



affordable housing



**Local Development Framework**







# Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document

## Background Documents

January 2008

John Archer  
Head of Planning



# **Contents**

Statement of Consultation

Supporting Documents

Non-technical Summary of Sustainability  
Appraisal Report



# Statement of Consultation





---

## STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION

### 1. Pre-production Consultation

- 1.1 Pre-production consultation in connection with this Supplementary Planning Document involved discussions with interested parties from within Warwick District Council, external agencies and the private sector.

Warwick District Council:

- Planning Officers
- Housing Officers
- Strategic Directors – Environment & Community
- Portfolio Holders (Members of Council) – Development and Housing
- Corporate Management Team

External Organisations:

- Registered Social landlords
- Development and Planning Consultants
- Architects
- Housing Consultants
- House Builders
- Warwickshire Rural Community Council
- Neighbouring Local Planning Authorities

- 1.2 Internal consultations took the form of meetings with the various parties. Registered Social Landlords were consulted within the Joint Commissioning Partnership meetings. As providers of the majority of affordable homes in the District, these organisations provided a very valuable input into the policy guidance. Other organisations, in particular the private sector, were consulted by way of a consultation event on 7<sup>th</sup> February 2007 during which a presentation was given by a Planning Officer and comments and suggestions were invited on the format and contents of the SPD.
- 1.3 In addition to the above, the Council's Planning Officers examined a number of similar SPDs from other local authorities around the country and considered best practice publications.
- 1.4 A full list of organisations invited to the consultation event is given in Annex I.

### **Summary of Issues Raised, the Council's Response and how the Issues were Addressed in the SPD**

- 1.5 The majority of participants accepted the urgent need for affordable housing in the District. There was concern, however, that the Council's current policy for managing housing supply (due to the over supply of housing in relation to the strategic requirement) would inhibit further the supply of affordable housing.

1.6 Suggestions and concerns included the following points:

- achieving the Council's target for affordable homes
- assessing site viability
- the integration of the affordable homes on the site
- the need for flexibility in negotiating the provision
- the need to consider housing for the elderly
- when to consider off-site provision or financial contributions
- the role of different types of affordable housing such as low cost market homes
- the tenure of the homes – rented or shared ownership
- the information that should be provided at the planning application stage
- the effectiveness of planning agreements
- the role of “lifetime homes” in private developments

1.7 The following Tables list the main issues raised during the pre-production consultation period, provide the Council’s response to each issue and outline the way in which this is reflected in the proposed guidance, if appropriate. In the case of a number of issues it was not possible to incorporate suggestions either because of planning legislation, government policy, or because the issue would involve the need for subjective considerations around which it would be impossible to develop clear policy guidelines.

Table 1 Comments from Joint Commissioning Partners

Table 2 Consultative Meeting with Housing Providers, Developers, Architects, Consultants and House Builders

**Table 1 Consultation with Joint Commissioning Partner Registered Social Landlords**

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD
<b>Affordable Housing: General Issues</b>		
The SPD should clearly set out the minimum standards to be achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that minimum standards should be set out. The Housing Corporation has issued new standards and requested that these standards are incorporated into local authority SPDs so that we can achieve consistent standards for new affordable homes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Table of standards is produced reflecting advice from Housing Corporation</li> </ul>
The need for developers to make contact with RSLs at an early stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that the SPD should include this advice</li> <li>• In line with new requirements on information to be submitted at planning application stage, Council to require more details on affordable housing schemes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert advice on early consultation with RSLs</li> <li>• Insert requirement for more details on affordable housing provision at planning application stage</li> </ul>
Can SPD discourage developers from seeking better offers from alternative RSLs after one RSL has already started working up a scheme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Govt guidance states that Councils should not prescribe RSLs. However, the RSL should have a proven record of delivery. The Council can, however, require details of the scheme at planning application stage – this should ensure the RSL is contacted earlier and the scheme drawn up at an early stage.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert requirement for more details on affordable housing provision at planning application stage</li> </ul>
The issue of the additional cost of service charges (eg for flats or unadopted roads) needs to be addressed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council accepts that service charges should be taken into account in assessing affordability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD will state that service charges will be taken into account in assessing affordability</li> </ul>
All rented affordable homes should be built to Lifetime Homes standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is now included within the Code for Sustainable Homes standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List within standards to be achieved</li> </ul>

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD
SPD should determine which types of homes should be built to Lifetime Homes standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree. In the private sector where 10% is required to Lifetime Homes standards, it will be necessary to determine which types of homes most commonly seek grants for adaptations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No information available on types of homes which most commonly seek disabled facilities grants so SPD will suggest 2-and 3-bed homes.</li> </ul>
The SPD should make clear the approach to negotiating a planning agreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree. A model Section 106 (planning) agreement has been produced and this will be available on the web site and in the Developers Pack</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD will list the items to be included in a S106 agreement and cross refer to the model Agreement</li> </ul>
Can the SPD produce a matrix for the prices of affordable homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council does not consider that this would be appropriate for an SPD which has a relatively long life – the information would soon be outdated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be addressed within the context of the Guidance for Developers</li> </ul>
Can other types of homes be provided in lieu of affordable homes eg Extra Care or HOLD (Home Ownership for People with Learning Difficulties) schemes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree – on suitable sites where the need can be demonstrated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insert this potential type of need into the SPD</li> </ul>
The SPD should not allow many 1-bed flats as these are not sustainable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree, these should only be allowed in small proportions. The Housing Needs Assessments agree with this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD will allow only small proportions of 1-bed flats</li> </ul>
Refer to Housing Corps new Design & Quality Standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refer to Design &amp; Quality Standards</li> </ul>
<b>Rural Exception Schemes</b>		
There should not be stricter qualifying criteria for schemes in the Green Belt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that this would be unfair</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stricter design, site location and layout criteria only in the Green Belt</li> </ul>
Validity of Needs Surveys – should be dependant upon factors other than time lapsed since survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include criteria for assessing validity of survey – time, size of settlement and supply changes since last survey</li> </ul>
Validity of Needs Surveys – should be 3 years unless there has been a change to housing supply in the parish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See above</li> <li>• This is already agreed as 2 years in Local Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See above</li> <li>• SPD can allow 3 years in exceptional circumstances</li> </ul>

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD
Rural exception scheme should meet the needs of a single parish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State this in SPD</li> </ul>
The SPD should not be prescriptive on the size of schemes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree, but guidelines should ensure it is "small in scale" to meet local plan and government policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set criteria for assessing whether the size of a scheme is acceptable</li> </ul>
Definitions of people with genuine local connections should not be too prescriptive as this could exclude some people with genuine connections and lead to the cascade mechanism cutting in	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree, but important that they are not too relaxed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set criteria but without too restrictive time periods for the local connection</li> </ul>

**Table 2 Consultative Meeting with Housing Providers, Planning and Housing Consultants, Architects, House Builders and Developers and other Public Bodies**

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD
<b>Affordable Housing: General Issues</b>		
How can affordable housing targets be achieved with Managing Housing Supply policies in place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree that this will affect the amount of affordable housing but SPD cannot address this issue</li> </ul>	
SPD should address the issue of assessing viability of sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendices include Checklist for information required to assess viability</li> </ul>
SPD should be flexible in terms of sites where constraints mean the types of affordable homes required cannot be provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be addressed under viability as above</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As above</li> </ul>
Where service costs are high, off-site contributions should be considered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD will consider off-site provision in exceptional circumstances</li> </ul>
The SPD should ensure that financial contributions cover the cost of providing affordable homes elsewhere	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Details to be set out in Guidance for Developers document</li> </ul>
There should be a role for different types of affordable homes eg low cost market homes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government guidance in PPS3 specifically excludes low cost market housing from the definition of affordable housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing definition is taken from Local Plan and PPS3</li> </ul>
SPD should ensure that affordable homes are properly integrated into site in terms of design etc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance given on integrating homes into the site</li> </ul>
Affordable Homes should not be located all together on one part of site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD will require pepper potting in small clusters across the site where possible</li> </ul>
The whole site should be designed as one rather than two separate sites so that the different elements of the site work well together eg orientation and layout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD will include guidance on designing the site as a whole</li> </ul>

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD
Affordable homes should be "tenure blind"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD will require affordable homes to be indistinguishable from market homes</li> </ul>
In terms of dwelling types, SPD should be flexible and consider schemes on a site by site basis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Types should reflect need</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
The priority for affordable housing should be those on housing benefit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree but a mix of rented and shared ownership should be provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD will aim to meet demonstrable needs with priority for social rented housing , as evidenced by needs assessments</li> </ul>
Crime & Disorder should be taken into account in all schemes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Standards will include requirement to submit application for Secure by Design</li> </ul>
SPD should set out minimum standards eg Eco Homes, Secure by Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum Standards set out including Code for Sustainable Homes and Secure by Design</li> </ul>
Planning applications should not be accepted unless full details of the affordable housing are given (as appropriate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree. New One App system and local arrangements for supporting information gives an opportunity to require this.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A list of information on affordable housing required at planning application stage is given</li> </ul>
Council should provide nominated Officer in Development Control for affordable housing schemes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Housing Development Officer takes on this role</li> <li>• There is a nominated DC Officer for each planning application</li> </ul>	
SPD should address the issue of Section 106 (planning) agreements and clauses about "mortgagees in repossession"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A model S106 Agreement has been produced and this addresses the issue</li> </ul>	
The needs of the elderly should be taken into account	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree</li> </ul>	SPD considers the needs of the elderly
<b>Rural Exception Schemes</b>		
No Comments here, but see above		

---

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD
<b>Mix of Housing</b>		
SPD needs to consider how to ensure some homes are built to Lifetime Homes standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agree – this issue was also raised during consultation on the Local Plan</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• SPD will require 10% of homes on large sites are built to Lifetime Homes standards</li></ul>



## 2. Consultation on Draft Supplementary Planning Document and Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report

- 2.1 A six week consultation period on the Draft SPD and Draft SA was carried out between Friday 31<sup>st</sup> August and Friday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2007. The consultation was advertised in the Leamington Courier and a press release was issued to the local press. The documents were placed in 10 locations in Warwick, Leamington, Kenilworth and Whitnash and full details were placed on the Council's web site. Letters were sent out to statutory consultees and to those who had expressed an interest through the Statement of Community Involvement and an "e-mail alert" was issued to those subscribing to the service.
- 2.2 A total of 23 representations were received following the consultation exercise. Of these, 19 included comments on the documents and 4 were responses which made no comments. Four representations were in full support of the SPD. The respondents are listed in Annex II and were made up as follows:
- 2 Registered Social Landlords
  - 8 Parish Councils
  - 3 Town Councils
  - 4 Housebuilders
  - 3 Organisations
  - 3 Public/ Government Agencies

### Representations on the Draft SPD

- 2.3 The representations were varied in nature, many commenting on matters of detail or requesting further clarity. More specifically, there were representations on the 80/20 split for social rented/intermediate housing; the application of "local connection" criteria on rural exception sites; clarification on the standards for affordable housing; and the suggested mix on private development sites. Some respondents held the view that the guidance on the mix of market housing consisted of new policy which should properly be included in a development plan document and be subject to examination by an independent Inspector.
- 2.4 Two respondents objected to the inclusion of guidance on the mix of market housing on the grounds that it represented new policy and should, therefore, be included in the Core Strategy rather than an SPD. Due to the fact that both new government guidance in PPS3 and the new planning system are in such early stages, this is an issue which has yet to be properly tested.
- 2.5 The representations on the Draft SPD are summarised below

SPD Section	Summary of Representations
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD should include SPD objectives</li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference should be made to the needs of gypsies and travellers</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestions for minor changes to the test of viability</li> <li>• People in neighbouring parishes should have preference over those in other rural parishes</li> <li>• Clarification needed on proportion of 40%</li> <li>• 40% requirement should be reconsidered in the light of PPS3</li> <li>• Public subsidy should be taken into account</li> </ul>

SPD Section	Summary of Representations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to density id inappropriate</li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 80/20 split for social rented/ intermediate housing is too prescriptive</li> <li>• Need for further information on income levels and house sizes</li> <li>• Need for clarity on price to be paid by developer</li> <li>• Flexibility needed on house types</li> <li>• Occupation costs are more appropriate than mortgage costs</li> <li>• Providers should be allowed to opt out of developer led management arrangements</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestions for other standards/ sustainability criteria</li> <li>• Checklist of standards unnecessary</li> <li>• Clarity needed on application of standards</li> <li>• “Design and Quality Standards” should be essential not advised</li> </ul>
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should refer to “affordable housing providers” rather than RSLs</li> <li>• Detailed information requirements at planning application stage is too onerous</li> <li>• Originally agreed price should be adhered to by developer</li> <li>• Types and tenures of homes should be stated in S 106 Agreements</li> <li>• Affordable housing provider not normally party to S 106 Agreement</li> <li>• Requirement for delivery clause in S 106 Agreement unnecessary</li> <li>• Different S 106 Agreements required for transfer of land or transfer of units</li> </ul>
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local connection criteria for rural affordable housing too prescriptive/ insufficiently prescriptive</li> <li>• The local connection criteria should be applied to (non exception site) affordable housing in Limited Growth Villages</li> <li>• More than just a small proportion of intermediate housing should be provided in rural exception sites</li> <li>• In rural exception sites, developers should contribute 3% of development cost towards local facilities</li> <li>• Contributions should be made towards new/existing sports facilities</li> </ul>
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section on mix of private housing introduces new policy and should be contained within Core Strategy and be subject to examination</li> <li>• Section on mix of private housing too prescriptive</li> <li>• Section on mix of housing not included in details in Local Development Scheme</li> <li>• Requirement for 10% Lifetime Homes too prescriptive</li> </ul>

### Representations on the Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report

- 2.5 Objections were raised to 3 aspects of the Sustainability Appraisal exercise. Firstly, that the “mix of market housing” element of the SPD was not included in the Scoping Report; secondly, that the options which were appraised were inadequate; and, thirdly, that the results of the pre-production exercise were not fed into the Sustainability Appraisal.

- 2.6 The first stage of the Sustainability Appraisal exercise, the Scoping Report, was published in November 2006 for three proposed SPDs, namely, Parking, Affordable Housing and Open Space. Following this, the Government published revised planning policy for housing, PPS3, which advised local planning authorities to set out in local development documents the likely profile of household types requiring market housing and to plan for a mix of housing for the different household types. On the basis of this, Officers decided to broaden the scope of the Affordable Housing SPD to include advice on the mix of market housing. Pre-production consultation was carried out on this basis and a draft Mixed Communities and Affordable Housing SPD and Sustainability Appraisal Report were produced for formal consultation. The Home Builders Federation, however have objected to the fact that the Scoping Report failed to include reference to the mix of market housing. This could be shown to be contrary to current planning regulations and the SEA Directive.

### **The Council's Response to Representations**

- 2.7 Table 3 below lists the representations and the Council's response. A number of minor amendments have been made to the Draft SPD to address issues made in representations on matters of detail and clarity. These include matters relating to the mix of affordable housing, the standards of affordable housing, the application of "local connection" criteria to rural affordable housing, and section 106 agreements.
- 2.8 The most significant change recommended by Officers is the deletion of the section on the mix of market housing. The reason for this is primarily because Officers would not wish to risk a challenge to the whole SPD for procedural reasons, concerning either the Sustainability Appraisal process or the way in which the guidance on the mix of housing is brought forward through a SPD. However, Officers consider that the mix of housing on private development sites can still be influenced through:
- Planning Policy Statement 3 (Housing) which states that local planning authorities should ensure that the proposed mix of housing should reflect the proportions of households requiring market housing;
  - West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy Policy CF5 (A) which seeks a range of housing types and tenures within new housing developments;
  - Warwick District Local Plan Policy SC1 which seeks a range of sizes and types of dwellings; and
  - Evidence from the South Warwickshire Housing Assessment (2006) and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment for the South Housing Market Area (2007)

### **Changes to the Sustainability Appraisal Report**

- 2.9 With regard to the Sustainability Appraisal Report, the references to the mix of market housing have been deleted in order to bring this Report into line with the Scoping Report. This was possible since both the market and affordable elements of the report tend to "stand alone" and were appraised separately. The minor amendments to the affordable housing element of the SPD were of insufficient significance to warrant a re-appraisal of the sustainability objectives in the report.



**TABLE 3****Summary of Issues Raised in Consultation Exercise and Council's Response**

<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council's Response</b>	<b>How Addressed in SPD.</b>
<b>Section 1</b>		
SPD should include SPD objectives	These are included in the Sustainability Appraisal Report	No change
<b>Section 3</b>		
SPD should make reference to the accommodation needs of gypsies and travellers.	Agree	Add new paragraph on the South Housing Market Area Study of Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation
<b>Section 4</b>		
The definition of affordable housing should include gypsy and traveller accommodation provided and managed by a local authority or registered social landlord	Agree	Add new paragraph 4.5 to this effect
<b>Section 5</b>		
SPD should clarify whether the 40% requirement relates to units/people or bedspaces	Agree	Clarify this in para 5.10
The reference to "other rural parishes" in para 5.9 is too wide if provision is to meet local needs	In the Limited Growth Villages, affordable housing provided by way of a Section 106 Agreement will be offered firstly to people with a local connection and, in the unlikely event that insufficient people come forward, the housing will be offered to others in the rural area. This is because there are so few opportunities for affordable housing in the rural area. However,	Make reference to the possibility of local lettings policies

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD.
	parishes may be able to agree a specific local lettings policy with the Council.	
Flexibility should be given to sites which were purchased prior to the SPD being adopted	This flexibility is allowed for in para 5.12 which invites developers to provide written evidence of the site and development costs to demonstrate non-viability.	No change
Written evidence of the cost of the scheme should be confidential between the Council and the developer	Agree	Add sentence re: confidentiality to para 5.12
The Economic Appraisal Tool recommended by the Housing Corporation could be referred to as a method of demonstrating development costs	Agree	In paragraph 5.12, refer to the Housing Corporation's Economic Appraisal Tool.
The "independent chartered surveyor" should be selected by the Council	Agree	Add "appointed by the Council"
Where the Council has been satisfied as to the inability of the site to support 40% affordable housing on grounds of viability, the SPD should state that the Council "may" be prepared to negotiate rather than "will" negotiate.	The Council considers that if non-viability is demonstrated, it would be unreasonable for the Council to refuse to negotiate.	No change
Affordable housing in Limited Growth Villages provided under Policy SC9 should, as a first priority, meet the needs of those with a local connection as set out in para 9.16 in respect of Rural Exception Sites.	Agree that this needs clarification	In para 5.9 add clarification about lettings policy of affordable housing in Limited Growth Villages provided as part of market housing scheme.
Table in para 5.14 is confusing	Agree that Table could be clearer	Add percentage figures to numbers of units to clarify
The 40% requirement should be reconsidered in the light of PPS3	In his report on the Local Plan Inquiry, the Inspector stated that the Council's Core Strategy would be the appropriate vehicle for addressing any changes in housing policy as set out in PPS3.  Notwithstanding this statement, the Council	No change

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD.
	<p>considers that nothing in PPS3 would preclude a proportion of 40% affordable housing. PPS3 states that local authorities should consider the economic viability of sites in setting different thresholds and proportions (Para 29). However, this need to consider site viability was also included in PPG3 and would, therefore, have been considered by the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector.</p> <p>The SPD allows for circumstances where viability is an issue – paras 5.12 and 5.13.</p>	
Overall targets for affordable housing should reflect the likelihood of attracting public subsidy	In the West Midlands, the Housing Corporation do not normally provide grant funding on “S106 sites” as it is assumed that on these sites the requirement for affordable housing will be considered at the land acquisition stage and the reduction in land value will provide the subsidy for the affordable homes. The purpose of Housing Corporation funding is not to subsidise the developer contribution. Only sites which provide “added value” will be considered for grant funding.	No change
Paragraph 5.5 should not cross refer to Policy DP5 (Density) – where developments comply with Policy DP5 they should not be judged as inappropriate	Para 5.5 is referring to developments which have an inappropriate density, when considered against Policy DP5, because they fail to make best use of land.	No change
<b>Section 6</b>		
SPD is unclear as to whether the 80/20 split (rented/intermediate) is required on all sites or how they will apply	The SPD does not intend to be prescriptive on the (affordable) tenure mix as each site is different and some sites may better lend themselves to a different mix. However, the	Add a sentence to the end of para 6.2 stating that this mix should normally be provided unless the applicant can demonstrate that such a mix would be inappropriate on the

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD.
	80/20 mix would best meet needs and should be provided wherever possible.	particular site.
The evidence for the 80/20 split fails to take into account the annual supply of 394 social rented units.	The 80/20 split is a ratio based on (1) the preferences of households in the household survey, and (2) affordability. It is not a calculation based on actual numbers. The South Housing Market Assessment showed that the annual shortfall of affordable homes, taking into account supply, was 625 dwellings of which 369 were social rented. However, the Council has traditionally achieved around 100 new affordable dwellings per year. The Council takes the view that the need for social rented housing must be a priority as these households are much less likely to be able to access housing in alternative sectors, such as the private rented sector.	See above
Para 6.2 regarding the 80/20 split between social rented and intermediate housing is too prescriptive. Tenure should be determined on a site by site basis taking into account the most up to date housing needs survey	The 80/20 split is based on the findings of up-to-date needs surveys and reflects preferences in the household survey and affordability. The split is given as a "general rule" only and is not prescriptive.	See above
In para 6.3, Section 11 should read Section 10	Section 10 to be deleted	Section 10 to be deleted
It is unduly prescriptive to state that 1-bed units will not normally be accepted	Experience has shown that 1-bed flats are often only a short term option for many households whose needs change after a short period of time. Thus 1-bed flats are considered to represent a poor use of resources as the tenancies change rapidly and vacancy rates are high. Affordable housing providers, therefore, prefer 2-bed units as these are more sustainable and more conducive to stable	No change



Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD.
	communities. One and two-bed households are able to bid for two-bed flats quite successfully.	
SPD should clarify the relationship between target rent levels and the price a developer could anticipate receiving for the priority house types	This will be incorporated into the Guidance for Developers	No change
SPD should acknowledge the fact that 4-bed homes are particularly expensive to provide and, where these are required, adjustments to the tenure split or numbers of units should be made.	The SPD gives guidance on house types and is not prescriptive. The overall package is always subject to negotiation.	No change
SPD should provide information regarding income levels for newly forming households against which the 3.5x multiplier could be used	This is included within the Council's Guidance for Developers which is updated more frequently than the SPD	No change
Another test of affordability is the relationship between occupation costs and household income which should be not more than 33% for intermediate housing.	Agree that this could be included as another test of affordability	Add a further test of affordability to the end of para 6.8
Paras 6.6 and 6.7 refer to "occupation cost" whereas para 4.2 refers to "mortgage costs". Consistency is needed	The Local Plan refers to "mortgage cost". The SPD, however, refers to "occupation costs" as this more accurately reflects the costs of ownership.	No change
The Housing Corporation maximum level of rent charged on un-owned equity should be 2.75% rather than 3% as stated in para 6.7.	Agree that 3% is the Housing Corporation's absolute maximum and 2.75% is the target	In para 6.8 state that the rent charged on un-owned equity should be at the level of the Housing Corporation's target rate of 2.75%
SPD should not rely on and assume that developers will make early contact with the Council	The SPD does not rely on assume developers will make early contact with the Council but encourages them to do so.	No change
Paragraph 6.9 should make reference to the Housing Corporation's Housing Quality Indicators and not the	Agree. Design and Quality Standards now incorporate all the standards.	Delete references to Scheme Development Standards in paras 6.10 and 9.19 and refer

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD.
Scheme Development Standards		instead to Design and Quality Standards
Paragraph 6.9 should allow RSL's to opt out of developer-led schemes	Paragraph states that service charges will be taken into account when assessing the affordability of schemes	No change
Questions whether purchasers are allowed to staircase out of Newbuild Homebuy schemes.	Staircasing out will not normally be required	Make reference in paragraph 6.11 to the fact that "staircasing out" will not normally be allowed in new shared ownership leases.
Reference to affordability in perpetuity in para 6.10 is contrary to government guidance in PPS3	Agree	Make reference in paragraph 6.11 to existing rights to "staircase out" of shared ownership and the "Right to Acquire" and the restrictions attached to these provisions
<b>Section 7</b>		
The SPD could recommend the use of the West Midlands Regional Sustainability Framework's Sustainability Checklist for setting benchmarks for future housing development	Agree	SPD could make reference to the checklist
Building for Life Standards should be encouraged to promote equality of housing choice	Agree	Include Building for Life Standards in the checklist of standards
Schemes should only be required to meet Housing Corporation Scheme Development Standards where Housing Corporation Grant is received.	The Council, and the Housing Corporation, take the view that all affordable housing should be built to these high standards as this will ensure consistent standards for new affordable homes. Local authorities are encouraged by the Housing Corporation to incorporate these standards into new SPD. (Letter from Housing Corp to all LA Chief Planning Officers dated 10/05/07)	No change
The checklist of standards is unnecessary as it duplicates other legislation	The checklist is intended to inform affordable housing providers and developers of the standards expected by the Council. See comment above.	No change

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD.
Checklist Table in 7.3 does not cross refer to other sections especially section 10.	Section 10 is deleted	No change
Guidance should be included on typical property sizes which would satisfy the various requirements	Agree that this is needed but consider that it would be more appropriate in the Guidance for Developers	Council will include property sizes in Guidance for Developers
Not clear whether Lifetime Homes standards is required across all units	Agree that clarification is needed	Delete requirement for all homes to be built to Lifetime homes standard and require 30% where practical and appropriate/
"Design and Quality Standards" as a minimum should be essential not advised as stated in paragraph 7.7	Re-word for clarification	Paragraph re-worded for clarification
<b>Section 8</b>		
SPD not clear whether "other organisations" in para 8.5 includes non-RSL providers	Agree. The Council is obliged to consider schemes from non-RSL's where they can demonstrate the ability to contribute to the delivery of the Council's Housing Strategy	Substitute "Affordable Housing Providers" for RSLs
Paras 8.7, 8.8 and 8.10 imply that partner RSL's are the only option	See above	See above
The requirements in para 8.9 for information at the planning application stage are too onerous and may not be known particularly in the case of outline planning applications	Agree that this information should not be a requirement in terms of outline planning applications. However, the Council considers that this information is required if a full planning application is to be determined speedily. Size and tenure of homes will be required for the new national single application form. It is not unreasonable to require information on the siting of the affordable homes at this stage. The Council prefers small clusters (rather than pepper-potting) and it is not unreasonable to expect this to be shown on submitted plans	Amend para 8.9 to make reference to full/reserved matters applications.

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD.
	(which normally show house type).	
Reference to "an agreed price" should be accompanied by a statement that this agreed price should not be later increased above a certain percentage.	The financial arrangements between the RSL and the developer are outside the scope of this SPD.	No change
Para 8.12 implies developer is transferring completed units. However, where serviced land is transferred the Council cannot control the completion of the units	Agree.	Amend para 8.12 to include circumstances where completed units are transferred, serviced plots are transferred or financial contributions are made.
Para 8.12 is unnecessarily prescriptive because if the affordable homes are pepper-potted across the site this will ensure that they are delivered in unison	The Council's preference is for small clusters rather than pepper-potting. On smaller sites the affordable homes may be completely separate, rather than integrated within, the market homes. Agreement is required to ensure the affordable element of the scheme is actually delivered with the market element. The Model Section 106 agreement is just the starting point for negotiation.	No change, but see above.
The types and tenure of affordable homes to be provided should be part of the Section 106 Agreement in para 8.13	Agree	Add additional bullet point to para 8.13 referring to the types and tenure of the affordable homes (in cases of full planning permissions only)
RSL's are not generally party to Section 106 agreements, contrary to implication in paragraph 8.13	Para 8.13 sets out the items which will normally be covered by a Section 106 Agreement in relation to affordable housing. It makes no assumption as to who will be party to the agreement.	No change, but see above
<b>Section 9</b>		
Para 9.4, in referring to the identification of housing needs in parishes, conflicts with para 5.9 which refers to general	Para 9.4 refers to rural exception sites only. The Local Plan allows for rural affordable	No change

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD.
rural housing needs.	housing in the Limited Growth Villages without a requirement for needs surveys.	
In Para 9.4, involvement of the Parish Council in any needs survey should be a requirement as without the involvement of the community, the survey would lack credibility.	Disagree because there may be cases where the Parish Council does not wish to be involved but where a large sector of the community would like a survey. The Council would encourage the involvement of the Parish Council but this is not always possible. However in all instances, the community should be involved.	No change
In para 9.4, the size of settlement as one criteria determining the current validity of the needs survey, should be deleted.	Disagree because in a very small settlement a needs survey would have a shorter life than in a larger settlement where relative changes to the housing needs of households would be less significant.	No change
In para 9.5, the survey should be expanded to include the needs of the wider rural community, rather than just residents, and should also survey the demographic make-up and social viability of the village.	The Council has some sympathy with these comments but government guidance only makes provision for exception housing to meet the needs of "the local community" by "accommodating households who are either current residents or have an existing family or employment connection". Thus, affordable housing for those without a local connection could only be provided through Warwick District Local Plan Policy SC9 and this only allows such development in the larger Limited Growth Villages. This SPD cannot change adopted Local Plan policy. The parish council is encouraged, therefore, to pursue such a change of policy through the emerging Core Strategy.	No change

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD.
Where parishes are too small for surveys to give meaningful results, there should be an opportunity to survey parishes in clusters.	Surveys of clusters of settlements may be appropriate but under exception housing policy, the housing can only be provided to meet the needs of the particular village within which it is located.	Include statement on surveys of clusters of settlements/parishes but with warning that housing in one settlement cannot be provided to meet the needs of that cluster
The Local Connection criteria in paragraph 9.16 should be expanded to include people with an affordable housing need in the wider locality, even though they do not have a specific link to the parish.	Under exception housing policy, the housing can only be provided to meet the needs of the particular village within which it is located. In allocating housing, however, if no one with a local connection expresses interest, the homes would be offered to other people with a housing need in neighbouring parishes and then the wider rural area.	No change
The criteria in para 9.16 are set at too low a level so that too many people would qualify for affordable housing in the parish	The criteria have been developed with advice from Warwickshire Rural Housing Association and the Rural Housing Enabler. It is not considered to be a problem if there are too many applicants as those most in need (or most suited to the accommodation provided) can be selected. It would be more of a problem if there were too few applicants.	No change
Para 9.16 should include an additional criteria relating to key workers	The Council has considered the issue of key workers in relation to affordable housing. However it is too difficult to define a "key worker" in Warwick District as insufficient research has been carried out. In the context of rural affordable housing it is considered to be more appropriate to give preference to those who work in the area	No change

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD.
Paragraph 9.18, should not only allow a "small" proportion of shared ownership housing. Such housing allows residents to have a stake in the future of their village and they are more likely to remain living in the community for many years.	It is particularly difficult to achieve genuinely affordable shared ownership housing in rural areas because of the high level of housing costs. Due to the large amount of unmet need, it is considered that rented housing should be the priority.	No change
In paragraph 9.24, remove "wherever possible".	Agree. Applicants should involve the local community in drawing up a scheme for affordable housing	Remove "wherever possible" in the 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence of para 9.24
In respect of affordable housing schemes, the Council should require 3% of the development cost to be paid to the Parish Council for the enhancement of local amenities for both new and existing residents.	Such a policy would need to be brought forward within a Development Plan Document rather than a SPD and would need to be in line with national legislation on planning obligations in Circular 5/05	No change
<b>Section 10</b>		
This section comprises new policy and should be tested through the statutory process	The section gives further guidance on the implementation of Policy SC1 which requires a range of types and sizes of dwellings. PPS3 states 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 information should be based on the findings of Strategic Housing Market Assessments. The guide to the mix of housing in para 10.8 is based on the findings of the Housing Assessment for South Warwickshire. It is not prescriptive, but for guidance only. Notwithstanding this, the section is deleted for procedural reasons.	Section 10 deleted

<b>Issues Raised</b>	<b>Council's Response</b>	<b>How Addressed in SPD.</b>
This section expands upon details of the SPD as contained within the LDS as approved by Government Office.	Agree. The scope of the SPD was increased after the LDS was agreed by Government Office but before its revision – the timetable for preparation did not allow for this.	Section 10 deleted
Para 10.7 is unduly prescriptive in its definition of 2- and 3-bed homes as small to medium family homes and in its preference for 2-bed flats.	Government policy in PPS3 is that Councils should set out the needs of different types of households based on housing needs assessments. Two such assessments have recently been carried out in the District and both identify 2- and 3-bed houses and 2-bed flats as the types of homes for which demand is greatest, taking into account the existing housing stock. The Council does not agree that this will limit flexibility to respond to market changes and to accommodate potentially innovative and sustainable design since these types of homes normally represent a large proportion of an area's housing stock. Notwithstanding the above, the section is deleted for procedural reasons.	Section 10 deleted
Paragraphs 10.8, 10.9 and 10.10 are unduly prescriptive	The Table in 10.8 is produced as a “general guide” and is only to be applied to large sites. The government expects local authorities to take a more pro-active approach to obtaining a good mix of housing. The mix in the Table is derived from an analysis of the demand and supply of housing in the District. Para 10.9 justifiably aims to prevent schemes containing large numbers of 4-bed properties, of which there is an adequate supply in the District.	Section 10 deleted



Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD.
	On small sites a set of general principles is given which is not prescriptive. Notwithstanding the above, the section is deleted for procedural reasons	
The requirement for 10% of homes to be built to Lifetime Homes standards in para 10.12 is too prescriptive and should be considered on a site by site basis taking into account character, viability and location.	The Council does not consider character and location are issues which should be taken into account. However the Council agrees that viability may be a consideration.	Section 10 deleted
This section of the SPD extends the scope of the SPD as contained in the Local Development Scheme and is therefore contrary to regulations.	Agree. The scope of the SPD was increased after the LDS was agreed by Government Office but before its revision – the timetable for preparation did not allow a further change to the LDS..	Section 10 deleted
This section was not subject to pre-production consultation	Incorrect. The section was subject to pre-production consultation at a seminar to which a number of local housebuilders and developers were invited. Notwithstanding the above, the section is deleted for procedural reasons	Section 10 deleted
<b>Appendices</b>		
The information required to be submitted with an application is too onerous and not all of this information will be known at the time of the application.	Much of this information will be required for Section 19 of the new "One App" national application form when it is introduced nationally. The Council believes that it is essential that developers liaise with affordable housing providers at an early stage prior to the submission of an application so that the way in which the affordable element of the scheme is to be provided is explored at an early date. This does not preclude the alteration or amendment of details at a later date.	

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD.
<b>Other</b>		
SPD should state that affordable housing providers should make contributions towards either improving existing sports facilities or creating new ones	This issue is covered in the adopted local plan Policy SC13 and the Open Space SPD (currently in preparation)	No change
Link to Guidance for Developers should be provided – consider importing key elements of Guidance for Developers or appending it to SPD	Agree that link should be made. The Guidance for Developers is intended to be the document which provided the greater detail, especially with regard to information which can be regularly updated. The SPD has a longer shelf life so is not appropriate for data which changes regularly. It is intended that the 2 documents will form part of a “developers’ pack”	Add web site link to Guidance for Developers in para 1.3
The SPD should identify the objectives of the documents	The Council wishes to keep this document as a practical tool which is succinct as possible. The SPD objectives are set out in the Sustainability Appraisal	No change
SPD should incorporate a policy which specifies the need for affordable housing to be recognised as a material planning consideration which should be taken into account in deciding planning applications	The Council does not believe that such a policy would be appropriate in a SPD which aims to give further guidance on the adopted Local Plan policy for affordable housing.	No change
Objection to wording of Policy SC9	Policy SC9 is an adopted Local Plan policy and objections to the wording of the policy cannot be considered at this stage.	No change

Issues Raised	Council's Response	How Addressed in SPD.
The SPD should recognise the fact that gypsy and traveller sites are considered as affordable housing where they are owned and managed by local authorities or Registered Social Landlords. (Local Authorities and Gypsies and Travellers: A Guide to Responsibilities. CLG May 2007)	Agree	Add new paragraph after 6.4 to refer to alternative types of provision subject to demonstration of need.
The SPD should include more flexible proposals to improve affordability for first time buyers in the short term	The detailed proposals suggested are outside of the scope of this SPD	No change
SPD should cover industrial buildings	This is outside of the scope of this SPD	No change
The SPD should cover a requirement for shared renewable energy installations	This will be the subject of another SPD.	No change
<b>Draft Sustainability Appraisal</b>		
The Scoping Report fails to include reference to the Section 10 (mixed communities) part of the SPD	Agree	Section 10 deleted
The appraisal process has failed to consider all reasonable alternatives.	The Sustainability Appraisal process considered the options of producing guidance or not producing guidance and applied these options to each objective of the SPD and to each of the 3 categories of policy guidance. This technique was successful in this particular instance since it allowed the appraiser to examine the effects of each and every part of the guidance. If one particular aspect of the guidance failed, then an alternative option could have been generated without that particular aspect of guidance. If different alternatives were generated at the outset, incorporating different aspects of guidance, then the results would have been no different. This is mainly because the different aspects of guidance generally "stand alone" and are not dependant on other aspects, as would be the case in geographical or spatial policies and options.	No change



**ANNEX I****List of Consultees at Pre-production Stage**

<b>Organisation</b>
Warwick District Council (Planning)
Warwick District Council (Housing)
Warwick District Council (Portfolio Holder - Community)
Warwick District Council (Portfolio Holder - Environment)
Warwick District Council (Head of Service - Housing)
Warwick District Council (Head of Service - Planning )
Warwick District Council (Corporate Management Team)
Warwick District Council Environment & Economic Policy Committee
Orbit Housing
Jephson Housing Association
Warwickshire Rural Housing Association
Servite Houses
Bromford Housing Group
West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium
Warwickshire Rural Community Council
Warwickshire Police
NHS West Midlands Division
South Warwickshire Primary care Trust
Warwick District Community Safety
Warwick Chamber of Trade
Kenilworth Chamber of Trade
Warwickshire County Council – Planning, Transport & Economic Strategy
Solihull MBC
Home Builders Federation
Highways Agency
Young Housing Project
Advantage West Midlands
Stagecoach in Warwickshire
Sport England
Leamington Gospel Hall Trust
Southern Windy Arbour Residents Association
Tyler-Parkes Partnership
Brian R Bassett Ltd
The Barton Wilmore partnership (Midlands) Ltd
King Sturge
Kevin Foreman Associates
John Burman & Sons
Roger Tym & Partners
Martin Bramwich Associates
Andrew Martin Associates
Arlington Planning Services
Development Planning Partnership

<b>ANNEX I Continued</b>
Stratford Town Management Partnership
Framptons
Crown Estates
Pro Vision Planning & Design
Smith Stuart Reynolds
Stoneleigh Planning
Midland Heart Ltd
Entec UK Ltd
Arlington Planning Services
Stansgate Planning Consultants
Stewart Ross Associates
Turley Associates
Bigwoods
Pegasus Planning Group
Planning & General Services
Alliance Environment & Planning Ltd
CDS Development Services Ltd
McCarthy & Stone Ltd
Shirley Estates (Developments) Ltd
Cala Homes (Developments) Ltd
Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd
GladeDale Homes Ltd
Court Homes
J G Land
Langstone Homes
T & N Ltd
Laing Homes
George Wimpey UK Ltd
Gallagher Estates
Court Developments
Parkridge Homes
Westbury Homes
Countrywide Homes Ltd
Bellway Homes (West Midlands)
Redrow Homes (Midlands) Ltd
Miller Homes
A C Lloyd Ltd
Hallam Land Management Ltd
Jones Laing Lasalle
Banner Homes (Midlands) Ltd
Greyvayne Properties Ltd
Pettifer Group Ltd
William Davis Ltd
Tesco Ltd
William Morrison Supermarkets plc
Mobile Operators AssociationThe Heretix

**ANNEX II****List of Respondents at Formal Consultation Stage**

<b>Consultee Name</b>	<b>Consultee Type</b>	<b>Inform of Adoption?</b>
Bromford Housing Group	RSL	Yes
Servite Houses	RSL	Yes
Offchurch PC	Parish Council	Yes
Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton JPC	Parish Council	Yes
Radford Semele PC	Parish Council	Yes
Hatton PC	Parish Council	Yes
Harbury PC	Parish Council	Yes
Bishop's Tachbrook PC	Parish Council	
Advantage West Midlands	Public Body	
Kenilworth Town Council	Town Council	Yes
Royal Leamington Spa Town Council	Town Council	
Whitnash Town Council	Town Council	Yes
Bigwoods on behalf of Various Clients	Housebuilders	Yes
Thomas Bates & Son	Housebuilders	Yes
Taylor Wimpey	Housebuilders	Yes
William Davis Ltd	Housebuilders	Yes
Friends, Families & Travellers	Organisation	No
The Leamington Society	Organisation	Yes
Home Builders Federation	Organisation	
<b>Consultees who responded with no comments</b>		
Budbrooke PC	Parish Council	
Leek Wootton & Guy's Cliffe PC	Parish Council	Yes
English Heritage	Public Body	
Highways Agency	Central Government	





# Supporting Documents



# Warwick District Local Plan (1996-2011)

## Sustaining Communities Chapter : Policies SC1 and SC11

### **SC1 Securing a Greater Choice of Housing**

Residential development will not be permitted unless it makes provision for a range of sizes and types of dwelling in all appropriate cases.

### **SC11 Affordable Housing**

Residential development on the following sites will not be permitted unless provision is made for a minimum of 40% affordable housing to meet local needs :-

- a) within towns, sites of 10 or more dwellings or 0.25 hectare or more in area irrespective of the number of dwellings; and
- b) within the rural areas, sites of 3 or more dwellings.

The form of provision, its location on the site and the means of delivery of the affordable element of the proposal will be subject to negotiation at the time of a planning application. Planning permission will not be granted until satisfactory arrangements have been made to secure affordable housing as determined by the following principles: -

- I. provision will be made on site either as serviced land and/or dwellings;
- II. the accommodation provided will be determined on the basis of local need as identified by the Council in accordance with the Housing Strategy and the Housing Needs Study and, where appropriate, by other local needs surveys and information;
- III. the accommodation provided is genuinely available to those households who have been identified as being in need;
- IV. forms of tenure other than social rented housing will be considered provided that:-
  - a) they achieve weekly outgoings significantly below the maximum affordable to households in housing need, and
  - b) such housing is available in perpetuity, where practicable, and only to those with a demonstrable housing need;
- V. the affordable housing will be normally provided through the involvement of a Registered Social Landlord (RSL) who is also a Joint Commissioning Partner; and
- VI. the affordable housing should be built within an agreed timescale.

Contributions in lieu of on site delivery, such as money, land or off site provision, may be accepted in exceptional circumstances.

## Rural Area Policies Chapter : Policies RAP1 and RAP4

### **RAP1 Directing New Housing**

Residential development will only be permitted in the following circumstances:-

- a) it is on previously developed land within the Limited Growth Villages of Barford, Bishops Tachbrook, Hampton Magna, Lapworth (Kingswood) and Radford Semele as defined on the Proposals Map where any market housing meets a specific local need as identified by the community in an appraisal or assessment;
- b) it is affordable housing in accordance with Policy RAP5;
- c) it is housing for rural workers in accordance with Policy RAP6;
- d) it is the conversion or subdivision of appropriate rural buildings in accordance with RAP8 where all the following additional criteria are met; or
- e) it is a replacement dwelling in accordance with Policy RAP4:-
  - I. the building is located within or adjacent to a village;
  - II. the housing meets an identified local need; and
  - III. outside of the Limited Growth Villages, the applicant can demonstrate that other uses (as identified by policies of this Plan) or a mixed use (where the residential element is subordinate to a business use) are not appropriate or viable.

### **RAP4 Providing Rural Affordable Housing**

The development of affordable housing in the rural area to meet the local needs of a village or parish may be permitted in exceptional circumstances where:-

- a) there is full, detailed and up to date evidence, in the form of a parish or village survey of housing need, which demonstrates that the proposal will meet a particular local housing need which cannot be met in any other way;
- b) the proposed development is small in scale, of appropriate design and is located within or adjoining an existing settlement; and
- c) the following principles are established: -
  - I. all of the housing provided will be for exclusive occupation of people with a demonstrable need to be housed in the locality;
  - II. the type of accommodation to be provided will be determined on the basis of local need;
  - III. forms of tenure other than social rented housing will be considered provided that they achieve weekly outgoings significantly below the maximum affordable to households in housing need; and
  - IV. such housing is available, both initially and for subsequent occupancy, only to those with a demonstrable housing need.

Outline planning applications will not be accepted for such proposals. Detailed permission will be valid for two years from the date of the decision and will expire if development has not commenced within this period.

# West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy (2001 – 2021)

## Communities for the Future Chapter : Policy CF5

### **Policy CF5: Delivering affordable housing and mixed communities**

- A. Local authorities, developers and social housing providers should co-operate to create more balanced and mixed communities through the provision of a range of housing types and tenures within new housing developments and sites across all parts of the Region.
- B. Local authorities should keep under review the need for affordable housing in their area, based on local housing needs assessments, using a broadly consistent approach, the production of which will be co-ordinated by the RPB. Both social and low cost market housing should contribute to meeting the need for affordable housing. Opportunities should be sought within the existing housing stock where this would help the creation of mixed communities, as well as through new build.
- C. The Regional Housing Partnership should facilitate partnership approaches to the assessment and delivery of affordable housing across common local housing market areas.
- D. Local planning authorities in their development plans should:
  - i) indicate how many affordable homes need to be provided throughout the plan area;
  - ii) in rural areas specify the balance of affordable housing to be achieved between market towns and villages where there is a need to retain or strengthen services; and
  - iii) consider the need to prevent the unjustified use of affordable housing provision for general market housing purposes.
- E. Local authorities should also consider whether there is a need for affordable housing to be sought on sites below the thresholds set out in national guidance in areas where low income households have particular difficulty in affording local general market house prices. Where local authorities can demonstrate that local circumstances, particularly the likely viability of developments, justify adopting a lower threshold, they should bring forward proposals through the development plan process. This applies especially in the south and east of the Region, in the corridor extending from the Malvern Hills to the Warwickshire border with the South East Region, and in some rural areas where appropriate thresholds should be set for settlements with populations of 3,000 or less.
- F. Development plans should ensure that adequate provision is made for suitable sites to accommodate gypsies and other travellers. Such provision should reflect the order of demand in the area as indicated by the trends shown by the ODPM annual count and any additional local information.

## Other Relevant Documents

### **Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) Housing and supporting document:**

#### **Delivering Affordable Housing**

Communities & Local Government. Nov 2006

### **Code for Sustainable Homes**

Communities & Local Government. Dec 2006

### **West Midlands Regional Housing Strategy**

West Midlands Regional Assembly. June 2005

### **Joint Housing Assessment for South Warwickshire**

- 1. Housing Needs of Warwick District**
- 2. Housing Markets of South Warwickshire**

Outside UK Ltd. August 2006

### **South Housing Market Area Assessment**

Rupert Scott. May 2007

### **Design & Quality Standards**

Housing Corporation. April 2007

### **A Guide to the Delivery of Affordable Housing in the West Midlands**

West Midlands Regional Assembly. November 2006



# Sustainability Appraisal Report

## Non-technical Summary







## Sustainability Appraisal Report: Non Technical Summary

1. This is the Non-technical Summary of the Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This SPD provides additional guidance on two policies in the Warwick District Local Plan – Policies SC11 and RAP4.
2. The purpose of a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) is to promote sustainable development by taking into account the social, economic and environmental effects of all planning policies. The procedures for carrying out SA's in relation to planning policy documents are set out in government guidance.
3. An important consideration in the Sustainability Appraisal of this SPD is that the SPD expands upon two Local Plan policies which have, themselves, already been the subject of a SA. Thus, the SA in respect of this SPD concentrates on the additional advice and guidelines included within it rather than the parent policies in the Local Plan.
4. There are two main stages in the preparation of an SA. The first stage is the production of a **Scoping Report** which sets out the scope of, and framework for, the Sustainability Appraisal. The Scoping Report for this SPD was issued for consultation in November 2006<sup>1</sup>. The second stage is the production of this report, the **Sustainability Appraisal Report**, initially in draft form for consultation purposes.
5. The Scoping Report sets out the **Sustainability Framework** within which the appraisal will take place. This includes the wider policy framework for sustainable development (such as government policy), the overall objectives of sustainable development and some "baseline" information on the current state of the District. From a trawl of the aims and objectives of the wider policy framework, it is possible to identify the main issues, or aims, in relation to the particular policy document and any possible problems or conflicts.
6. The **Sustainability Issues**, or aims, in relation to the Affordable Housing SPD are identified as follows:
  - Homes in the Right Places
  - Homes to Meet Current and Future Needs
  - Homes of High Quality Designs in Attractive Environments
  - Homes Built to a High EcoHomes and Space Standards
  - Safe and Inclusive Living Environments
  - Well Planned, Managed and Delivered Affordable Homes
7. Possible problems or conflicts identified in the Scoping Report included the issue of providing homes both to a high standard and with affordable occupation costs whilst at the same time trying to keep costs down so that sufficient homes can be provided of the right type, size and tenure.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment for SPDs on Parking, Affordable Housing and Open Space: Scoping Report. November 2006.

8. The actual appraisal process itself (the second stage) proceeds alongside the preparation of the SPD. It involves testing the aims of the SPD, and any policy options, against the Sustainability Objectives. Where there is likely to be conflict with the Sustainability Objectives, the SA should describe how these will be dealt with.
9. There are 17 **Sustainability Objectives** and they fall into 4 categories:
- Sustainable Consumption and Production
  - Natural Resource Protection and Environmental Enhancement
  - Climate Change and Energy
  - Sustainable Communities
10. The Sustainability Appraisal found few conflicts between the aims of the SPD and the Sustainability Objectives. In the main these included the link between more new housing and increased generation of waste and carbon emissions. There was some conflict between the provision of homes in the rural area with the aims of reducing the need to travel, promoting the use of sustainable transport and increasing access to services.
11. Two Options are appraised in this Sustainability Appraisal:
- Option 1: Prepare an SPD  
Option 2: Rely on the Local Plan Policies and Government Guidance
12. Each option is assessed for positive, negative and neutral effects against the Sustainability Objectives. Both options performed well, with only potential secondary negative effects, although Option 1 performed slightly better. This was largely because the additional guidance provided by an SPD would help ensure the provision of a greater number of affordable homes, homes of the right type, size and occupation cost to meet needs and affordable homes built to a higher standard.
13. Local Plan **Policy SC11** sets out the broad principles which govern the provision of affordable housing. The SPD would set out more detailed guidance on each of these principles, for example, assessing the viability of developments; the requirement in terms of the minimum site size; applying the proportion of affordable homes; the way in which the affordability of homes will be assessed; the types of homes most in need and the best ways in which to ensure the effective delivery of the homes. It also set out minimum standards for the design of the affordable homes based on Housing Corporation standards. The appraisal exercise concludes that the application of the local plan policy by itself would be effective in straight forward cases. However, few housing schemes are straight forward and the SPD would be able to add clarity to the principles in order to ensure the more effective implementation of the policy. By setting down the design standards for new affordable homes, the policy would help to ensure developments of good quality internal and external design which add to the local townscape with homes which are efficient and affordable to run into the long term. A potential negative effect of the SPD might be the impact of the requirements on the cost of the homes and hence the viability of the development.
14. Local Plan **Policy RAP4** sets out comprehensive advice on rural exception schemes. Additional advice in the SPD would give more detailed guidance on the local needs survey, define more clearly the acceptable size of developments and interpret “local connection” to the village/parish in question. This may lead to greater understanding of rural exception schemes and a better prospect of the homes being occupied by someone with a genuine local connection. Since most rural exception schemes

- receive Housing Corporation funding, the homes will normally be built to a high standard without the need for a specific requirement in the SPD.
15. Following the appraisal of the two options, the SA examines the potential secondary negative effects of producing an SPD and ways in which these effects can be addressed. Potential secondary negative effects largely relate to the potential effect on development costs of setting down more detailed requirements on the type, size, affordability and design of the homes.
  16. In general, the Council takes the view that residential land value should reflect the need to provide affordable housing to a high standard – particularly since this is now a government priority. However, the SPD should acknowledge the fact that there are occasions when site constraints do not become apparent until a relatively late stage in the planning process. An element of flexibility will be required in the SPD to take development costs into account when negotiating for affordable housing, provided these can be fully justified. The SPD should then set out the way in which it will consider alternative contributions in exceptional circumstances.
  17. In terms of design standards for affordable housing, these have the potential to increase building costs. The funding of affordable housing schemes is particularly complex. There will inevitably need to be a balance between numbers and types of affordable homes and the costs of providing them. In general this will be the subject of negotiation between the affordable housing provider, the developer and the Council. There are no prescriptive rules and an element of flexibility will be essential.
  18. The Council will also be able to mitigate against the potential non-viability of developments by ensuring that developers are aware of their obligations at an early stage. The Council currently produces a “Guidance for Developers” document and aims to produce a “Developers’ Pack” which will include all the material relevant to the provision of affordable housing in the District.
  19. The SA sets out the ways in which the Council will monitor the sustainability effects of implementing the SPD. The Council has set up a system of monitoring the “baseline data” on an annual basis and this information is published in an Annual Monitoring Report. Another annual document, the Housing Monitoring Report, includes information on, and analysis of, housing development in the District over a twelve month period.
  20. Finally the SA sets out the results of the consultation on the Draft SA. The majority of representations related to matters of detail or the need for clarification. However, one representation highlighted the fact that the mixed communities aspect of the SPD (Section 10) had not been included in the Scoping Report. This was because, following the consultation on the Scoping Report, the Government issued PPS3 which advised local authorities to include guidance in local development documents on the types of households likely to be in need of homes in the future. The Council, mindful of the fact that the SPD could be challenged on this point, deleted the Mixed Communities chapter from the SPD. In order to align the Sustainability Appraisal with the Scoping Report, the mixed communities element of the SA was also deleted since, without inclusion in a Scoping Report, it would be contrary to the SEA Directive.