

GROUP A – IDEAS AND OPTIONS (GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS)

GROUP FACILITATOR: GAVIN MISSONS		
Policy adjustments		
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – AGREED. <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> – ACTION: <i>to follow up with planning colleagues as part of review of Affordable Housing SPD.</i> – ACTION: <i>to include in the draft interim housing strategy.</i>
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – AGREED. <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> – NB: <i>our new housing study will help identify need by type/location.</i> – ACTION: <i>to follow up with planning colleagues as part of review of Affordable Housing SPD.</i> – ACTION: <i>to include in the draft interim housing strategy.</i>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – AGREED. <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> – NB: <i>our new housing study will help identify need by type/location.</i> – ACTION: <i>to follow up with planning colleagues as part of review of Affordable Housing SPD.</i> – ACTION: <i>to discuss with HA partners.</i>

GROUP A – IDEAS AND OPTIONS (GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ACTION: to include in the draft interim housing strategy.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NOT AGREED. 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. - NB: our new housing study will still help identify need by type/location and allow us to negotiate with a good and reliable evidence base.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider specific zoning of land for affordable and/or specialist housing; - Or zoning for self-build housing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NOT AGREED. This would be at odds with mixed communities concept. - SDC will need to zone land for self-build through the planning framework (legal requirement), so not needed in housing strategy. - ACTION: to consider communications channels and associated promotional materials.
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adopt a rural policy which allows specialist housing on exceptions sites (including private sector). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AGREED. Subject to evidence (though no agreement to private element). - ACTION: to follow up with planning colleagues as part of review of Affordable Housing SPD. - ACTION: to include in the draft interim housing strategy.
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NOT AGREED.
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider more residential accommodation above existing shops, libraries, offices and car 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AGREED. Though subject to evidence. - ACTION: to investigate further and consider in the interim housing

GROUP A – IDEAS AND OPTIONS (GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS)

	parks etc., on both new-build and/or retrofit (approach taken in NYC).	strategy and related planning policy.
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Encourage high-density development, if pocket homes and other well-designed modern housing models. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – AGREED. <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> – ACTION: <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> – ACTION: <i>to investigate underground parking options.</i> – ACTION: <i>to then feed into the draft interim housing strategy and relevant housing policy, if appropriate.</i>
Investment		
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Provide financial input to enable lifts and/or other assistive technologies to be built into in new social housing schemes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – AGREED. <i>As per point 3 approach, above.</i> – <i>Ongoing service charge/maintenance costs to be considered on a site-by-site basis.</i> – <i>NB: our new housing study will help identify need by type/location.</i> – ACTION: <i>to investigate further and identify potential approaches.</i> – ACTION: <i>to then feed into the draft interim housing strategy and relevant housing policy, if appropriate.</i>
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Use S106 funds to commission more specific studies to help build up our evidence base (and to achieve particular objectives such as point 4). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – AGREED. <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> – <i>Agreed funds from S106 affordable housing pot, but SDC to consider</i>

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

GROUP A – IDEAS AND OPTIONS (GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ACTION: <i>to be taken to SMT for further consideration.</i>
Other		
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote employer-led affordable housing projects (can be tied in with option 8). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AGREED. <i>As per point 8.</i> - ACTION: <i>to investigate further and consider in the draft interim housing strategy and planning policy.</i>
17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop materials and undertake promotion to raise awareness of shared-ownership resales. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AGREED. - ACTION: <i>to take forward immediately.</i>
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase member-led promotion of affordable housing in respective ward areas to support housing, health and wider community strategy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AGREED. <i>Subject to any promotional activity being directly related to evidenced need in the respective parish/ward.</i> - ACTION: <i>to factor this into our working practices and prepare communications plans as and when required.</i>
Additional		
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NOT AGREED. <i>Would potentially wipe out S106 pot and sacrifice all other work programmes.</i> - ACTION: <i>to continue to explore other means of achieving financially-viable projects, including a range of cross-subsidy models etc.</i> - ACTION: <i>to review £350k (unused) allocation previously agreed for this purpose.</i>

DRAFT