

**Issue 10 Homes and Affordable Housing (WEL17 – WEL22)**

## Questions

10.1 What is the justification for the requirement for 15% of market homes to be designed to meet higher accessibility standards and is the reference to economic viability in the third paragraph of policy WEL17 appropriate and justified?

The Joint Promoters have withdrawn their objection to the level of prescription in this policy on the grounds that a viability test is introduced. The Joint Promoters accept and support the need for the provision of market homes that meet higher accessibility standards, but there needs to be some recognition that at 15% across the whole community this could have an impact on viability and the ability to support affordable housing or other forms of infrastructure.

10.2 Is the Council's approach to the provision of private market rental housing sufficiently flexible?

The Joint Promoters objected to this policy. The Council is considering further modifications in response and these will be contained in the Statement of Common Ground.

10.3 Core Strategy policy CS18 requires 40% affordable housing on sites of 15 or more dwellings. What is the justification for reducing the percentage at Welborne to 30% bearing in mind the significant need for this type of housing in the area?

There is clear evidence of low viability, see for example the Joint Promoters response to Question 11. Therefore a balance has to be struck between deliverability and the level of affordable housing that can be supported. As described in the response to question 11 the Joint Promoters are proposing the delivery of 30% affordable housing in each and every phase, but, the viability model that underpins that level of affordable housing has not yet been agreed with the Council. A requirement for 40% affordable housing would not be deliverable in any viability and funding model that is realistic. There would need to be a fundamental review of other infrastructure priorities.

10.4 Is the reference in paragraph 2 of policy WEL18, to the precise number and mix of affordable homes being agreed by the Council at the time a phase comes forward, a justified approach? Does it demonstrate that the plan is positively prepared and effective?

The joint promoters have proposed further modifications to this policy as it goes to the heart of delivery. The policy is too prescriptive and lacks flexibility.

The mix of affordable housing should be reviewed during the life of the plan as the needs of the Borough may change. We propose that the word "agreed" in para 6.20 is deleted and add "subject to viability" after "Therefore". The sentence could thus read "Therefore, subject to viability the mix of affordable homes... in each residential phase should reflect identified needs at the time the phase...."

10.5 Is the tenure split, of 70% being affordable or social rent and 30% being intermediate provision, justified?

The joint promoters would support a higher proportion of intermediate homes as they provide an opportunity for home ownership. It is important that the flexibility to provide affordable or social rented is maintained.

10.6 Is the inclusion of policy WEL22 on gypsies and travellers consistent with national policy? Does it have any substantive impact on the effectiveness of LP3?

The joint promoters have objected to this policy and have nothing further to add to their objection at this stage.