs Veronica Robinson
Mr Paul Southby, CBI East Midlands	Howkins and Harrison	Mr Harris, Richard Raper Planning	
Friends of the Earth, East Midlands Region	Age Concern Leicestershire & Rutland	Mr Dennis Singer Swift Valley Partnership	
Mrs Lynn Simms	Mr Max Bowden	The Youth Council	

## Summary of Responses

Representation ID	Name of respondent /organisation	Summary of response	Suggested Council response	Recommendation
01	The Environment Agency	No comments to make on the SPD.	No response required	No change to SPD
02	Civil Aviation Authority	The CAA makes a number of comments about safeguarding aerodromes but no objections to the SPD.	Comments are noted but they are not relevant to the SPD.	No change to SPD
03	The Coal Authority	No specific comments on the document at this stage.	No response required	No change to SPD
04	English Heritage	No comments to make on the draft SPD.	No response required	No change to SPD
05	Highways Agency	The issues covered in the consultation document are not expected to have a material impact on the Strategic Road Network, and as such the Highways Agency has no specific comments to make.	No response required	No change to SPD
06	Ashby Civic Society	Notes that the proposed SPD contents were put before the Cabinet meeting of 2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2010. The Cabinet approved the proposals with modifications to the percentage of affordable housing for Ashby. Query the validity of the consultation in view of Cabinet decision.	Cabinet considered the issue of affordable housing in the context of the Core Strategy not the SPD. In view of what Cabinet had resolved it made sense to retain the targets previously agreed but to subject these to	No change to SPD

		<p>Additional comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Despite the Regional Plan being abandoned recommendations on housing targets are based on sound data which should still be considered.</li> <li>• The SPD recommendations ignore the reports defining the housing needs and pander to developers gripes about viability</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed SPD supports a policy of Gentrification of Coalville and the de-gentrification of Ashby. This is a political aspiration and does not reflect the housing needs of the District.</li> <li>• The proposed SPD will deliver affordable housing levels far below those required and in the wrong place.</li> </ul>	<p>wider consultation as part of the draft SPD.</p> <p>The evidence used to inform the SPD is based on a balance of local evidence from the SHMA and Viability Assessment in accordance with PPS3. This evidence is both more specific to NWL and more up to date. The need to ensure viability is recognised in PPS3 and also in decisions of the High Court.</p> <p>The SPD seeks to ensure provision of affordable housing where it is needed having regard to viability.</p> <p>The affordable housing targets are intended to maximise the delivery of affordable housing, above levels of the current SPD. It is acknowledged that</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
--	--	---	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider that the proposed SPD will be found unsound at the SOS enquiry of the LDF.</li> </ul> <p>Also submitted were previous comments made relating to the Core Strategy (dated 30<sup>th</sup> January 2010).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Makes a number of comments regarding the existing SPD based on work previously undertaken known as the Fordham Report, the Housing Needs Assessment, and outlines a number of its key findings.</li> <li>Note that the Regional Plan demands that a minimum of 3,264 affordable houses are supplied over the planned period. This approximates to 32% of the total build.</li> <li>Note that the Viability Report recommends that the affordable housing build target be reduced to 2,410 houses or 23% and that the split around the District is based on viability and not need.</li> <li>Set out a comparison of the various reports and recommendations , including the fact that:</li> <li>Only the Ashby proposal meets the Regional Plan target.</li> </ul>	<p>overall the affordable housing targets will not be achieved. However, the draft SPD seeks to strike a balance between viability and need.</p> <p>Note that SPDs do not go before the Secretary of State.</p> <p>Comments are noted. The information in the Fordham Report and the Regional Plan targets have now largely been superseded by the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coalville and Castle Donington needs are less than 50% met</li> <li>• Other settlements target supplies only 12% of the recognised need. This confirms the previous comments that the overall housing target for other settlements is too low.</li> <li>• There is no evidence presented that suggests that the shortfall of affordable housing can be met by Housing Associations.</li> </ul> <p>As a result concludes that the proposal recommended by the officers does not achieve the needs of the District or meet recommendations in the Regional Plan.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that not all of the need for affordable housing will be met. This is recognised in various pieces of Government guidance.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>
07	William Davis	<p>A number of objections are raised, these are as follows:</p> <p><u>AH4 Tenure (paragraph 7.5.5)</u>  The preferred tenure split of 79% social rented and 21% intermediate affordable housing reflects needs identified in the SHMA, the viability assessment only tested a split of 75% social rented and 25% intermediate. The evidence base therefore only supports this lower percentage of social rented and the SPD should be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>The figures tested in the viability assessment were intended to provide information for the Council to use in planning for the longer term. Whilst it is true that the viability study tested at 75% social rent, this does not automatically imply that a higher figure is not viable. If evidence is available as part of an application which</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>

		<p><u>AH5 Intermediate Housing</u> Notes that the Three Dragons viability assessment only assessed new build HomeBuy with a shared purchase proportion of 40%. Therefore, the evidence base only supports this higher entry level and the SPD should be amended accordingly. The viability assessment did not specifically consider discounted sale housing, however, the degree of subsidy required to make units available at 50% of market value is significantly higher than for HomeBuy and this has not been tested by the viability assessment. Given recent falls in market value it is considered a figure of 70% of market value is now more reasonable and affordable.</p> <p><u>AH8 Off Site Provision (paragraph 7.7.7)</u> The list of components to be considered in any financial appraisal set out at paragraph 7.7.7 refers to “site purchase price (including date of purchase”. This, however, is totally irrelevant. What should be considered is the market value of the land. Land owners will only make their land available for development if they obtain a return commensurate with its development value minus construction and other cost components.</p>	<p>suggest that 79% is not viable this can be taken into account in accordance with the advice in PPS3. However, this does not need to be stipulated in the SPD as it merely repeats national policy</p> <p>Noted, but as outlined above if evidence is available which suggests that viability is compromised by this requirement this will be taken into account as part of negotiations.</p> <p>It is accepted that it would be appropriate to refer to ‘market value’ rather than purchase price.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>That paragraph 7.7.7 be amended by the deletion of “Site purchase price (including date of purchase)” and the insertion of “the market value of the site with development on it”.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

08	Leicester City Council - Rob Foers	No specific comments to make on the SPD at this stage.	No response required	
09	Kegworth Parish Council	<p>Kegworth Parish Council have a number of observations including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raise concerns regarding car parking and request that enough car parking spaces are provided as part of any type of housing development.</li> <li>• Affordable housing should be of variable sizes. Two bedroom bungalows are also essential to give the elderly or disabled the possibility of renting or part purchasing an affordable property.</li> <li>• The ability to use money from one housing development to provide affordable housing on an alternative site should be welcomed.</li> <li>• It is detrimental to the local community if a builder is not required to provide some contribution towards local amenities that the occupiers of those properties will be able to use and such costs will then have to be borne by the Parish Council and local Council Tax payers.</li> </ul>	<p>Acknowledge that car parking is a contentious issue however it is not the concern of the SPD.</p> <p>Agree that a mix of property types should be provided as identified in the SHMA. This is reflected in Key Principle AH6.</p> <p>Noted. However, it is intended that this will only occur in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Noted but this SPD does not deal with other S106 requirements other than the amount and type of affordable housing. Other S106 issues will be the subject of the LDF or another SPD.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider that if there were smaller, well planned developments in villages it would encourage older residents to downsize, therefore making more larger properties available for families. If a greater number of larger houses were available, this would lower the prices, and would have a knock on effect of lowering the prices of the smaller houses making them more affordable and there would be less need to build vast numbers of “affordable houses”.</li> <li>• There are many properties that have stood empty for a number of years and Housing Associations and Local Authorities should be encouraged to speed up the taking over of these properties to provide accommodation to people on the housing waiting lists.</li> <li>• Rural areas should be the exception to the rule of building as many small houses on a site as possible. The general layout of a village should be taken into consideration and the percentage of affordable houses lowered accordingly, so that the new development sits comfortably within its surroundings.</li> <li>• Due to the effects of noise and pollution from East Midlands Airport, Kegworth Parish Council considers that Kegworth is a restrained village. Housing</li> </ul>	<p>It is acknowledged that older person's housing is required, as identified on the SHMA due to demographic changes. It is important to strike a balance between new housing types as per PPS3.</p> <p>Alongside the provision of new affordable housing the Council recognises that empty housing stock needs to be brought back into use. The Council has an Empty Properties Strategy designed to achieve this.</p> <p>The Council recognises the importance of design and is in the process of preparing an SPD on design.</p> <p>Noted, but this matter is not considered as part of this SPD.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
--	--	--	---	---

		developments should only be allowed within the development line of the village, except for the provision of an Affordable Housing Rural Exception Site.		
10	The Theatres Trust	The Theatres Trust is the National Advisory Public Body for Theatres. No comment to make on the SPD.	No response required	No change to SPD
11	East Midlands Housing Association	<p>The main comments are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note a lack of clarity in relation to regional planning.</li> <li>2. Concerns that the SPD does not give more attention to rural affordable housing, although note that some of the aspects covered in this draft will no doubt relate to rural housing e.g. quality, design etc.</li> </ol> <p>3. Page 12 – On-site provision of small numbers of affordable homes is supported by EMHA. Where</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.13 does state that the document is not specifically concerned with rural affordable housing. However, it would be helpful to clarify that the Council will continue to help bring forward appropriate developments in rural areas.</p> <p>In terms of design it would be useful to clarify that design/quality standards also need to be met on exceptions sites.</p> <p>Noted. It would be appropriate to make it</p>	<p>Following text added to end of Para 5.13 “The Council will continue to work closely with the East Midlands Rural Housing Enabler (or successor) to ensure rural sites are bought forward for affordable housing development”.</p> <p>“(Including exceptions sites)” added to second line of Key Principle AH9 between ‘housing’ and ‘to’.</p> <p>Text added after Para 7.7.4 “Developers and</p>

		<p>affordable apartments are provided it is easier from a management and maintenance perspective if these are in distinct blocks.</p> <p>4. Page 14 – Note that units provided without grant can be considered as affordable. Many of the offers that EMHA provide are predicated on a 'nil grant' basis. This can also mean that the developer does not have to achieve the minimum HCA standards of HQI, Building for Life or Code for Sustainable Homes</p>	<p>clear that developers and agents need to be made aware of this before they submit schemes.</p> <p>Note the comment that design standards do not have to be achieved if grant is not provided.</p>	<p>agents need to be aware that, as detailed in the viability assessment, housing associations are willing to accept on-site provision of affordable housing on small sites. There may be particular schemes where on-site provision is not the preferred option, these are detailed below.”</p> <p>Additional text added after Para 7.8.2 which states that “In regards to rural affordable housing that is provided in the form of apartments it is considered that these should be provided in distinct blocks to assist with the management and maintenance of these properties.”</p> <p>“(regardless of grant funding)” is added to the third sentence of Para 7.8.1 between 'housing' and 'should'.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>unless specified in the planning requirements.</p> <p>5. 7.6.5 – Would suggest a rounding up of the percentage figures in Table 2</p> <p>6. AH6 – Suggest minimum HCA standards; Building for Life, CSH, HQI's etc.</p> <p>7. 7.7.4 – Assume that transfer of free serviced land is where the developer does not want to build out the affordable housing units. The recipient association may still then need access to HCA or other form of public subsidy to deliver the affordable housing requirement on the land.</p> <p>8. The calculation of a commuted sum – would be useful to see an example.</p> <p>9. 7.7.12 – Using three RSL offers; each one will put a different level of internal subsidy to the scheme which will make a difference to the offers. What is important is to have some clear base lines e.g. types/tenure/size and quality standards for all properties. The delivery timeframe and procurement routes so that all offers are on a similar basis.</p>	<p>Figures in the table can be rounded up</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The example as set out in the current SPD at Para 7.7.13 could be retained in the updated SPD</p> <p>Paragraph 7.7.12 does make it clear that the number of properties is to be agreed beforehand. Acknowledge that different housing associations have different levels of subsidy available, but this is a matter for individual</p>	<p>Figures in Table 2, column titled 'percentage of housing need' to be rounded up or down as necessary and to be updated regularly</p> <p>No change to SPD</p> <p>The example set out in 7.7.13 can be retained in the updated SPD (strikethrough removed).</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
--	--	---	--	--

			RSLs	
12	Stefanie Goedecke, David Lock Associates on behalf of Tapton Estates	<p>On behalf of Tapton Estates</p> <p>Welcome the reduced affordability targets set out in Key Principle AH3 to reflect the current market situation. Note that some sites across the District might be even less viable in the current market. In particular, it is suggested that it would be inappropriate to seek 30% in Woodville as house prices in Swadlincote are 8.5% lower than in Coalville.</p> <p>Recognise the impossibility of framing an affordable housing policy which reflects site specific variations in viability. Also recognised is that viability varies over time. They suggest amending Key Principle AH3 to reflect the need to take account of viability as required in PPS3.</p>	<p>The SHMA was undertaken for the Leicester and Leicestershire Housing Market Area and as Swadlincote falls outside of the District and the Housing Market Area boundaries it is therefore not an appropriate comparison. Suggest that any assessment should be based on house prices in Woodville, not Swadlincote.</p> <p>National Policy in PPS3 requires the Council to take account of viability, therefore it does not need to be repeated in this SPD.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
13	David Bainbridge, Bidwells on behalf of Davidsons	<p>The SHMA was published in December 2008 and is nearly 2 years since its publication and over 2 years since the collation of the data. The credit crunch surfaced last quarter of 2007 with the UK entering into recession by the end of</p>	<p>Advice in SHMAs Practice Guidance (Version 2, August 2007) states that SHMAs do</p>	<p>Please note that the needs data contained in Table 1 are intended to be updated annually,</p>

	<p>Group</p>	<p>2008. Positive national growth only returned in the first quarter of 2010. The impact on the housing land market and housing sales market has been unprecedented and whilst both markets have shown signs of recovery predictions vary as to the future direction.</p> <p>Guidance on monitoring and updating of SHMAs states that housing market partnerships should not need to undertake comprehensive assessment exercises more frequently than every 5 years although they should be updated regularly. The question as to whether or not the SHMA of December 2008 remains credible and robust is a relevant consideration.</p> <p>It is requested that the status of the SPD is explained in more detail especially from the perspective of determining planning applications and also what will happen to the SPD when the Core Strategy is progressed through to examination and adoption?</p> <p>Notes that reference to the East Midlands Regional Plan has been removed due to its revocation by the Secretary of State on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2010. However, the SPD does not make reference to the evidence base underpinning the Regional Plan which remains material in considering housing requirements in the period to 2026 at least therefore it would appear appropriate for this to be made clear in the SPD.</p>	<p>not need to be updated more frequently than every 5 years. Notwithstanding this the HMA partnership is currently working on establishing a common methodology by which to update the SHMA .It is considered that the data is adequate for the purposes of this SPD.</p> <p>The status of the document is set out in Para 3.1 but clarification about what will happen to the SPD when the core Strategy is adopted would be appropriate.</p> <p>The SPD is based on local evidence and is not concerned with general housing requirements.</p>	<p>therefore the data is subject to change.</p> <p>Additional text added to the end of Para 3.1 “in relation to the Core Strategy, once it has been adopted, the need for the SPD will be reviewed”</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
--	--------------	--	---	---

		<p>The 'equivalence principle' in respect of the option for a commuted sum towards affordable housing provision as opposed to on-site provision is challenged. Notes the important aspect is deliverability of provision of the affordable housing element to comply with adopted planning policy and if viability of development is undermined through on-site provision then this must be a planning consideration.</p> <p>Support is expressed for Key Principle AH3 – Targets. In particular the Council's intention to seek to secure, through negotiation, a minimum of 20% target for Ibstock is supported.</p> <p>In respect of the Key Principles, for thresholds, percentage and targets for tenure split, it should be made explicit that the issue of development viability will be taken into consideration in negotiations with applicants. It is considered this statement does not set new policy and hence is permissible in an SPD.</p>	<p>The SPD sets out the Council's preferred approach, it doesn't rule out off-site provision however evidence would need to be provided where viability is an issue.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Viability is set out in PPS3 and the Council needs to be in accordance with this. Therefore, it is not appropriate for the SPD to further detail this.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
14	David Bainbridge, Bidwells on behalf of Davidsons Group and Persimmon Homes (North Midlands)	<p>The SHMA was published in December 2008 and is nearly 2 years since its publication and over 2 years since the collation of the data. The credit crunch surfaced last quarter of 2007 with the UK entering into recession by the end of 2008. Positive national growth only returned in the first quarter of 2010. The impact on the housing land market and housing sales market has been unprecedented and whilst both markets have shown signs of recovery predictions vary as to the future direction.</p> <p>Guidance on monitoring and updating of SHMAs states that</p>	<p>Advice in SHMAs Practice Guidance (Version 2, August 2007) states that SHMA does not need to be updated more frequently than every 5 years. Notwithstanding this the HMA partnership is currently working on establishing a common</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>

		<p>housing market partnerships should not need to undertake comprehensive assessment exercises more frequently than every 5 years although they should be updated regularly. The question as to whether or not the SHMA of December 2008 remains credible and robust is a relevant consideration.</p> <p>It is requested that the status of the SPD is explained in more detail especially from the perspective of determining planning applications and also what will happen to the SPD when the Core Strategy is progressed through to examination and adoption?</p> <p>Notes that reference to the East Midlands Regional Plan has been removed due to its revocation by the Secretary of State on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2010. However, the SPD does not make reference to the evidence base underpinning the Regional Plan which remains material in considering housing requirements in the period to 2026 at least therefore it would appear appropriate for this to be made clear in the SPD.</p> <p>The 'equivalence principle' in respect of the option for a commuted sum towards affordable housing provision as opposed to on-site provision is challenged. Notes the important aspect is deliverability of provision of the affordable housing element to comply with adopted planning policy and if viability of development is undermined through on-site provision then this must be a planning consideration.</p>	<p>methodology by which to update the SHMA .It is considered that the data is adequate for the purposes of this SPD.</p> <p>The status of the document is set out in Para 3.1 but clarification about what will happen to the SPD when the core Strategy is adopted would be appropriate.</p> <p>In regards to the Regional Plan the SPD is based on local evidence and is not concerned with general housing requirements.</p> <p>The SPD sets out the Council's preferred approach, it doesn't rule out off-site provision however evidence would need to be provided where viability is an</p>	<p>Additional text added to the end of Para 3.1 "in relation to the Core Strategy, once it has been adopted, the need for the SPD will be reviewed"</p> <p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
--	--	---	---	---

		<p>Support is expressed for Key Principle AH3 – Targets. In particular the Council’s intention to seek to secure, through negotiation, a minimum of 20% target for Coalville is supported.</p> <p>In respect of the Key Principles, for thresholds, percentage and targets for tenure split, it should be made explicit that the issue of development viability will be taken into consideration in negotiations with applicants. It is considered this statement does not set new policy and hence is permissible in an SPD.</p>	<p>issue.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Viability is set out in PPS3 and the Council needs to be in accordance with this. Therefore, it is not appropriate for the SPD to further detail this.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
15	Councillor John Legrys (Coalville Ward)	<p>1. Whilst the document indicates considerable research by Officers – some of data is old and pre dates trends which have significantly changed in the last three years – There is a significant need to check research data against commercially available population &amp; economic trend statistics.</p> <p>2. The proposed reduction in housing development unit minimum from 15 to 5 is to be welcomed – but the converse is that the developers ‘economic’ argument against any affordable housing provision is being enhanced by the proposed paper.</p>	<p>1. The SPD is based on information in the SHMA which was completed in December 2008. As noted above the SHMA does not need to be updated more frequently than every 5 years, it is considered that the data is adequate for the purposes of this SPD.</p> <p>2. Noted, but as set out in PPS3 it is necessary to balance need against viability</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>

		<p>3. Notes the RSS has been abolished and there is uncertainty regarding the Core Strategy which needs to be reflected in the SPD. Uncertainty in the SPD will mean developers will ask for reduced provision affordable housing.</p> <p>4. Objects to any reduction in the level of affordable housing being made available for the 'Coalville Urban Area'. Does not dispute that bungalows are in urgent need but councillor casework identifies a need for family houses who find themselves in economic difficulty.</p> <p>5. Considers the proposed reduction to a 20% affordable housing target for the Coalville Urban Area will alter the specific and perhaps unique cohesiveness of the community.</p> <p>6. Would prefer to see specific targets in each of the 'affordable housing' categories. In my opinion the greatest need and priority should be for social housing provided by an RSL.</p>	<p>3. Comments are noted but there is no evidence to suggest that developers are seeking reduced affordable housing contributions.</p> <p>4 + 5. The affordable housing target for Coalville is based on viability and housing need. As the majority of future development is to be located in the Coalville Urban Area for sustainability and regeneration reasons it is anticipated that a significant number of affordable properties (of varying types and sizes) will also be delivered.</p> <p>6. It is considered that specific targets for different affordable types would be overly prescriptive and reduce flexibility.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
16	National Trust	The National Trust has, on this occasion, no specific comments to submit.	No response required	No change to SPD

	Midlands Office (East)			
17	Paul Percival, Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service	<p>General statements about what they would reasonably expect to be more explicitly stated in more detailed future plans.</p> <p>In regards to Section 106 contributions they state that District Council Planning Authorities accept (in principle) that Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service, acting as the delivery partner for the Combined Fire Authority, can claim, using a tariff for developments over 10 dwellings and possibly a planning condition for developments under 10 dwellings.</p>	No response required	No change to SPD
18	Highways Agency	The issues covered in the consultation document are not expected to have a material impact on the Strategic Road Network, and as such the Highways Agency has no specific comments to make.	No response required	No change to SPD
19	English Heritage	As well as new buildings, which the SPD focuses on, there is an opportunity for the reuse of redundant buildings as affordable housing, particularly in rural areas. Therefore, under the section on design, page 30, it is suggested that reference could be made to design standards in relation to reused buildings. Suggested that there could be a footnote to the English Heritage guidance on affordable housing in rural areas: <a href="http://www.helm.org.uk/server/show/nav.20835">http://www.helm.org.uk/server/show/nav.20835</a>	Acknowledge their comments.	Add the following to Page 30 Para 7.8.2 "The Council recognises that there is an opportunity for the reuse of redundant buildings as affordable housing, particularly in rural areas. English Heritage has published design standards in relation to reused buildings which can be found on their website."
20	Castle	The Parish Council support Key Principles AH1, AH2, AH3,	No response required	No change to SPD

	Donington Parish Council	AH4, AH5, AH6, AH7, AH8, AH9, and AH10.		
21	Derbyshire Gypsy Liaison Group	<p>Notes that there is no reference to Gypsy and Traveller provision in the draft SPD. Suggests that it would be useful to clarify how Gypsy and Traveller provision and policy relate to the SPD given that a proportion of the pitches needed in NWL should be affordable.</p> <p>Several methods of affordable pitch provision could be considered. The organisation Friends, Families and Travellers have suggested investigating the following mechanisms which we agree should be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sites funded from planning obligations or developer contributions developed on a self-build basis by the site residents. Land ownership could be vested in a housing association or another body with the residents paying ground rent on long leases or using a rent to buy arrangement with the ultimate aim of ownership.</li> <li>• Land developed and managed by housing association, council or other RSL with residents as tenants in perpetuity.</li> <li>• Shared ownership schemes paralleling those in operation in housing schemes</li> </ul> <p>Pitches that are owned or managed by a RSL or local authority are considered as a type of affordable housing and therefore can be funded by planning obligations as can other types of affordable housing. The SPD needs to make it clear where this type of accommodation is considered.</p>	<p>The Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland Gypsies and Travellers Accommodation Needs Assessment 2006-16 suggests, as a guide, that 25% of new pitch provision should be in the form of socially rented pitches.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged in PPS3 that Local Planning Authorities should plan for a mix of housing on the basis of the different types of households that are likely to require housing over the plan period. This will include having particular regard to several criteria, including: the diverse range of requirements across the area, including the need to accommodate Gypsies and Travellers. This matter will be</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>

			covered elsewhere in the Council's LDF.	
22	Leicestershire County Council	No Comment	No response required	No change to SPD
23	David Price (Ashby Town Councillor)	<p>Where the document indicates required affordable housing numbers, and how they translate into new build proposals, problems translating what those figures mean in terms of actual TOTAL housing targets/allocations. For example, (why not); if x = the number of 'affordable' homes required p.a. and x = one-third (for arguments sake) of all new builds, does 3x = the total number of properties p.a. intended to be built in Ashby (once sewage disposal is sorted)?</p> <p>Alternatively, if ALL new housing proposed for Ashby consisted of solely affordable homes, would any other homes be needed? Questions whether he has understood the document or whether it is simply limited in its scope?</p> <p>Questions why disregard market housing? In Ashby there appears to be a lot of recently-built lower value homes (detached, terraced and maisonettes/flats) up for re-sale. Has the Council surveyed what is already on the market, or assessed how many of these properties – if proposed as new-build would drop into the category of affordable housing? If this market housing can meet or serve to significantly reduce the affordable needs, what criteria would be used for determining yet more non-affordable housing in Ashby?</p>	<p>Concerns over how the targets are derived and how this relates to the overall housing provision figure in Ashby.</p> <p>In PPS3 the definition of affordable housing specifically excludes open market housing, irrespective of size and costs. Open market housing will contribute to Ashby's dwelling provision.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
24	Bloor Homes	Would like to request that where different targets are	Acknowledge the	A map is to be included in

		required in different areas, maps of these areas should be included in the SPD so there is certainty as to which targets are applicable on a given site.	comment and consider that a map could be produced and appended to the Final SPD.	the final SPD.
25	The Theatres Trust	The Theatres Trust is the National Advisory Public Body for Theatres. No comment to make on the SPD.	No response required	No change to SPD
26	Natural England	<p>The SPD deals with a topic that is not directly relevant to Natural England's remit, and in terms of directing development, the SPD is qualitative rather than geographically specific. Nothing within the document raises concerns and the general principles are supported. Suggest making reference to the River Mease SAC.</p> <p>No specific comments to make on the Sustainability Appraisal.</p>	Acknowledge comments, the issue of the River Mease is dealt with through other legislation and it is considered unnecessary to repeat this advice in the SPD.	No change to SPD