

## APPENDIX I – Aff Hsg : Summary of consultation issues raised, responses and proposed actions

| Rep No. | Name  | Summary of Issues Raised  | Officer Response  | Changes made                       |
|---------|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| 20      | Coombe Bissett Parish Council                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Support for the guidance is expressed.</li> <li>ii. Must ensure that Registered Social Landlords are vetted to ensure Aff Hsg schemes are fairly run</li> <li>iii. Seeks reassurance that planning objectives of the local plan are not compromised in order to provide sites for development, particularly rural exception sites.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The support of the respondent is noted</li> <li>ii. Section 6.2 of the guidance contains criteria which will be used to test the 'social landlord' credentials of an operator. It should be noted that Registration should ensure that safeguards are ensured.</li> <li>iii. Whilst Rural Exception sites take advantage of cheaper land on sites which would not normally be permitted, there is still a requirement that local plan policies are complied with,</li> </ul>  | No Action                          |
| 19      | Alexander Pearce Group Limited & Macfarlanes (Legal Advice) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Expresses overall support for the aims of the guidance which is backed by the respondents own work on the matter..</li> <li>ii. Questions why the matter was not addressed during the formulation of the Local Plan.</li> <li>iii. Asserts that the data on which the SPG is based is not up to date and so contravenes the advice in Circular 6/98.</li> <li>iv. It is not appropriate for every scheme under rural exceptions policy to be accompanied by a local needs assessment as the resources required for the exercise will act as a disincentive to bring sites forward.</li> <li>v. There should be no requirement for rural exception proposals to be acceptable in broad planning terms as any proposal will conflict with other policies within the plan.</li> <li>vi. The provision of land at nominal cost is too prescriptive and should be omitted in line with HA25 and HA2. Otherwise this may act as a disincentive for sites to be brought forward for Aff Hsg.</li> <li>vii. SPG seeks to change the policy contained in the local plan which is not acceptable in light of PPG12</li> <li>viii. No suggestion within the Local Plan policy that developers should provide subsidy in cases where SHG is not available. Aff Hsg Delivery statement is unreasonable.</li> <li>ix. Concern is expressed about the automatic introduction of lower site size thresholds as propose in a revision to PPG3, even though this has yet to be adopted nationally.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The support of the respondent is noted</li> <li>ii. The findings of the Housing Needs Survey were not released until late 2002, by which stage the Local Plan was nearing the point of adoption. Further delay to the process (which already extended over 7 years) would have delayed the release of housing sites which would have compounded housing problems by restricting the supply of new dwellings.</li> <li>iii. The Housing Needs Survey completed in 2002 remains an up to date basis underpinning the need for affordable housing. The Council would question the benefit of a new study Aff Hsg ahead of a planned review in 2005 or 2006 given that trends point towards the affordability situation worsening. As regards up to date data, the Council's Housing waiting list remains a valid supporting source of information, as do periodic reviews of the ratio between local house prices and incomes.</li> <li>iv. The respondent clearly misunderstands the basis for the release of such sites. Studies of Local Needs are essential in bringing forward exception sites as they enable it to be demonstrated that the housing provided will be for a target <u>local</u> population – hence the justification for the release of sites which would not normally be allowed.</li> <li>v. All proposals for development must be determined in light of the development plan. If this fundamental principle is set aside important landscape, biodiversity and amenity assets, for example, come under threat. In considering exception sites, the Council, as guided by national guidance, may release land for properly controlled Aff Hsg schemes that would not normally be permitted, but in considering such releases other policies will be given due regard. If this means opportunities to provide affordable homes are lost, this is accepted on the basis that other planning reasons</li> </ul> | ➤ <b>Actions set out in report</b> |

| Rep No. | Name  | Summary of Issues Raised  | Officer Response  | Changes made                       |
|---------|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
|         |   |   | <p>cannot be set aside.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>vi. Aff Hsg on Exception Sites are made affordable by the fact that land values outside of Housing Policy Boundaries are lower – normally reflecting an agricultural value. The respondent asserts that providing land at such a nominal cost is too prescriptive and will act as a disincentive. This view again misinterprets what is trying to be achieved by the policy – the provision cheaper housing which is made so by the release of land without full development value.</li> <li>vii. The limitations of SPG as a policy tool are addressed in section 3a) of the attached report.</li> <li>viii. The Local Plan policy requires that qualifying sites deliver an element of affordable housing. If funding of any type is not available the developer will need to identify other means to deliver the Aff Hsg in order to gain planning consent. The Aff Hsg Delivery statement is a reasonable means to enable developers to demonstrate how they will achieve the requirement of Aff Hsg ahead of detailed discussion which will be expected in drawing up a S106 agreement.</li> <li>ix. Issues related to the changes proposed in PPG3 are set out in section 3b) of the attached report.</li> </ul>                               |                                    |
| 18      | Carol Muston<br>House Builders Federation (HBF) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. SPG should not attempt to fundamentally change the policy contained in the adopted Local Plan, the SPG being used as a device to avoid public scrutiny of policies, as outlined in PPG12.</li> <li>ii. The Statement within consultation arrangements suggests that the Council will be selective in their consideration of representations. All representations should be taken into account and given equal consideration.</li> <li>iii. It cannot be assumed that the revisions to PPG3 will contain lower thresholds.</li> <li>iv. Respondent objects to the need for viability assessments where there is disagreement between the Council and a developer. This is not backed by guidance or the Local Plan. Considers this should be based on negotiation between the Council and developer. Measure is likely to stifle supply of land coming forward. The SPG should make it clear that the existing value of a site will be taken into account when assessing the suitability of site's to provide Aff Hsg .</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The limitations of SPG as a policy tool are addressed in section 3a) of the attached report.</li> <li>ii. In the original draft a statement in the introduction indicated that consultation responses would be considered where they made a clear and honest contribution to improving the SPG. This statement was designed to encourage constructive dialogue rather than unfocused criticism.</li> <li>iii. Issues related to the changes proposed in PPG3 are set out in section 3b) of the attached report.</li> <li>iv. Issues related to the development viability assessments are set out in section 3c) of the attached report.</li> <li>v. The final clause of Local Plan policy H25 incorporates the relevance of other costs in the achievement of a successful development. The SPG reflects this and the viability tests (considered in the main report) are a means to enable developers to justify their concerns about profitability</li> <li>vi. Issues relating to tenures of affordable housing are set out in section 3e) of the attached report.</li> <li>vii. Section 6.2 already sets out that there is no requirement for developers to work with the Council's partner RSL's, although it is considered beneficial to do so on account of</li> </ul> | ➤ <b>Actions set out in report</b> |

| Rep No. | Name                    | Summary of Issues Raised   | Officer Response   | Changes made   |
|---------|-------------------------|--|--|--|
|         |                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v. Not enough reference is given to developer profitability within the SPG.</li> <li>vi. The expectation that 87% of Aff Hsg will be social rented is unduly prescriptive and should be considered on an individual basis in line with PPG3.</li> <li>vii. Circular 6/98 does not require the developer to use a RSL which is on the Council's list of preferred partners.</li> <li>viii. There is no requirement for Aff Hsg to be provided in perpetuity, all owners have the Right to Acquire by virtue of Section 16 of the Housing Act 1996. Request that the reference in this section to the requirement for Aff Hsg to be provided in perpetuity be deleted.</li> <li>ix. There should be no requirement for Aff Hsg to be well distributed, RSL's prefer single locations for management purposes.</li> <li>x. SPG is overly prescriptive in its intention to influence the types and sizes of market housing.</li> <li>xi. The requirement to build Aff Hsg to Housing Corporation standards is unreasonable where no SHG is being provided.</li> </ul> | <p>the local experience they have.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>viii. Aff Hsg is a public resource. The requirement that Affordable Homes be made available in perpetuity is essential to ensure such properties are maintained for those in housing need and not sold onto the open market where their benefit would be lost. The point related to 'right to acquire' does not acknowledge that in acquiring the property, occupants pass the capital sum paid back to the RSL who can then recycle that sum to build new affordable properties.</li> <li>ix. This matter is already effectively addressed in section 6.5 of the guidance and was discussed with RSLs in drawing up the original guidance</li> <li>x. In light of the failure of the market to deliver housing which meets the needs of local people, section 6.5 includes a guide the types of housing which local people are in need of. As a means to encourage developers to more readily meet local needs rather than aspirational needs from a regional or national market it is an entirely appropriate for the SPG.</li> <li>xi. With the exception of Low Cost for Sale properties, it is expected that affordable homes are transferred to an RSL (or housing provider with similar credentials) On this basis it is reasonable that the operators requirements are met. The Council would accept the right for RSL's to relax standards as they consider appropriate.</li> </ul> |  |
| 17      | Idmiston Parish Council | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Concern that increased requirements may not be financially viable - the amount of Aff Hsg should be appropriate to the individual area and its residents.</li> <li>ii. The word erected should not be used for reasons of clarity. Created or delivered would cover conversion and new build and therefore would be a more suitable term.</li> <li>iii. SDC should encourage more 1- 2 bedroom dwellings to cater for demand and increase the number of affordable market housing. The existence of more smaller dwellings would widen the availability of housing stock, this would in turn decrease the overall need for Aff Hsg</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Issues related to development viability and increased Aff Hsg proportions are set out in sections 3a) 3c) and 3d) of the report, however the respondent can be assured that affordable housing requirements are required to address identified housing needs, and particularly specific local needs in rural settlements.</li> <li>ii. The offending word in para. 7 of the executive summary will be amended, but the respondent can be assured that conversions, new build and any other means of creating a dwelling will be taken into account in the application of policy H25</li> <li>iii. The respondent highlights the failure of the market to deliver types of housing which local people need. Section 6.5 of the guidance addresses this point in providing information for the development industry and the Council to act upon.</li> </ul>  | ➤ <b>Action</b> – para 7 of executive summary. Replace 'erected' with 'provided' |

| Rep No. | Name   | Summary of Issues Raised  | Officer Response  | Changes made   |
|---------|--|---|---|--|
| 16      | Nathan Cronk, Raglan Housing Association   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Support for the guidance is expressed</li> <li>ii. Document is too long, may benefit from a more comprehensive summary.</li> <li>iii. Could include a table that sets out the requirement for Aff Hsg by settlement for ease of reference</li> <li>iv. Could include a stronger statement on the expectations of Aff Hsg where no grant is available.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Support of the respondent is noted</li> <li>ii. The comment is accepted, however the guidance is aimed at being a single source of information (as far as it can be) to guide a full range of stakeholders in the development process. Officers will consider preparing a pocket summary of the proposals for more informed users.</li> <li>iii. Section 6.3 of the guidance gives an outline of the relative need in the district's 6 community areas. To set out precise pre-established requirements by settlement would be to prejudge the ability of a site to deliver. Furthermore, updating the information on a regular basis would not be cost effective and the benefit would be questionable in settlements where little development is likely to occur.</li> <li>iv. Issues relating to funding of affordable housing are set out in section 3d) of the attached report.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Action set out in report</b></li> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – officers will put together an abbreviated summary of the SPG as a separate exercise following the adoption of the guidance.</li> </ul> |
| 15      | Stuart Todd, S W Regional Assembly   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Support for the guidance is expressed</li> <li>ii. Identifies wording changes to the Regional Guidance reference in section 2.1 of the draft SPG which more accurately reflect what is set out in RPG10</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Support of the respondent is noted</li> <li>ii. The alterations proposed are accepted as being entirely reasonable and clearly set out the regional perspective</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – alterations to section 2.1 of the guidance in line with the details set out in the representation.</li> </ul>   |
| 14      | Humberts on behalf of St Modwen Developments, Pensworth Farms and Professor R Williams | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Aff Hsg should be assessed on an individual basis, in areas where there is more than adequate provision the Aff Hsg target of 25% should be reduced to 20%. In some cases there may be no demonstrated need for Aff Hsg and for these areas there should be no target.</li> <li>ii. The Council's comment that it is not blind to the economics of provision is welcomed. The costs of developing individual sites, such as the additional costs of Brownfield development, should be taken into account when allocating Aff Hsg. This would help ensure that the development of sites is not rendered unviable by additional costs.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Council's approach in this matter is entirely consistent with the views set out by the respondent. If there is limited or no housing need within a locality the affordable housing requirement will be reduced or set aside. In the current climate however, it appears unlikely that this would be appropriate anywhere in the district.</li> <li>ii. The policy as it stands reflects the need to consider other costs and planning obligations associated with a development proposal. However, it will be a matter for applicants to demonstrate that a development will be rendered financially unviable by affordable housing or any other requirements associated with a proposal</li> </ul>   | No Action  |
| 13      | Bell Cornwell Partnership on behalf of Westbury Homes                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The SPG attempts to fundamentally change the policy contained in the adopted Local Plan, and is being used as a device to avoid public scrutiny of policies, as outlined in PPG12.</li> <li>ii. SPG states within the consultation arrangements that we will be selective in our consideration of representations. All representations should be considered equally.</li> <li>iii. SPG is seeking to alter the level of Aff Hsg provision from which should be addressed in the appropriate</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The limitations of SPG as a policy tool are addressed in section 3a) of the attached report.</li> <li>ii. In the original draft a statement in the introduction indicated that consultation responses would be considered where they made a clear and honest contribution to improving the SPG. This statement was designed to encourage constructive dialogue rather than unfocused criticism.</li> <li>iii. The limitations of SPG as a policy tool are addressed in section 3a) of the attached report.</li> <li>iv. Issues related to the development viability assessments are</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Action set out in report</b></li> </ul>  |

| Rep No. | Name               | Summary of Issues Raised  | Officer Response  | Changes made                      |
|---------|--------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|
|         |                    | <p>manner during the preparation of the LDF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iv. No evidence in policy guidance or within the local plan indicates that it is necessary to provide a full viability assessment for Aff Hsg. It is deemed that this should be based on negotiation between the Council and developer, and should be in accordance with the policy in the Local Plan.</li> <li>v. The expectation that 87% of Aff Hsg will be social rented is too inflexible, Aff Hsg tenure should be considered on an individual basis. The SPG should not include such a precise figure and should provide more information on ways to permanently retain a discount on low-cost market housing.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v. Issues relating to tenures of affordable housing are set out in section 3e) of the attached report.</li> </ul>  |                                   |
| 12      | Woolley and Wallis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Representation sets out their own case that affordability in the local market is set to increase further as a result of low incomes and rising prices, the latter of which is being fuelled by Buy to Let investors. They question whether the income/house price ratio is now not substantially higher.</li> <li>ii. Clients generally accept that land for Aff Hsg will be at nominal or nil value, but expresses concern that imposing greater aff hsg requirements without grant support will impose a cost requirement which will reduce land values to a point where land supply may not come forward. In turn this may constrain new house building and ultimately increase prices, exacerbating the problem</li> <li>iii. SPG should address a broader range of tenures away from Social Rented. Providing more low cost Aff Hsg to buy will reduce the demand on private rented housing which will in turn decrease the opportunities for buy-to let which creates a problems by limiting access to the housing market for buyers.</li> <li>iv. The percentage of Aff Hsg on Brownfield and Greenfield sites needs to be reviewed/ altered to ensure the viability of schemes.</li> <li>v. SDC should look to increase/encourage more 1 &amp; 2 bedroom properties through the use of planning obligations to improve supply of market housing.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The information provided gives a well informed appraisal of some of the key problems in the subject area. The Council does not doubt that the situation has worsened since 2002.</li> <li>ii. Issues relating to funding of affordable housing are set out in section 3d) of the attached report.</li> <li>iii. Issues relating to tenures of affordable housing are set out in section 3e) of the attached report.</li> <li>iv. The policy as it stands reflects the need to consider other costs and planning obligations associated with a development proposal. However, it will be a matter for applicants to demonstrate that a development will be rendered financially unviable by affordable housing or any other requirements associated with a proposal</li> <li>v. For some time the Council has been seeking to encourage the delivery of more small open market dwellings as a means for people to get onto the property ladder. Section 6.5 of the guidance now seeks to address this point more proactively by providing information for the development industry and the Council to act upon in drawing up dev schemes.</li> </ul> | ➤ <b>Action set out in report</b> |

| Rep No. | Name  | Summary of Issues Raised  | Officer Response   | Changes made  |
|---------|---|---|--|---|
| 11      | Chalke Valley Preservation Society  | <p>i. Respondent expresses support for the draft guidance as a means to deliver more affordable homes. The construction of individual private dwellings for workers in existing businesses in rural areas, excluding agriculture, should be encouraged. The Aff Hsg built in surrounding areas is often inappropriate for such workers and employers must compete with larger towns to attract employees to their businesses.</p>   | <p>i. Support of the respondent is noted<br/> ii. New measures set out in draft PPS7 set out a broader range of business types which could benefit from tied dwellings. Providing measures are in place to secure properties from being sold to the open market, the Council would, in principle, support for the respondents view.</p>  | <p>No Action – <i>although in principle support is offered where such dwellings are maintained for their original intention or, subsequently, made available to meet local housing need.</i></p>    |
| 10      | Rupert Scott, Aff Hsg Consultant on behalf of the Wilton and Longford Estates | <p>i. The SPG seeks to amend policy which should be undertaken as part of the new Local Development Framework process.<br/> ii. The guidance does not set out other measures to bring forward other forms of affordable housing<br/> iii. The absence of grant funding in a district such as Salisbury will result in an unrealistic burden being placed on the landowner,<br/> iv. Aspirations to achieve 87% Social Rented housing compound issues related to the financial burden when other tenures could alleviate pressures which are contributing to higher demand for Social Rented.<br/> v. The need to provide a financial viability assessment by a firm commissioned by the Council at their own cost is unacceptable.<br/> vi. The treatment of Housing for Key Workers should be included as part of the normal Aff Hsg requirement as they have the same definition in Circular 6/98.<br/> vii. SPG should not state a RSL's involvement in Aff Hsg as essential, should recognise that any private sector organisation is able to provide, own or manage Aff Hsg and that this should be encouraged.<br/> viii. Nominal land values related to Rural Exception sites do not encourage their release in the same way that land value subsidy for mainstream affordable housing will act to restrict overall supply. Completed houses on the land can provide much higher longer-term benefits to the purchaser rather than the landowner.<br/> ix. SPG is too restrictive in its criteria for Exceptions Sites to come forward and it does not provide a list of settlements that meet the Local Plan criteria. The ability of individuals to access amenities, and local need should form the criteria for Aff Hsg, rather than the exact location and number of amenities.</p> | <p>i. The limitations of SPG as a policy tool are addressed in section 3a) of the attached report.<br/> ii. To some degree this point is accepted, however the respondent must accept that this is a planning document rather than a housing strategy. The Council's Housing Strategy does look much more widely at potential solutions and where appropriate planners will help to facilitate other means of affordable housing delivery. As regards specific mention of Rural Exception sites, the guidance does seek to demystify the processes and requirements of such schemes as an option for local action and the Council is hopeful that the changes to proposed PPG3 retain the intention to allow allocations of rural sites to more readily encourage their implementation.<br/> iii. Funding issues are set out in section 3d) of the attached report,<br/> iv. Tenure issues are addressed in section 3e) of the attached report<br/> v. Issues related to the development viability assessments are set out in section 3c) of the attached report.<br/> vi. The tenures provided are the same and occupants are likely to provide socio-economic benefits which can only improve services to the remainder of the local population. However, for such schemes to be brought forward the relevant employers will need to demonstrate that staff recruitment and retention will be improved by such provision. The mix of different types of tenure will, however, still be subject to agreement as part of negotiation<br/> vii. Section 6.2 of the guidance could not be any clearer in addressing this matter. Slight revisions have been made to make tests of other forms of housing provider clearer. The clients of the respondent are acknowledged to provide for certain groups in housing need, however in considering the role of the Estates as potential managers of affordable housing, the Council has no reassurances their expressed</p> | <p>➤ <b>Action set out in report</b><br/> ➤ <b>Action</b> – amendment of section 6.9 to reflect that of key worker housing should not be in addition to normal affordable housing requirements.</p> |

| Rep No. | Name  | Summary of Issues Raised   | Officer Response  | Changes made   |
|---------|---|--|---|--|
|         |   |  | <p>benevolence will extend beyond their own interests. If the Estates can enter into an appropriate arrangement which takes on board RSL credentials (ensuring the long term wider public benefit of affordable housing) there is no reason why they cannot effectively contribute to addressing the observed problem.</p> <p>viii. Aff Hsg on Exception Sites is made affordable by the fact that land values outside of Housing Policy Boundaries are lower – normally reflecting an agricultural value. The respondent asserts that providing land at such a nominal cost is too prescriptive and will act as a disincentive. This view misinterprets what is trying to be achieved by the policy – the provision cheaper housing which is made so by the release of land without full development value.</p> <p>ix. The SPG simply clarifies the requirements of policy H26. The policy is necessarily restrictive to ensure that the housing provided is cheap and maintained in perpetuity. The Council will not consider any relaxation of the policy where it would enable houses built to ultimately be released onto the open market whereby they would be lost as a social resource. As far as providing a list of settlements that meet the Local Plan criteria, such an exercise would be fraught with disagreement. Ultimately the respondents view on this matter is acceptable in the ability of individuals to access amenities and the demonstration of local need should form the criteria for such sites rather than an absolute count of local facilities. Other elements of the policy, however, are still required to be adhered to.</p> |  |
| 9       | J Crapper<br>Swaythling<br>Housing Society                    | <p>i. Land/ buildings should be discounted far more than is stated in the SPG and offered at nil value or 40-50% of market value. Completed development should be offered to RSL's at no more than 80% TCI.</p> <p>ii. There will be increased pressure on the developer to subsidise Aff Hsg provision with limited funding/ grants available. This will place pressure on the developer and may subsequently limit the supply of affordable rented accommodation if the costs of development are too high.</p> | <p>i. Funding issues are set out in section 3d) of the attached report</p> <p>ii. Funding issues are set out in section 3d) of the attached report</p>  | ➤ <b>Action set out in report</b>  |
| 8       | Louise Harrison<br>Government<br>Office for the<br>South West | <p>i. GOSW compliments the thoroughness of the guidance as a tool to inform the delivery of affordable housing</p> <p>ii. Respondent suggests that section 1.3 of the draft would be more logical at the beginning of the section</p>  | <p>i. The support of the Government office is welcomed</p> <p>ii. The draft SPG has been amended in light of this observation and it is accepted that the result is more logical and concise.</p> <p>iii. This point is not accepted. The aim of the guidance is to direct stakeholders in the development process to</p>   | <p>➤ <b>Action set out in report</b></p> <p>➤ <b>Action</b> – Reorganisation of section 1 of the draft guidance to bring forward and expand upon the</p> |

| Rep No. | Name   | Summary of Issues Raised   | Officer Response   | Changes made  |
|---------|--|--|--|---|
|         |  | <p>in order to set out definitions from the outset. Section 1.1.could also be condensed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iii. SPG should not to refer to documents, such as the Housing Corporation standards, that do not form part of the development plan, as this is inconsistent with PPG12.</li> <li>ii. SPG is seeking to alter the level of Aff Hsg provision from a minimum of 25% in the local plan to 40% in the SPG. This represents a significant change in policy and should be addressed through a partial review of the local plan. The provision of minimum and maximum targets is contrary to PPG12 in that it is attempting to introduce policies which should be included within the development plan.</li> <li>iii. PPG3 is still in draft form and so the requirement that all developments of 0.5ha irrespective of the size of settlement, and the intention to increase Aff Hsg in rural areas, is contrary to current national policy as well as contradicting the adopted Local Plan.</li> <li>iv. The reference to approval or refusal of applications in the diagram in the New Forest section is prejudicial.</li> <li>v. The allocation at Salisbury District Hospital should be cross referenced with the relevant policy or proposals map within the Local Plan to be in accordance with PPG12.</li> </ul> | <p>associated documents which are relevant to delivering affordable housing. The particular reference to Housing Corporation standards is caveated by stating 'where relevant' which is reasonable as RSL's will normally require these standards to be met in properties which are to be transferred to them. In short, it is relevant for developers to be aware of such standards and requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iv. The limitations of SPG as a policy tool are addressed in section 3a) of the attached report.</li> <li>v. Issues related to the changes proposed in PPG3 are set out in section 3b) of the attached report.</li> <li>vi. The diagram has been amended to indicate the likely recommendation rather than to an absolute decision.</li> <li>vii. The appropriate cross reference will be set out in the final version of the guidance.</li> </ul> | <p>definitions from the outset of the guidance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> – amend diagram relating to the consideration of New Forest sites to ensure comments to not prejudice decision making</li> <li>➤ <b>Action</b> - amend section 6 relating to key workers to include policy reference of the housing allocation on the SDH site.</li> </ul> |
| 7       | Tisbury and West Tisbury Parish Councils                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Parish Council expresses support for the guidance particularly the proposal to prevent policy evasion by the division of development sites.</li> <li>ii. Parish Council would like to see Aff Hsg provision in Tisbury at the upper end of the 25 – 40% range, in line with Salisbury and Amesbury. Aff Hsg need for local Tisbury residents should not be underestimated</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The support of the Parish Council is welcomed.</li> <li>ii. It is a fact that the Housing Needs Survey points towards a lower need for affordable homes in Tisbury than in Salisbury and Amesbury where the problem is most acute. However, when individual development sites come forward, the most up to date waiting list data, and any local needs information that is available, will be used to justify an appropriate proportion of affordable housing. If figures point to a high level of need, the Council will negotiate for provision in excess of the general 25% requirement.</li> </ul>   | No Action   |
| 6       | Level Consulting on behalf of Persimmon Homes and McCarthy & Stone | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Respondent criticises the Housing Needs Survey findings and suggests further work is needed to underpin the draft guidance</li> <li>ii. Respondent considers policy basis is limited in its coverage</li> <li>iii. SPG cannot be used to introduce new strategies such as the Council's Housing Strategy.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Housing Needs Survey was undertaken in line with best practice guidance and uses a methodology which has been subjected to numerous appeals (contested with the respondent). In terms of further research, the Council has been keeping this area under review for some time and remains confident that the basis of the information underpinning the guidance is sound, if not a little cautious.</li> </ul>  | ➤ <b>Action set out in report</b>   |



| Rep No. | Name | Summary of Issues Raised   | Officer Response   | Changes made |
|---------|------|--|--|--------------|
|         |      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>iv. Respondent considers that the SPG goes beyond what the Local Plan policy states and that this should be dealt with through a review of the Local Plan</li> <li>v. No reduction in the qualification thresholds for Aff Hsg should be made on the basis of new Government Guidance (PPG3) which is still unfinalised.</li> <li>vi. Respondent criticises the intention to apply varying thresholds across the district in response to localised need. Considers that Aff Hsg requirements should be set out on a site by site basis.</li> <li>vii. Respondent considers that the requirements set out in the SPG – 40% requirement and nil grant – has not taken any account of financial realities.</li> <li>viii. The implication that disputes should be resolved by means of open book appraisal, to be carried out by a consultant appointed by the Council, is not appropriate and should be removed.</li> <li>ix. The planning process is not the only source of supply for Aff Hsg and the target of 150 does not have to be met through the planning process alone.</li> <li>x. Respondent suggests that the Council accepts that Low Cost for Sale Housing will require subsidy.</li> <li>xi. Respondent suggests that restrictive resale covenant on low cost housing for sale should be examined on the basis that it may be unlawful.</li> <li>xii. The Council should acknowledge that RSL's are not the only appropriate delivery mechanism, and not seek to prescribe whom developers should be working with.</li> <li>xiii. Further advice and information should be provided in respect of S106 agreements and planning obligations, taking account of Circular 1/97 and 9/98.</li> <li>xiv. The respondent is concerned that excessive emphasis is placed on the Social Rented tenure when other needs could be met by shared ownership/Low Cost for Sale</li> <li>xv. The respondent indicates that their clients are unhappy with any move towards prescribing the mix of unit sizes amongst private dwellings</li> <li>xvi. The Housing Corporation's Scheme Development Standards cannot be considered as a material consideration and should be placed within the Housing Strategy rather than SPG.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. Consultation responses with national, regional and strategic bodies have failed to identify any deficiencies in the policy background. The quotes set out in the response do not add anything which the guidance does not already cover.</li> <li>iii. The Housing Strategy referred to in section 2.2 underpinned the content of the Local Plan policy. The point raised, which is admittedly unclear, appears to suggest that it is not relevant to consider this.</li> <li>iv. The limitations of SPG as a policy tool are addressed in section 3a) of the attached report.</li> <li>v. Issues related to the changes proposed in PPG3 are set out in section 3b) of the attached report.</li> <li>vi. The respondent's criticism is unwarranted here. The draft guidance was clear that affordable housing requirements will be assessed on a site by site basis. The reference to varying need in sections 3.1 and 6.3 reflect current realities that proportions are likely to be higher in certain areas if one considers all development sites to be the same. Clearly different sites will have different costs and obligations and so a balance will be struck.</li> <li>vii. Funding issues are addressed in section 3d) of the attached report</li> <li>viii. Issues related to the development viability assessments are set out in section 3c) of the attached report.</li> <li>ix. The 150 unit per year target does reflect all forms of social housing supply. Table 2 set out a projection of underlying aff hsg provision by RSLs – i.e. units secured or brought into use without developer contributions.</li> <li>x. The Council does not accept or make this point anywhere. The price of Low Cost for Sale properties would normally amount to the build cost and reflect a nil land value. This formula will result in a value which is, coincidentally, in line with what average local incomes can afford.</li> <li>xi. Advice taken indicates no legal issues. Providing nominated buyers are made fully aware of the covenanted restrictions and enter into the sale in that knowledge there appears to be no issues to contend with.</li> <li>xii. Section 6.2 of the guidance could not be any clearer in addressing this matter. Slight revisions have been made to make tests of other forms of housing provider clearer.</li> <li>xiii. Given the differing characteristic and types of provision of affordable housing it would be misleading to set out any more detail than is already contained in the guidance. The</li> </ul> |              |

| Rep No. | Name | Summary of Issues Raised   | Officer Response   | Changes made |
|---------|------|--|--|--------------|
|         |      | <p>xvii. The addressing of commuted sums within the SPG should more accurately reflect the intentions of Circulars 6/98 and 1/97</p> <p>xviii. Any occupancy conditions on housing should accord with the cascade requirements found in Circular 6/98</p> <p>xix. Government Guidance does not recommend that developers should make up the funding for social rented Aff Hsg where public subsidy is not available. Alternative tenures which take less public subsidy or lower percentages of Aff Hsg should be considered by the Council. SPG should not proffer advice in respect of the amount and type of Aff Hsg where no SHG can be made available.</p> <p>xx. All sources of Aff Hsg should be incorporated in the target number of houses provided. Wider monitoring should be in place to measure the additions to Aff Hsg stock.</p> <p>xxi. SPG states the requirements for Aff Hsg to have suitable access to services and facilities. This is considered unnecessary in light of the requirements of Circular 6/98 and its coverage in policy H25, it should therefore be deleted from the SPG.</p> | <p>respondent can be assured that the relevant circulars and other guidance will inform the clauses set out in any agreement and will be the subject of scrutiny by solicitors</p> <p>xiv. Tenure issues are addressed in section 3e) of the attached report</p> <p>xv. The concern is noted, but if the market continues to fail to provide the right type of housing further guidance, may be considered.</p> <p>xvi. The aim of the guidance is to direct stakeholders in the development process to associated documents which are relevant to delivering affordable housing. The particular reference to Housing Corporation standards is caveated by stating 'where relevant' which is reasonable as RSL's will normally require these standards to be met in properties which are to be transferred to them. In short, it is relevant for developers to be aware of such standards and requirements</p> <p>xvii. Given that instances of off site provision or commuted payments are likely to be rare, the guidance in this section is considered acceptable as a basis for negotiation in such situations. The point made in relation to public subsidy is noted.</p> <p>xviii. The point is accepted, although not explicitly stated in the guidance. The Council would not seek to constrain occupancy to a group whose needs might cease. Occupancy arrangements are normally agreed with an RSL and/or set out in legal agreement.</p> <p>xix. Funding issues are addressed in section 3d) of the attached report</p> <p>xx. The Council undertakes a wide range of monitoring activity to inform its policies and programmes. As resources permit the scope of monitoring will be widened to be as comprehensive as possible.</p> <p>xxi. The requirements of section 6.12 of the draft guidance set out suggested maximum distances which people should have to travel for key services and facilities. The basis for this is to encourage less reliance on car use. Its application is equally relevant to market housing and affordable housing. As it is directly referred to in relation to policies H26 and HA2, the suggestion that it be deleted due to the lack of relevance to Policy H25 is rejected.</p> |              |

| Rep No. | Name   | Summary of Issues Raised  | Officer Response   | Changes made                      |
|---------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| 4       | Peter Westbury, Barton Wilmore Planning on behalf of Defence Estates | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The proportion of Aff Hsg to be provided should be determined on an individual basis, particularly outside the identified centres of greatest need in Salisbury and Amesbury.</li> <li>ii. The requirement of up to 40% Aff Hsg is too high and this figure should be for areas of greatest need, Salisbury and Amesbury. A lower proportion would better meet the local need in other areas and the SPG should be amended to an overall provision of 33% Aff Hsg. This would result in a 40% provision in high demand areas and a 20% provision in other settlements</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Council accepts the view that sites are assessed on an individual basis. It is not the intention to apply a blanket requirement to any development site, instead housing need in the locality will be assessed and an appropriate requirement will be set out for negotiation with a developer.</li> <li>ii. Further to the response made in respect of the first point, the knee-jerk reaction by the respondent that a 40% requirement is being imposed across the board is unwarranted. The Council will negotiate with a developer in line with localised housing need – lower need will equate to a lower requirement, even to the point where this is below the basic 25% level set out in the Local Plan.</li> </ul>  | No Action                         |
| 3       | Mr R Cave & Miss D Sheppard  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Support for the principles set out in the guidance</li> <li>ii. Respondents set out their own personal predicament and see no way out of the situation.</li> <li>iii. Highlight that Shared Equity represents a real opportunity for people in their situation but remain disappointed that properties of this type provided locally were rapidly lost to the open market through staircasing arrangements meaning the benefit could not be passed on to others.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The support of the respondent is noted.</li> <li>ii. The Council sympathises with the respondents but would emphasise that the time, effort and funding set aside for this issue is trying to provide solutions for people like them.</li> <li>iii. The Council acknowledges that occupants of Shared Equity properties can buy out the RSL share and then sell the property on to the open market. The fact that the capital receipt is then recycled to build new homes should be acknowledged, however the use of that money may not be in the same locality. The Council is looking at more constrained tenures – referred to as restricted equity schemes – whereby buying out is not possible, which in turn allows such properties to be maintained for those in housing need.</li> </ul>   | No Action.                        |
| 2       | John Coleman   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Council have brought the shortfall of Aff Hsg on themselves through refusing planning permission on Aff Hsg developments in previous years.</li> <li>ii. SDC and Central Government are blind to the economics of provision as there is currently no funding available and the onus is being placed on the developers.</li> <li>iii. Should the lowering of the threshold for Aff Hsg be adopted it must be fully advertised and its implications made clear well in advance of its implementation.</li> <li>iv. With no current funding available in the Salisbury District it is essential that alternatives to funding through an RSL are put in place.</li> <li>v. Quotas of Aff Hsg have to be financially viable and should be variable in response to individual circumstances.</li> <li>vi. Planning authorities are not able to control maximum</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The respondent highlights cases in which other planning considerations appear not to have been satisfied. The provision of affordable housing through the planning process is an important objective, but not at the expense of other planning objectives.</li> <li>ii. Funding issues are addressed in section 3d) of the attached report</li> <li>iii. The District Council has, and will continue to, publicise changes to its policy and guidance through as many effective channels as possible to ensure that all stakeholders in the development process are kept informed. The Council cannot take responsibility for the publicity of changes to national guidance.</li> <li>iv. Funding issues are addressed in section 3d) of the attached report</li> <li>v. The policy as it stands reflects the need to consider other costs and planning obligations associated with a development</li> </ul> | ➤ <b>Action set out in report</b> |

| Rep No. | Name             | Summary of Issues Raised   | Officer Response  | Changes made |
|---------|------------------|--|---|--------------|
|         |                  | <p>and minimum densities, to state this in the SPG is to contravene all previous guidance</p> <p>vii. SPG may fail in its objective as many schemes could be shelved as they are not financially viable adding further pressure to the housing market.</p> | <p>proposal. However, it will be a matter for applicants to demonstrate that a development will be rendered financially unviable by affordable housing or any other requirements associated with a proposal if this cannot be addressed through normal negotiations.</p> <p>vi. PPG3 already establishes that development should make efficient use of land and prescribes a general requirements for 30 dwellings per hectare., which should rise in line with the built context. For example, in an unconstrained city centre location, high density schemes may well be appropriate providing flats or apartments. Conversely in a village location, the 30 dwellings/ha may well constitute over development. The respondent's assertion that his human rights are being contravened is unfounded.</p> <p>vii. See v) above and refer to section 3d) of the attached report..</p> |              |
| I       | Anna Frost, CABE | CABE would take this opportunity to offer advice at an early stage on any strategic design proposals which arise in the area.  | The offer made by the respondent is noted for future reference  | No Action    |