

GROUP A – IDEAS AND OPTIONS (GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS)

GROUP FACILITATOR: GAVIN MISSONS		
Policy adjustments		
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Widen scope/increase flexibility of off-site provision and/or financial affordable housing contribution options to prevent affordable housing being linked to high market values (and therefore at the high end of the intermediate range).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <b>AGREED.</b> <i>General support for off-site in lieu of on-site provision, where appropriate, though a concern from one member re creating future ghettos. Although this approach could create mono-tenure sites, they would be small and unlikely to ever exceed the District’s largest rural exception site - so nothing like the creation of old council estates. Location of alternative sites would also be carefully considered so as not to create any unsustainable housing developments.</i></li> <li>– <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to follow up with planning colleagues as part of review of Affordable Housing SPD.</i></li> <li>– <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to include in the draft interim housing strategy.</i></li> </ul>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Widen scope/increase flexibility of payments in-lieu of on-site provision in areas where the delivery of affordable housing is not practical and/or where concentrated provision already exists etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <b>AGREED.</b> <i>Subject to evidence suggesting as such and on a site-by-site basis. This could enable us to develop housing in areas where a significant need is evidenced, rather than in an area where a concentrated supply of affordable housing already exists (shifting planning gains to another ward, therefore).</i></li> <li>– <b>NB:</b> <i>our new housing study will help identify need by type/location.</i></li> <li>– <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to follow up with planning colleagues as part of review of Affordable Housing SPD.</i></li> <li>– <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to include in the draft interim housing strategy.</i></li> </ul>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Negotiate fewer affordable housing units in order to secure enhanced standards on others, e.g. two homes fewer as a trade for some fully wheelchair accessible homes and/or other enhanced design units.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <b>AGREED.</b> <i>Although we’d need to have a clear understanding of the finances in order that any trade-off was not over and above what would be required to enable any enhanced units.</i></li> <li>– <b>NB:</b> <i>our new housing study will help identify need by type/location.</i></li> <li>– <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to follow up with planning colleagues as part of review of Affordable Housing SPD.</i></li> <li>– <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to discuss with HA partners.</i></li> </ul>

GROUP A – IDEAS AND OPTIONS (GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> to include in the draft interim housing strategy.</li> </ul>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduce more specific rules in the new affordable housing SPD, e.g. minimum percentage of Lifetime Homes and/or minimum percentage of fully wheelchair accessible properties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>NOT AGREED.</b> Too restrictive and would be difficult to achieve with already-difficult viability issues. This could be better addressed through measures on a site-by-site basis, as agreed above.</li> <li>- <b>NB:</b> our new housing study will still help identify need by type/location and allow us to negotiate with a good and reliable evidence base.</li> </ul>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consider specific zoning of land for affordable and/or specialist housing;</li> <li>- Or zoning for self-build housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>NOT AGREED.</b> This would be at odds with mixed communities concept.</li> <li>- SDC will need to zone land for self-build through the planning framework (legal requirement), so not needed in housing strategy.</li> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> to consider communications channels and associated promotional materials.</li> </ul>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adopt a rural policy which allows specialist housing on exceptions sites (including private sector).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>AGREED.</b> Subject to evidence (though no agreement to private element).</li> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> to follow up with planning colleagues as part of review of Affordable Housing SPD.</li> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> to include in the draft interim housing strategy.</li> </ul>
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Adopt a rural policy which allows cross-subsidy on exceptions sites, e.g. allowing a small number of market home sales to support the delivery of affordable housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>NOT AGREED.</b></li> </ul>
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consider more residential accommodation above existing shops, libraries, offices and car</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>AGREED.</b> Though subject to evidence.</li> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> to investigate further and consider in the interim housing</li> </ul>

GROUP A – IDEAS AND OPTIONS (GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS)

	parks etc., on both new-build and/or retrofit (approach taken in NYC).	<b>strategy and related planning policy.</b>
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Encourage high-density development, if pocket homes and other well-designed modern housing models.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <b>AGREED.</b> <i>There is a need for this kind of housing for younger economically-active but low-income households, though likely a resistance to zero parking provision and a concern re buy-to-let landlords. Although outright sale is the typical tenure, we could consider others to better control client types and income levels etc.</i></li> <li>– <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to investigate further and look at potential for intermediate rented units for working households with incomes exceeding SDHR level, but below £60k threshold (up to 80K from 01/04/16) - through intermediate range, therefore.</i></li> <li>– <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to investigate underground parking options.</i></li> <li>– <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to then feed into the draft interim housing strategy and relevant housing policy, if appropriate.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Investment</b>		
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Provide financial input to enable lifts and/or other assistive technologies to be built into in new social housing schemes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <b>AGREED.</b> <i>As per point 3 approach, above.</i></li> <li>– <i>Ongoing service charge/maintenance costs to be considered on a site-by-site basis.</i></li> <li>– <i>NB: our new housing study will help identify need by type/location.</i></li> <li>– <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to investigate further and identify potential approaches.</i></li> <li>– <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to then feed into the draft interim housing strategy and relevant housing policy, if appropriate.</i></li> </ul>
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Use S106 funds to commission more specific studies to help build up our evidence base (and to achieve particular objectives such as point 4).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <b>AGREED.</b> <i>Some concern re cost of such a study (it requiring fieldwork etc), but general consensus re the significant weight such a study would have in planning cases etc. It could also allow a settlement-specific AH policy and enable us to much more effectively plan for housing growth in areas where need is evidenced.</i></li> <li>– <i>Agreed funds from S106 affordable housing pot, but SDC to consider</i></li> </ul>

GROUP A – IDEAS AND OPTIONS (GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS)

		<p><i>this as a corporate item when setting future corporate budgets.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to take forward with planning policy colleagues in 2016.</i></li> </ul>
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fund a third-phase of the District Council’s own bespoke shared-ownership product (A Home of Your Own);</li> <li>- Include provisions in future phase for a ‘Housing for People with Learning Disabilities’ (HOLD) and ‘Shared-Ownership for the Elderly’ (SHOE) model.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>AGREED.</b> <i>To fund phase-3, subject to Moat’s proportion of investment (current concern) and housing-related priorities at that time.</i></li> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to investigate further with Moat Homes and produce a business case for further consideration on a phase-3, as and when required.</i></li> <li>- <b>AGREED.</b> <i>To consider inclusion of a specialist element, again subject to evidenced need.</i></li> <li>- <b>NB:</b> <i>our new housing study will help identify need by type/location.</i></li> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> <i>again, to investigate further with Moat Homes as part of any phase-3 considerations.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE: DUE TO GOVERNMENT POLICY CHANGES AND RELATED CUTS, MOAT CAN NO LONGER PARTICIPATE IN THIS SCHEME.</b></p>
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide financial incentives for landowners to prepare land for self-build housing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>NOT AGREED.</b> <i>Onus is on private land-owners, though we will operate a register to enable such development.</i></li> </ul>
<b>SDC assets</b>		
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Allocate SDC land for self-build housing and apply for CLG self-build grant (£150-million pot).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>NOT AGREED.</b> <i>Again, no financial support for private sector in this respect - though, as above, we will operate a register to enable such development.</i></li> </ul>
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Place more emphasis on the delivery of affordable housing (and less so on capital receipts) when disposing of SDC land.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>This could create future revenue issues as part of SDC’s investment plan.</i></li> <li>- <b>AGREED.</b> <i>We should look at on a site-by-site basis, however.</i></li> <li>- <b>NB:</b> <i>our new housing study will help identify need by type/location.</i></li> </ul>

GROUP A – IDEAS AND OPTIONS (GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to be taken to SMT for further consideration.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Other</b>		
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promote employer-led affordable housing projects (can be tied in with option 8).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>AGREED.</b> <i>As per point 8.</i></li> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to investigate further and consider in the draft interim housing strategy and planning policy.</i></li> </ul>
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop materials and undertake promotion to raise awareness of shared-ownership resales.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>AGREED.</b></li> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to take forward immediately.</i></li> </ul>
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase member-led promotion of affordable housing in respective ward areas to support housing, health and wider community strategy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>AGREED.</b> <i>Subject to any promotional activity being directly related to evidenced need in the respective parish/ward.</i></li> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to factor this into our working practices and prepare communications plans as and when required.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Additional</b>		
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- with 1% pa social housing rent reduction through 2016-20 (combined effect of over 20% loss) and future development programme under threat, SDC looks to provide S106 top-up funding to plug consequent funding gaps in housing developments in order to maintain a social rented tenure housing development programme going forward.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>NOT AGREED.</b> <i>Would potentially wipe out S106 pot and sacrifice all other work programmes.</i></li> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to continue to explore other means of achieving financially-viable projects, including a range of cross-subsidy models etc.</i></li> <li>- <b>ACTION:</b> <i>to review £350k (unused) allocation previously agreed for this purpose.</i></li> </ul>

DRAFT