

**Agenda**  
**Session 5 – 13.30 10 May 2017**  
**Matter 5**  
**Affordable Housing, Housing Mix and Standards**

This matter considers affordable housing (Policies HC4 and HC5) including the requirement that developments over 10 units provide 30% provision and the criteria for considering exception sites. Policy HC4 requires that 80% of affordable housing is social rented.

Policy HC11 seeks to secure a particular mix of housing sizes within market and affordable developments.

Policy HC11 also seeks accommodation that achieves the Nationally Described Space Standard and the accessibility standard set out in Part M4 (2) of the Building Regulations.

Self-build housing is to be encouraged by Policy HC3.

The Council has proposed some modifications to Policies HC3, HC4 and HC11.

Main modifications MM55-61 and MM69-73 are relevant to this matter.

**Issues**

**1. The affordable housing policy and requirement (30%) (Policy HC4)**

The Council state that the viability evidence, including the updated analysis in CD19, indicates that Policy HC4 and a 30% affordable housing requirement would allow a competitive return on development. A modification is proposed to Policy HC4 to ensure that affordable housing is designed as an integral part of developments (MM59).  
*Does the evidence, including that relating to different Value Areas, suggest that 30% affordable housing should be set as a minimum or maximum requirement?*

*Does the 30% requirement take into account the implications for viability of other policy requirements?*

*Should Policy HC4 include a requirement that provision below 30% is supported by a viability assessment?*

**2. The split between rented and intermediate housing (80/20%)**

The Council indicates that the split is supported by needs evidence within the HEDNA and has been tested within the viability studies. The wording of Policy HC4 allows it to be applied flexibly.

*Should Policy HC4 be modified to be less prescriptive, particularly in view of the contents of the Housing White Paper?*

### **3. Affordable Housing Exception Sites (Policy HC5)**

The Council indicate that rural exception sites need to have regard to the principles of sustainable development. The availability and accessibility of services is a relevant consideration for those with limited disposable income.

*Are the criteria of Policy HC5 sufficiently flexible to support affordable housing on exception sites, particularly in rural areas? In this respect criteria a), d) and the final paragraph including a) to d) will be discussed.*

### **4. The housing mix (Policy HC11)**

The Council suggests that the housing mix outlined in Policy HC11 meets the District's needs. The policy is not intended to be applied rigidly but will be a starting point for negotiations on individual sites.

*Is the housing mix sought by Policy HC11 too prescriptive?*

*What are the implications of the mix for the viability of development and the deliverability of sites having regard to the viability studies?*

*Has the housing mix been correctly assessed in the viability studies?*

*Will the housing mix in Policy HC11 result in an under-supply of house types which the market suggests are in high demand e.g. 4-bed properties?*

*How, if at all, should Policy HC11 be modified to allow more flexibility?*

### **5. Space and Accessibility Standards (Policy HC11)**

The Council considers that space standards have been justified and they will not prejudice viability. The requirement to meet Part M4(2) of the Building Regs is supported by evidence about the number of people who will have mobility issues and has been tested in terms of its effect on viability.

*Are the space and accessibility standards within Policy HC11 justified as required by the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)?*

*In particular has the Council justified internal space standards in terms of need, viability and timing in accordance with the PPG?*

*Is the evidence within the HEDNA such as that relating to an ageing population sufficient to demonstrate a need to set higher accessibility/adaptation standards (Building Regulations M4(2)) having regard to the guidance within the PPG?*

*Does the latest viability assessment take into account any additional costs from requiring the optional higher M4(2) standard?*

*Is Policy HC11 as proposed to be modified consistent with the advice within the PPG about applying accessibility requirements to only those dwellings where the local authority has allocation or nomination rights?*

*If the requirement for an accessibility standard is justified what proportion of new dwellings should it be applied to?*

**Self-build housing (Policy HC3)**

The Council point to recent LP Examination Reports which highlight the difficulty of requiring self-build plots within developments. The demand for self-build is limited based on the self-build register.

A modification is proposed to Policy HC3 to make it clear that it is for the Council to consider viability and site-specific circumstances.

*Does the policy provide sufficient encouragement for self-build housing whilst recognising that it should be applied with flexibility having regard to viability considerations?*

**Main Evidence Base**

CD27 – Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA)

CD25 – SHELAA

CD19 - CD22 – Viability Studies

EX/05 - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions of 14 February

EX/13 – Schedule of Proposed Modifications

**Participants**

DDDC

Roger Yarwood (2164)

Home Builders Federation (4794)

WYG for William Davis (5317)

CPRE (5628)

**Statements**

DDDC

Home Builders Federation

WYG for William Davis