

Consultation Documents Update and Proposed Responses
Report by Planning Policy Officer

Summary:	This report informs the Committee of the Officers' proposed response to planning policy consultations recently received, and invites any comments or guidance the Committee may have.
Recommendation:	That the report be noted and the nature of proposed response be endorsed.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Appendix 1 shows selected planning policy consultation documents received by the Authority since the last Planning Committee meeting, together with the officer's proposed response.
- 1.2 The Committee's endorsement, comments or guidance are invited.

2 Financial Implications

- 2.1 There are no financial implications.

Background papers: None

Author: Natalie Beal
Date of report: 22 October 2014

Appendices: APPENDIX 1 – Schedule of Planning Policy Consultations received

Planning Policy Consultations Received

ORGANISATION:	Norwich City Council
DOCUMENT:	Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document
LINK	http://www.norwich.gov.uk/YourCouncil/Consultations/Pages/NorwichLocalPlanAffordableHousingSPD.aspx
RECEIVED:	26 September 2014
DUE DATE:	31 October 2014 (we have an extension to 7 November 2014)
STATUS:	Consultation
PROPOSED LEVEL:	Planning Committee endorsed.
NOTES:	<p><u>Background</u> Norwich City Council are consulting on a new <i>Affordable housing supplementary planning document</i> (Affordable Housing SPD) to provide further detail to support adopted <i>Joint Core Strategy</i> Policy 4 (JCS4) and the Development Management Policies Plan Policy DM33, which will come into force in late 2014. The SPD will form part of the new local plan for the city which sets out policies and proposals to guide development and change in Norwich until 2026.</p> <p><u>Summary of document</u> The SPD provides guidance on the council's approach to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on-site provision of affordable housing in accordance with <i>Joint Core Strategy 4</i> • how the council will deal with applications where viability means that affordable housing cannot be provided on site, including prioritisation of planning obligations and how commuted sums for provision off-site will be calculated • review of development viability, and • guidance on what the council expects to be included in a viability assessment. <p><u>Relevance to the Broads Authority</u> The Broads Authority defers to the relevant constituent Councils' Affordable Housing policy as set out in DP23 of the Development Management DPD. The Sites Specifics Local Plan allocates land at the Utilities Site for around 250 dwellings which will trigger Norwich City Council's Affordable Housing policy. As such, this SPD is of great relevance to the Broads Authority as it expands on the policy to which we defer.</p>
PROPOSED RESPONSE:	Section 2, page 6: Local Policy Context. This section needs to explain how the Broads Authority defers to Norwich City Council's Affordable Housing Policy for development that is within Norwich City Council's Administrative Area (as per DP23 of the Development Management DPD). Subsequently, this SPD will also be referred to for any planning application that is submitted and triggers JCS4 (such as the Utilities Site). This fact that this SPD effectively applies to two Local

Planning Authorities is fundamental to this SPD.

Paragraph 7, page 6. Clarification is sought if an application is 0.4Ha in size. The wording of the policy does not make it clear if the Affordable Housing contribution should be 20% or 30%. Whilst this is the wording policy and the SPD cannot change that, perhaps the SPD can clarify this ambiguity.

Paragraph 41, page 13. This should include reference to who pays for the independent verification This is set out later in the SPD at paragraph 66, but could be referred to here as well. Furthermore, it should be clarified what is meant by the reasonable profit return?

Paragraph 63, page 18.

- Criterion 1. If the financial appraisal has demonstrated that the scheme cannot deliver one house, does this criterion allow for commuted sums to be paid for a partial cost of a dwelling?
- Notwithstanding the previous comment on criterion 1, is there an element of sensitivity testing that is expected – that is to say testing the viability at 30%, 25%, 20% etc. affordable housing contribution?
- Should the last sentence of criterion 1 say ‘...is not sufficiently viable to enable the provision of **even one** affordable dwelling on site’? The JCS policy will typically require the delivery of more than one affordable dwelling, so the current wording does not seem clear.

Page 18, last paragraph. Need some guidance in this document relating to the information required to be provided to demonstrate that the constraints on the site make it impractical for development in a form attractive to RPs.

Paragraph 69, page 19. Suggest that something along the lines of ‘The City Council will provide justification for spending the money on a city-wide basis’ is added.

Paragraph 74, page 20. First sentence. ‘...via a deed of variation to the original **S106** agreement.’

Page 21. Recommend the option of ‘Clawback’ be mentioned here. This provision has been used twice in the Broads in the last two or three years, at Pegasus development in Oulton Broad and Ditchingham Dam development in South Norfolk. On both occasions, the relevant Council’s Housing Team, the BA’s Development Management Team and the developer have worked together to produce a suitable and appropriate agreement. The Clawback Provision applies if there is a significant improvement in market conditions during the construction and sale period of the scheme. An agreed percentage of the difference between base price and sale price is passed to the Council for Affordable Housing.

Paragraph 81, page 22. These bullet points have the potential to be of great use to developers, however as written they are not in a logical order and the wording could be improved to make them more user friendly. A general review of the wording and order is strongly recommended.

Page 29. Wording after table. Suggest the formula is set out using the letters as included in the headers to each row of the table.

	<p>Page 32 'Sustainability standards' bullet point. Where there is mention of Code for Sustainable Homes, is this appropriate given the Government's intention as set out in the Housing Standards Review consultation? If the reference remains, should it say something like 'or successor document' or 'or subsequent requirements'?</p>
--	---