



# **Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document**

## **Consultation Statement**

---

June 2020

I.1. The Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides further guidance to support the implementation of Local Plan policies, in particular Policy SD28: Affordable Homes and Policy SD29: Rural Exception Sites. Once adopted, the SPD will be a material consideration for relevant planning applications.

I.2. This Consultation Statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 12(a) and (b) of the Town and Country (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 which states:

*“Before a local planning authority adopt a supplementary planning document it must—*

*(a) prepare a statement setting out—*

*(i) the persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document;*

*(ii) a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and*

*(iii) how those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document; and*

*(b) for the purpose of seeking representations under regulation 13, make copies of that statement and the supplementary planning document available in accordance with regulation 35 together with details of—*

*(i) the date by which representations must be made (being not less than 4 weeks from the date the local planning authority complies with this paragraph), and*

*(ii) the address to which they must be sent.”*

I.3. This statement sets out details of the consultation that has taken place to date which has informed and refined the SPD. It sets out details of how, when and with whom the initial consultations with interested parties and organisations took place and how this has informed the SPD.

I.4. Following the preparation of the draft SPD, the Authority resolved to undertake an eight week consultation on the Affordable Housing SPD between 24 September 2019 and 19 November 2019. As part of the consultation, the Authority:

- Published the draft Affordable Housing SPD on the SDNPA website
- Made the draft SPD available for inspection at the South Downs Centre during opening hours;
- Sent emails and letters to persons and organisations on the SDNPA Local Plan mailing list inviting them to examine the consultation documents and make representation on them during the consultation period;
- Sent emails to consultation bodies identified below, which the Authority considers to be affected by the SPD;
- Released details of the consultation to the local press via a press release;
- Presented the draft SPD to local agents at the SDNPA Agents Forum on 16 October 2019 and invited agents to respond to the consultation.

I.5. The Authority considered it appropriate to consult the following consultation bodies on the draft Affordable Housing SPD:

- Homes and Communities Agency
- Relevant district and county councils
  - Adur District Council
  - Arun District Council

- Brighton & Hove City Council
- Chichester District Council
- East Hampshire District Council
- East Sussex County Council
- Eastleigh Borough Council
- Hampshire County Council
- Horsham District Council
- Lewes & Eastbourne District Councils
- Mid Sussex District Council
- Surrey County Council
- Waverley District Council
- Wealden District Council
- West Sussex County Council
- Winchester City Council
- Worthing Borough Council
- Parish Councils within the National Park
- CPRE Hampshire
- Action in Rural Sussex
- Local developers and Registered Providers
- Estates within the National Park that have developed Whole Estate Plans

I.6. Consultation responses were received from 45 individuals and organisations. The comments received are summarised in **Appendix 1**. Officer comments relating to the responses received and how the SPD has been amended in response to these is set out in Appendix 1.

I.7. The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (As Amended) legally require local planning authorities, prior to adopting a SPD, to publish the Consultation Statement and revised SPD for comment for a minimum four week period. This consultation took place from the 2 March to 6 April 2020. A further eight representations were received during this period and these are summarised in **Appendix 2**. Officer comments relating to the responses received and how the SPD has been amended in response to these is set out in Appendix 2.

## Appendix I

### Draft Affordable Housing SPD: Summary of comments received Sept – Nov 2019 and officer comments

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
Andrew Simpson	Refers to Mid Sussex DC guidance note on Vacant Building Credit (VBC) – SDNPA should develop a similar guidance on applying VBC. Affordable homes in Lewes should be provided as Lewes Low Cost Housing.	Agree further guidance on VBC should be included in the SPD. The SPD states LLCH will apply in Lewes Town.	Provide further guidance on the application of VBC.
Andy McIvor	Specific objection to Wiston WEP; not relevant to the SPD consultation.		None required
Chichester District Council	2.12 Consistency with NPPF – amend wording from Intermediate Home Ownership to Low Cost or Affordable Home Ownership.	SPD is consistent with the Local Plan glossary.	None required
Chichester District Council	Suggests 2.19 is not compliant with policy 7.62 of Local Plan. To give priority to residents of specific settlements difficult to administer.	2.19 is consistent with cascade set out in 7.61 of the SDLP. This cascade has been approved by SDNPA members. The SDNPA will seek the early involvement of the relevant housing authority in securing and delivering affordable housing.	None required.
Chichester District Council	2.25 Typo - should RSL be RLV?	Typo	Correct typo
Chichester District Council	Figure 4 Lower margin of build cost may be acceptable – generally professional fees exceed 6% of build costs.	Figure 4 key inputs should ordinarily be used, if an applicant differs from these they will need to provide	Clarify that Fig 4 inputs are the benchmark, any departure from these will require justification and evidence.

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
		justification and evidence which will be independently reviewed.	
Chichester District Council	2.44 - Prefer term of Community Led Housing to be used. CLTs only represent one element.	This terminology would be more encompassing and offer more flexibility.	Reference in 2.44 to Community led housing added.
Chichester District Council	Section 4 – Legal Agreement Include reference to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum unit sizes</li> <li>• Restriction on disposals – non commencement until LHA/LPA has notification of RP</li> <li>• Mortgagee in possession clause</li> <li>• Description of process for letting (e,g through local housing register)</li> </ul> Benefits: reduces barriers to delivery & secures better fit with local housing register & allocation policy	Minimum unit sizes not needed in S106 as these are assessed by DM and covered by the approved plans.  Agree bullet 2 and 3  Bullet 4 would only be as good as the local housing register (see concerns of B&H CLT re housing lists). This is not essential for S106 purposes and should be covered by HA housing policies.	Add bullet 2 & 3 to section 4.
Chichester District Council	Appendix 2 Stronger commitment to indexation – methodology appears to produce lower figure than expected given higher value of properties in SDNPA	Agree to including a commitment to alter figures annually in line with BCIS All-in Tender Price Indices	Include reference to in lieu rates increasing in line with BCIS All-in Tender Price Indices.
Ringmer Area CLT	No mention of CLT's other than in para 2.44, lack identifying needs of CLTs in relation to policies SD27, 28 & 29	SDLP and the SPD support delivery of affordable homes through CLTs	Reference to appropriate legal agreements added to para. 2.51
Ringmer Area CLT	2.19 No acknowledgement of CLT's having specific occupancy policy. Unlikely to include local in connection priority 4. Concern re external (SDNPA) determination of local connections.	All forms of affordable housing delivery will be expected to apply the local connection cascade set out in the SDLP to meet local needs for affordable housing. Para. 7.62 of the SDLP recognises regard will be had	Add para in section 2 to clarify expectation to use SDNPA cascade for all affordable home developments in SDNP.

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
		for a CLT's objectives when a CLT is the managing body.	
Ringmer Area CLT	1.3 Concern that 100% on Rural Exception Sites (RES) will not be financially viable unless some market housing. Query that 100% is in line with NPPF rules.	Also raised by B&H CLT - RES is outside of settlement boundary and would not otherwise be built on. Emphasis in SDNP is 100% supported by Whole Plan viability assessment, any alternative only considered with support of viability appraisal.	Align SPD with SDLP regarding 100% affordable on RES
Ringmer Area CLT	Need for agreements to be drawn up for mixed schemes to assure landowners that CLT can deliver.	CLT's should be drawing up agreements with developer to secure sites, this should cover this issue.	Add para re need for agreements between developers/CLT's to secure sites.
Ringmer Area CLT	S106 needs to reflect roles of two parties in a development.	S106 is agreement between the developer and SDNPA, not an agreement with the CLT, this needs to be separate between developer/CLT.	Add para re need for agreements between developers/CLT's to secure sites.
Brighton & Hove CLT	Requirement of 20% shared ownership may be too low	Section 2.12 refers to a max 25% initial equity share, owners may increase their ownership and flexibility will be considered if local needs are met.	None
Brighton & Hove CLT	Market housing on RES – allowable with mechanisms to prevent being used for profit	Also raised by Ringmer (see above). Emphasis in SDNP should be 100% supported by Whole Plan viability assessment, any alternative only	Align SPD with SDLP regarding 100% affordable on RES

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
		considered with support of viability appraisal.	
Brighton & Hove CLT	Concern that LA housing registers may not represent all in housing need.	Noted.	None
Eames Almshouses	Consider adding almshouses as a source of social housing.	SPD to refer to Community Led Housing which incorporates a wide range of charitable trusts. Community-led housing organisations which create permanently affordable homes to meet local housing needs will be encouraged.	Reference in 2.44 to Community led housing added.
Eames Almshouses	Request for clarification of almshouses status	See above.	As above.
START CT	2.3, 2.15-2.17, 2.43-2.47, 2.53. Agree	Noted.	None required.
START CT	1.2, 1.3, 2.12, 2.22, 3.1 Concern re 100% on RES and 25% shared ownership limit with regard to viability	Emphasis in SDNP is 100% supported by Whole Plan viability assessment. Any alternative only considered with support of viability appraisal. 25% is the initial equity share, owners may increase their ownership and flexibility will be considered if local needs are met.	Align SPD with SDLP regarding 100% affordable on RES
START CT	1.2 Recognises issues with house prices in SDNPA but not importance of land prices in delivering RES. May rule out RES unless compromise can be found.	Land price should reflect RES are outside settlement boundary so would not normally be used for housing.	Align SPD with SDLP regarding 100% affordable on RES

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
START CT	Viability appraisal is calculated only on 100% affordable – assumes that landowners will accept residual land value figure.	Land price should reflect RES are outside settlement boundary so would not normally be used for housing.	None required.
START CT	S106 agreement Section 4 – fourth bullet – needs beefing up re completion of roads – wording is too weak. Should include details of services and access at point of occupation for each property. Should also include a layout plan detailing all properties and tenure.	Agree – add bullet re completion of roads etc prior to occupation. Add details of services and access that should be in place at occupation. Layout plan to be included in S106 to secure provision.	Add these to bullet list in Section 4 of the SPD.
Bargate Homes / Metis Homes / Oakford Homes	- SPD goes beyond scope of SPDs by introducing additional requirements on proposals in relation to viability. - SPD departs from assumptions used in BNP Paribas VA. No supporting evidence for the standardised VA inputs proposed in the SPD	SPD provides further guidance to support the implementation of LP policies. Para 7.64 to 7.66 of the LP sets out the requirement for a viability appraisal to justify any departure from SD28. Figure 4 key inputs should ordinarily be used, if an applicant differs from these they will need to provide justification.	Clarify that Fig 4 inputs are the benchmark, any departure from these will require justification.
Bargate Homes / Metis Homes / Oakford Homes	2.12 & 2.13 AH Tenure SDNPA should not assume preference for Social Rent over Affordable Rent  Shared Ownership Housing is typically offered at 40% of OMV (SPD assumes 25%)  40% for discounted market sales housing does not reflect the NPPF definition (at least 20%)	Defra Circular 2010 (paras 76-79) sets out the government expectation that NPAs maintain a focus on affordable housing and ensure that the needs of local communities in the National Parks are met. Social Rent is most affordable to those in greatest need. 25% is the initial equity share, owners may increase their	SDNPA will seek a minimum discount of 30% on local market value, reflecting the high cost of buying in the National Park and local income levels. A minimum 30% discount is also in line with current government proposed 'first homes' model.



Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
	Placing definitions of affordable housing in the Local Plan glossary above definitions in the NPPF is at odds with Government policy.	ownership and flexibility will be considered if local needs are met. Government definition of DMS sets minimum discount, does not preclude higher discount	Para. 2.13 amended to state that Local Plan definitions of affordable homes apply within the National Park.
Bargate Homes / Metis Homes / Oakford Homes	2.25 Landowner premium EUV + 10% is far too low – DVS typically agrees 20%, 30 -40% is accepted elsewhere in the South. EUV + 10% may result in less than market value - land will not be released. Premium should be 20-30% incentive.	Land owner premium will be site specific. Figure 4 key inputs should ordinarily be used, if an applicant differs from these they will need to provide justification and evidence which will be independently reviewed.	Clarify that Fig 4 inputs are the benchmark, any departure from these will require justification and evidence.
Bargate Homes / Metis Homes / Oakford Homes	<p>Viability Assumptions</p> <p>External works – ranges from 5-35% of Main Works Costs and typically 25%. BNP Paribas VA assumed 17.5% - this was too low.</p> <p>Professional fees – at least 8%. BNP Paribas VA assumed 10%. Planning applications in National Park require greater professional fees. (Provides appeal case that supports 10%)</p> <p>Selling costs – should be at least 2%. BNP Paribas VA used 3%</p> <p>Profit – should be 20% (as used by BNP Paribas VA) – 15% only appropriate for short term capital outlay or pre-sold project.</p>	Figure 4 key inputs should ordinarily be used, if an applicant differs from these they will need to provide justification and evidence which will be independently reviewed.	Clarify that Fig 4 inputs are the benchmark, any departure from these will require justification and evidence.

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
Bargate Homes / Metis Homes / Oakford Homes	Nominations rights – S106 should reflect RPs nomination rights on 1 <sup>st</sup> lets and subsequent lets.	Nomination rights to be agreed between housing authority and RP and will be expected to reflect the SDNPA cascade	None.
Bargate Homes / Metis Homes / Oakford Homes	Low Cost Home Ownership Unrestricted staircasing should be allowed. S106 needs to include mortgage in possession clause otherwise it will be unmortgageable.	Para. 2.12 allows for occupiers to increase their equity share towards outright ownership.	Mortgage in Possession clause to be included in S106
Bargate Homes / Metis Homes / Oakford Homes	<p>Review Mechanisms Mandatory review should also allow for reduction in AH if review concludes this.</p> <p>SDNPA should state whether a review of viability post permission or at reserved matters will be accepted.</p> <p>Questions SDNPA position to review AH contributions if these are agreed resulting from Valuation.</p> <p>Questions Early Review mechanism – use on small sites, clear definition of when.</p>	<p>A reduced AH provision would require a new or revised planning application. Reviews of viability would only be undertaken post permission where the review triggers set out in the SPD document are met. Review mechanisms are widely used and supported by National Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 10-009-20190509)</p> <p>Early review will be required if sufficient progress is not made. This is triggered where ground works and foundations are not completed within 2 years of permission being granted.</p> <p>For an early stage review where development has been subject to</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Clarification provided on meaning of sufficient progress.</p> <p>Clarification provided in respect of late stage review mechanisms that</p>

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
	<p>Not practical to require onsite AH provision as part of review (dwellings already sold) – financial contribution instead.</p> <p>Late Stage Review – considered to be unreasonable and impractical</p>	<p>no/limited construction progress there is clearly the ability to provide any additional affordable housing required on site. For late stage review mechanisms where most of the development has been completed or sold it is acknowledged that a financial contribution toward off site affordable housing is more likely.</p> <p>Review mechanisms are widely used and supported by National Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 10-009-20190509). The benefits of a late stage review are that they are based on actual values achieved and actual costs incurred. A late stage review is restricted to development schemes of 25 dwellings and above and, in most cases, only changes to Gross Development Value and build costs will need to be considered. The approach is therefore considered both reasonable and proportionate.</p>	<p>the outcome of such a review is typically a financial contribution toward off site affordable housing provision (rather than affordable housing provision on site).</p> <p>None.</p>
Bargate Homes / Metis Homes / Oakford Homes	Vacant Building Credit Approach in SPD is not consistent with NPPF and NPPG	The policy is intended to incentivise brownfield development, including the reuse or redevelopment of	Include detailed criteria on the assessment of applications for VBC.

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No requirement to be in use for 6 months in last 3 years</li> <li>- NPPG does not state whole building must be vacant</li> <li>- CIL and VBC can both be applied</li> </ul>	empty and redundant buildings. It is therefore reasonable to expect the whole building to be vacant. Given that the NPPG states that a building should not have been made vacant for the sole purpose of redevelopment it is also reasonable to expect a minimum period of vacancy. CIL and VBC cannot normally be applied to the same building.	
Bargate Homes / Metis Homes / Oakford Homes	Rural Exception Sites SPD should be more supportive towards RES – give greater weight to AH provision over environmental impacts. Site selection process should not need to consider sites within the settlement.	First purpose of the National Park is given priority. All development in the SDNP is expected to be landscape-led. Agree that sites within the settlement boundary do not need to be considered.	Remove reference to alternative sites within the settlement boundary.
Angmering Park Estate	Greater incentive required to persuade landowners to bring forward ‘exception sites’ (NOTE: Angmering Park do not have a WEP, nor have they been in active discussion with SDNPA to produce one in last 2 years). For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• allowing 50% market housing</li> <li>• allowing Estate to retain a proportion of nomination rights</li> </ul>	Emphasis in SDNP should be 100% supported by Whole Plan viability assessment, any alternative only considered with support of viability appraisal.	Align SPD text with SDLP regarding 100% affordable on RES
Barlavington Estate	Policy will only be successful if there is an element of market housing (approx. 33%) to provide the revenue to construct the AH. (NOTE: are engaged in WEP process, although no WEP endorsed)	Emphasis in SDNP should be 100% supported by Whole Plan viability assessment, any alternative only	Align SPD text with SDLP regarding 100% affordable on RES

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
		considered with support of viability appraisal.	
Bramshott & Liphook PC	General support for SPD. Proposes mechanism whereby small local developer obtains permission covering multiple sites to be built out over 5-10 years.	Planning application can be made for multiple sites, although time period may be a restriction.	None
Country Land and Business Association (CLA)	Seeking greater flexibility in the SPD. LP glossary definitions of AH should not take precedent over national definitions. SPD should support landowners providing AH (in place of RPs, HA or CLTs) especially on small sites. NPPF para 77 support cross subsidy on RES.	2.43 delivering AH does acknowledge landowners as potentially delivering and managing AH	Amend text on RES to reflect Local Plan more closely
CPRE Sussex	Support for Local Plan policies and SPD. Requiring 100% affordable on RES is counter-productive, SPD should reflect approach in LP para 7.78. SPD needs to be more flexible regarding CLTs e.g. in regards to tenancy allocations, local connection & type of tenancy	Agree that SPD should reflect more closely the approach set out in the LP regarding RES. Para. 2.20 states the specific local connection criteria applied to a site may reflect evidence provided by a CLT.	Amend text on RES to reflect Local Plan more closely
David Cubey	Objection to the Wiston WEP and prospect that Bayards Field will be put forward as a RES.		None required
Mr Trevor Cree	Objection raises the issue of settlements just outside the SDNP boundary and associated development pressure at these locations. In particular objection relates to Steyning and proposals in the WEP.	Noted.	None required
Dr Prosser	Raises a number of affordable housing issues relating to South Harting including support for C2 accommodation and raising the priority given to an employment connection in the cascade. Smaller	Issues relating to South Harting are noted. Employment connection is already covered in the local connection criteria.	None

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
	villages in the NP should be treated differently to the larger conurbations.		
Elizabeth Lawrence	Annexes could provide short term low cost accommodation for local permanent and seasonal workers.	Noted	None
Eric Croft	2.1 should be landscape & <u>natural habitat led</u> 2.12 social rented housing should only be provided by registered providers Fig 4 – why does APR vary? 2.28 In lieu financial contributions should only go to housing authority provision 2.38 Tied agricultural/forestry worker dwellings should be in perpetuity.	SDLP Policy SD5 requires landscape-led development, biodiversity, the water environment and other ecosystem services are encompassed in the landscape-led approach. Other forms of affordable housing may be provided by other providers e.g. CLTs. In lieu financial contributions will be used for affordable housing provision within the National Park. Occupancy conditions are secured in S106 and not removed while there is a need for such dwellings in the local area	None
Findon Parish Council	Refers to current planning applications which do not follow the guidance in regards to up-to-date local housing needs assessment. Para. 2.16 should clarify who supplies evidence for housing need.	Housing need assessments prepared by different organisations varying by location e.g. Action Hampshire in EHDC, CDC in CDC	None
Fittleworth Parish Council	General support for the SPD. In lieu financial contributions should be ring fenced for use in the parish they are collected. Concerned that housing authority tenure preference will not reflect local needs. Concerned that occupancy conditions & local connection criteria are not strong enough.	In lieu financial contributions will be used within local area collected wherever possible. There can be time restrictions on the use of S106 funds such that they need to be spent in a timely manner.	Include reference to using fund raised locally wherever possible and within a timely manner.

<b>Person or organisation who made representations</b>	<b>Issue raised</b>	<b>SDNPA response</b>	<b>Proposed action</b>
Friends of Lewes	Support for the SPD and implementation of LLCH via the SPD in particular. In lieu financial contributions should be ring fenced for use in neighbourhood area collected. Amend 2.48 to state in lieu financial contributions will be used in Lewes NDP area.	Seek to use in lieu contributions locally wherever possible, although there may not always be opportunities within the parish and there may be time limit for spending in lieu funds.	Amend para. 2.28 to state funds raised from financial contributions will be used to increase affordable housing provision locally (within the parish) wherever possible and within a timely manner.
George Gordon	Specific objection to Wiston WEP and example site.	Not relevant to the SPD consultation.	None required.
Hywel and Jean Griffiths	Specific objection to Wiston WEP and example site.	Not relevant to the SPD consultation.	None required
Glynde Estates	100% affordable is counter-productive, and unfeasible economically; mix should include some open market units (particularly if required to build using traditional materials and styles). In terms of Nomination Rights, happy to work in partnership with CLT's, but Estate would want final say on who occupies property.	Emphasis in SDNP should be 100% supported by Whole Plan viability assessment, any alternative only considered with support of viability appraisal.	Align SPD text with SDLP regarding 100% affordable on RES
Ian Graham for West Dean Estate	100% affordable is counter-productive, and unfeasible economically; mix should include some open market units (particularly if required to build using traditional materials and styles).	Emphasis in SDNP should be 100% supported by Whole Plan viability assessment, any alternative only considered with support of viability appraisal.	Align SPD text with SDLP regarding 100% affordable on RES
Itchen Valley Parish Council	RES policy should allow for some enabling development subject to an enhanced scheme or community facilities.	Emphasis in SDNP should be 100% supported by Whole Plan viability assessment, any alternative only considered with support of viability appraisal.	Update SPD to reflect para 7.78 of the LP – subject to viability appraisal will consider optimum alternative option.

<b>Person or organisation who made representations</b>	<b>Issue raised</b>	<b>SDNPA response</b>	<b>Proposed action</b>
Kingston Parish Council	Support for the SPD.	Noted	None required.
Stephen Fuggles	Specific objection to Wiston WEP and example site.	Not relevant to the SPD consultation.	None required.
Luken Beck	Queries para 2.25 landowner premium of just 10% of EUV. Should use DCLG benchmark land values for greenfield sites. Disagrees with use of VA key inputs. GDV should be based on net sales income. Affordable housing revenue does not need to be based on RP evidence. Build costs should be based on bespoke cost plan or upper quartile BCIS standard. Professional fees should be 10%. Agrees with finance costs. Developer profit should be 20%.	Figure 4 key inputs should ordinarily be used, if an applicant differs from these they will need to provide justification and evidence which will be independently reviewed.	Clarify that Fig 4 inputs are the benchmark, any departure from these will require justification and evidence.
Lewes & Eastbourne DC	Blended profit margin for open market and affordable homes falls below the range allowed by NPPG (15-20%)	Development in the SDNP is generally low risk, a profit margin at the lower end of the scale is considered reasonable. Figure 4 key inputs should ordinarily be used, if an applicant differs from these they will need to provide justification and evidence which will be independently reviewed.	Clarify that Fig 4 inputs are the benchmark, any departure from these will require justification and evidence.
Midhurst Society	Support for SPD. Suggestion that long term vacant properties should be made available for sale to CLT at 50% discount.	Noted	None
Mr Hicks	Support for SPD with following comments – AH should be for working persons and not retirees.	Noted	None



<b>Person or organisation who made representations</b>	<b>Issue raised</b>	<b>SDNPA response</b>	<b>Proposed action</b>
	No design compromises. Benefits to community should be clearly set out. Location of care homes should take into account proximity of health services.		
Nick Bailey	Specific objection to Wiston WEP and example site.	Not relevant to the SPD consultation.	None required.
Oliver Darlington	Comments relate to government's definition of affordability which is not genuinely affordable.	Local Plan policy emphasis on affordable rent tenure reflecting evidence of need. SPD also supports the implementation of LLCH.	None
Sarah O'Kane	Support for emphasis on affordable rent tenure and smaller units. When dealing with large sites, priority should be given to proposals put forward by CLTs.	SDLP and SPD are supportive of delivery through CLTs.	None
Selborne PC	General support for the SPD. Request that Parish councils are consulted on suitable mix for a site. Recommend revised wording regarding WEPs at para 2.12. Revise para. 2.38 to take account of former estate worker accommodation. Two paragraphs 2.50. Concerned whether the AH review mechanism robustly addresses reduced AH provision post permission. Detailed wording amendments to RES section proposed.	SPD para 2.17 refers to regard being had to any local housing needs evidence, which would include evidence presented by the parish council.	Correct para. numbering and some wording amendments made as suggested.
Steep Parish Council	Support for SPD. Parish Council should have greater say over local connections and nominations in their parish.	Local connection is determined by the SDNPA, parish council and Housing Authority. Anyone eligible within the parish can be on the housing register and the SDNP local connection cascade will give	None

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
		preference to those within the settlement / parish.	
Storrington Parish Council	Number of observations made. Question raised as to how right to buy legislation will affect perpetual affordability objective?	National legislation allows some ex-council home tenants to have a Preserved Right to Buy. In addition, Right to Acquire allows some housing association tenants to purchase their homes at a discount (the discount varies from £9,000 to £16,000). The SDNPA will endeavour through the SDLP policies SD28 and SD29 to address affordable housing needs in the National Park.	None
Sue Fasquelle	Objection to government definition of affordable housing.	AH SPD provides guidance for the implementation of LP policies SD27, 28 & 29. Whilst the LP needs to be in conformity with national policy and guidance, the LP does emphasise the provision of affordable rent tenure and the SPD seeks to implement LLCH within Lewes neighbourhood area.	None required.
Sussex Hub AiRS	General support for approach taken by the SDNPA in particular AH on small sites, commitment to social rented and community led housing. Seeks greater flexibility for Community Led Housing (CLH) to offer a higher equity share on shared ownership units to make schemes more viable. Also suggests some flexibility re. 100% AH on RES	Support noted and welcomed. Para. 2.12 of the SPD provides flexibility on shared ownership to reflect providers' business model as long as the core objective of meeting housing needs is met. This applies to CLH as well as other registered	SPD to reflect para. 7.78 of the LP on RES & mix of tenure. New para 3.3 states SDNPA will work with relevant stakeholders for optimum alternative option where viability is a barrier to delivery.

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
	<p>could better reflect the aims of CLH which are genuinely seeking to address local needs. Argues for bespoke housing allocation policies – housing registers don't reflect rural AH needs. No mention of CLH in the SPD. Professional fees considered too low for the types of project CLH will seek to bring forward.</p>	<p>providers. Emphasis in SDNP should be 100% AH on RES which is supported by the Whole Plan viability assessment. Where viability appraisal evidence shows this is not viable, the SDNPA will seek the best alternative option to meet the needs of the local community. Para 2.20 of the SPD states that local connection and occupancy criteria for specific sites will have regard to evidence presented by CLH organisations where applicable. Agree that reference to CLH would be more encompassing. Figure 4 key inputs should ordinarily be used, if an applicant differs from these they will need to provide justification and evidence which will be independently reviewed.</p>	<p>Include reference to CLH in SPD (includes co-housing, cooperatives &amp; community self build)</p>
<p>Wealden DC Housing &amp; Property Services</p>	<p>Para 2.8 C2 use – case law suggests 2 hours week minimum care requirement</p> <p>To enable delivery, AH should be required to be built to RP and Homes England standards (e.g nationally described space standards) and Building Regs Part Q - security.</p>	<p>In the appeal case referred to, the LPA had set no guideline minimum requirement. 4 hours is considered reasonable to qualify as care that is significant.</p> <p>Onus is on developer to ensure necessary standards are met to ensure onward sale to a Registered Provider.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
	<p>Reference to HCA should be Homes England / Regulator of Social Housing.</p> <p>Parish level information on affordable home ownership need is not readily available.</p> <p>Suggests Local Connection criteria has 5<sup>th</sup> priority which refers back to Local Housing Authority.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>An up-to-date Local Housing Needs Assessment would address this.</p> <p>This cascade was approved by SDNPA members at Committee. The SDNPA will seek the early involvement of the relevant housing authority in securing and delivering affordable housing.</p>	<p>Amend references to Homes England / Regulator as relevant.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
Winchester CC	<p>Support classification of extra care housing as C3. Chesil Lodge, Winchester is good example of mixed tenure extra care scheme.</p> <p>Social rent requires significant funding which may only be granted by Homes England post permission.</p> <p>Shared ownership – 25% share can make unviable for RP, allow for higher share at point of sale.</p> <p>Discounted market sale – any evidence 40% discount is viable?</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Social rent is the SDNPA's preferred form of rented tenure and the Authority will seek to secure this tenure as widely as possible. Para. 2.12 of the SPD provides flexibility on shared ownership to reflect providers' business model as long as the core objective of meeting housing needs is met. SDNPA will seek a minimum discount of 30% on local market value, reflecting the high</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>SDNPA will seek a minimum discount of 30% on local market value.</p>

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
	<p>Cascade should include prioritizing those within the parish but outside the SDNP.</p> <p>Landowner premium of just 10% is low – any evidence to support this?</p> <p>In lieu financial contribution should vary according to size of units and reflect the onsite mix.</p> <p>Extending allocation of AH across the SDNP does not reflect spirit of providing AH for local people.</p>	<p>cost of buying in the National Park and local income levels. A minimum 30% discount is also in line with current government proposed ‘first homes’ model.</p> <p>Para 2.19 sets out that those with a local connection to the parish, <u>partly</u> or wholly within the National Park will be prioritised within the cascade.</p> <p>Land owner premium will be site specific. Figure 4 key inputs should ordinarily be used, if an applicant differs from these they will need to provide justification and evidence which will be independently reviewed.</p> <p>Financial contribution in lieu is based on size mix required by SD27. This is considered to be a reasonable approach and provides a clear in lieu financial contribution rate per affordable home.</p> <p>Cascade prioritises local need i.e. the settlement, parish &amp; nearby settlements, before the wider SDNP area. SDLP and DEFRA circular</p>	<p>None required.</p> <p>Clarify that Fig 4 inputs are the benchmark, any departure from these will require justification and evidence.</p> <p>None.</p>

Person or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
		directs the Authority to reflect local affordable housing need within the National Park.	
Valerie Haggie	Raises a number of concerns regarding the King Edward VII development and recent planning application; not relevant to the SPD consultation.	Noted.	None required

## Appendix 2

### Consultation Statement & Revised Affordable Housing SPD: Summary of comments received March 2020 and officer comments

People or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
Cove Construction	<p>SPD takes an unreasonable approach to viability appraisal (VA).</p> <p>SPD sets landowner incentive to apply to Existing Use Value (EUV) as 10% for non-agricultural uses. The premium for landowners should reflect circumstances of the site.</p> <p>Developer profit level is unreasonable and unrealistic. It doesn't reflect the risk level in getting through DM process given the SDNP landscape designation and high design &amp; sustainability requirements.</p>	<p>The SPD requirements for viability appraisal are in line with National Planning Guidance. Minimum content of an applicant's viability appraisal is set out in Appendix 3 and any viability appraisal should be supported by appropriate available evidence.</p>	<p>Figure 4 checklist of key inputs for viability appraisal to be removed from the SPD.</p>
CPRE Hampshire	<p>Support for the amended draft SPD.</p> <p>Raises the issue of commuting to work and its contribution to the climate change emergency. Current local connection cascade could lead to people occupying affordable housing considerable distance away from their place of work. Suggests place of employment is factored into the last stage of the cascade.</p>	<p>Support welcomed.</p> <p>Note the issue of commuting and its contribution to the generation of greenhouse gas emissions. Covid-19 pandemic has illustrated that commuting can be reduced through alternative working arrangements and use of virtual technology. Also it is noted that the criteria for local connection used by housing authorities and set out in the SPD</p>	<p>None required.</p>

People or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
		includes being employed or due to take up employment in the relevant area.	
Environment Agency	Flood risk should be a key consideration for the site selection process for RES and assessing potential RES should meet the requirements for sequential test and exception test.	Agreed. Vulnerability to flooding should be a key consideration in the assessment of potential RES sites.	Include additional bullet point at para. 3.6 'vulnerability to flooding'
Findon Parish Council	No further comments to make.	N/A	None
Historic England	No comments to make.	N/A	None
Highways England	No comments to make on the amended draft.	N/A	None
McCarthy & Stone	<p>Para. 2.8 reference to 'care home' should be deleted, extra care housing could fall within use class C2.</p> <p>The reference to a minimum of 4 hours is arbitrary and should be removed.</p> <p>Tenure has very little to do with use class and should be removed from the list at Para. 2.9</p>	<p>Agreed, planning applications for extra-care housing may fall into either category C2 or C3, the level of care provided determines the use class. In this paragraph use the term 'residential institution / accommodation' as used in the Use Class order.</p> <p>It is reasonable to expect a minimum level of care in judging which use class a development falls within.</p> <p>Tenure is one of several variables in the type and form of extra-care housing and will be given</p>	<p>Replace references to 'care home' with 'residential institution or accommodation' in para 2.8.</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>



People or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
	<p>Provision of therapy rooms should not be a determining factor.</p> <p>Para 2.10 suggests a degree of independence is indicative of a C3 use, this is erroneous.</p> <p>Para 2.11 suggests self-contained accommodation is determinative of a C3 use, it is not.</p> <p>Para 2.12-14 tenure requirements for housing for older people should reflect the needs of older people and not tenure needs of housing overall.</p>	<p>consideration when judging the use class of an application.</p> <p>Provision of therapy rooms is one of various indicators of the level of care to be provided and will be given consideration when judging the use class of an application.</p> <p>Retaining a degree of independence is the converse to being dependent on care. For a development to classify as C2 use class, the provision of care must be significant and the care provided must be the primary reason why residents seek to live there.</p> <p>The form of accommodation is one of several elements that will be considered in making a judgement on the use class of an application.</p> <p>The tenure requirements of SDLP SD28 are based on evidence from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Housing &amp; Economic Development Assessment. In absence of locally specific evidence on the tenure</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

People or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
	<p>Viability inputs for specialised housing for older people varies from conventional housing and should be acknowledged in Para 2.28. Profit levels are established at 20% and a 10% landowner premium is unrealistic.</p>	<p>needs of older people it is considered appropriate to apply these tenure requirements across housing types including specialist housing for older people.</p> <p>The SPD requirements for viability appraisal are in line with National Planning Guidance. Minimum content of an applicant's viability appraisal is set out in Appendix 3 and any viability appraisal should be supported by appropriate available evidence.</p>	<p>Figure 4 checklist of key inputs for viability appraisal to be removed from the SPD.</p>
Midhurst Society	<p>Repeats suggestion that CLTs are given the right to purchase vacant properties which are vacant for a number of years.</p>	<p>Suggestion is beyond the scope and remit of the SPD.</p>	<p>None.</p>
Oakford Homes	<p>Representation maintains it would be unlawful to adopt the SPD as a supplementary planning document as it contains policy statements on viability and review mechanisms which constitute new policy and should be in a DPD such as a Local Plan and not a SPD.</p>	<p>The SPD requirements for viability appraisal are in line with National Planning Guidance. Minimum content of an applicant's viability appraisal is set out in Appendix 3 and any viability appraisal should be supported by appropriate available evidence. Officers will consider whether the assumptions used by an applicant are reasonable. Clawback clauses may be negotiated in S106</p>	<p>Figure 4 checklist of key inputs for viability appraisal to be removed from the SPD.</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.57-2.71 on review mechanisms to be deleted from the SPD.</p>

People or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
		agreements on a case by case basis in line with paragraph 7.67 of the Local Plan.	
SMART CLT	<p>Maximum equity on shared ownership should be 90% to ensure the dwelling is available to the community in perpetuity with first option of purchase going to the landlord. Para 3.2 suggests outright ownership will be an option.</p> <p>Support for new paragraph 3.3.</p>	<p>Agree, Local Plan policy SD28 states affordable housing should where feasible remain affordable in perpetuity.</p> <p>Support welcome.</p>	Remove brackets '(unless an occupant has increased their equity share to outright ownership)' from para. 3.2.
Waverley District Council	No comments to make.	N/A	None
Wealden District Council	No comments to make	N/A	None
Winchester City Council	<p>Para. 2.16 &amp; 3.4 clarification that a housing needs survey is not required should other evidence exists.</p> <p>Fig 1 does not state whether homes can be flats or the occupancy rates (e.g 2 bed 4 person rather than 2 bed 3 person</p> <p>2.22 how will Discounted Market Sales units be marketed?</p>	<p>Should other appropriate evidence exist, a housing needs survey is not required.</p> <p>Flats may be appropriate depending on the site circumstances. The figure is for illustrative purposes and is not intended to go into detail of occupancy rates.</p> <p>Whilst specific marketing requirements are likely to be site specific, agree that the SPD can make clear that minimum marketing requirements which prioritise local</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Include the following in para 2.22 "Marketing arrangements will be included in a S106 agreement and will include minimum marketing periods to ensure local needs are</p>

People or organisation who made representations	Issue raised	SDNPA response	Proposed action
	<p>2.47 Stronger wording / evidence needed on developers effectively managing affordable housing</p> <p>3.3 Tenure on Rural Exception Sites should reflect local needs</p> <p>Section 4 - concerned that the 21 day timeframe for housing authorities to nominate is insufficient to work through the cascade.</p>	<p>needs will be included in a S106 agreement.</p> <p>The SPD requires developers to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the SDNPA that they can provide and manage the affordable housing to the same quality as a Registered Provider. This is considered to be sufficient to ensure effective management.</p> <p>Agreed. SD29 requires tenure to reflect up-to-date evidence of local need.</p> <p>Note that the timeframe may be tight given the example of a 2 week advertising window used by Hampshire Home Choices. Timeframe will be extended slightly but it is important to ensure affordable homes are allocated to local needs promptly.</p>	<p>prioritised in line with the cascade set out in paragraph 7.61 of the SDLP and paragraph 2.19 of this SPD.”</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Amend timeframe in para. 4.3 to 28 days.</p>