



Harlow District Council

Affordable Housing Consultation Statement

Adopted
March 2007

Harlow Council
Planning Services
Civic Centre
The Water Gardens
Harlow Essex
CM20 1WG



**Harlow Affordable Housing
Supplementary Planning Document
Consultation Statement 2007**

Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document **Consultation Statement**

The Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides a master plan framework which clarifies the Council's policies on Affordable Housing for the benefit of informing negotiations between the Council in particular Strategic Housing Services, Developers and Registered Social Landlords.

This SPD has been prepared in accordance with the relevant regulations and guidance. This document contains information to show the ways in which responses to consultation have been taken into account. It also indicates how the SPD was changed as a result of the sustainability appraisal process.

The document is divided into 3 sections:

Section 1 – Public participation December 2006 – January 2007.

It sets out who was consulted and what methods of consultation were used. It also sets out what issues were raised in the process of consultation and how these issues have been met by the SPD.

Section 2 – How the SPD was changed as a result of the Sustainability Appraisal Process.

Section 3 – Initial consultation July – September 2006

It sets out who was consulted and what methods of consultation were used. It also sets out what issues were raised in the process of consultation and how these issues have been met by the SPD.

Organisations and individuals that have submitted comments on the SPD can see how their comments have been taken into account and how the SPD has been amended as a result of the sustainability appraisal process.

Furthermore, it may be of benefit to those organisations and individuals who did not submit comments but are interested in understanding how the Affordable Housing SPD Involvement has been prepared.

Section 1

Public Participation Consultation

Who was consulted?

As part of the public participation six-week consultation, which took place 21st December 2006 – 31st January 2007, over 400 organisations, companies and individuals were consulted on the Affordable Housing SPD. Harlow Council actively targeted Hard-to-reach groups, which included; Faith groups, ethnic minority groups, disability groups and youth/educational groups (Appendix 1)

What methods of consultation were used?

Hard copies of the documents were sent to all of the Hard to reach groups, in addition to hard copies of all supporting documents i.e. Response form, FAQ sheet etc. Copies of the SPD and supporting documents were sent to all other consultees, including special interest groups such as planning organisations and developers, on disc.

The SPD was also made available on the Council website, with all supporting documents, for download. The Council also advertised the SPD and its consultation period in a local newspaper (Appendix 2), stating that the SPD was available to view in the Civic Centre and all local libraries. Posters regarding the SPD and its consultation period were also advertised in the Civic Centre and in all local libraries (Appendix 3).

The Council also advertised a weekly time slot for anyone to come into the Civic Centre and ask questions regarding the SPD with a member of the planning team.

The issues raised

The issues raised from the public participation consultation can be grouped as follows;

- Percentage of affordable housing at 33% was the main concern as it was felt by the respondents to be too rigid and not related to the 30% baseline set out in the Adopted Replacement Harlow Local Plan. The policy in the Adopted Replacement Local Plan states that the proportion of affordable houses relates to the housing requirements survey carried out in 2005. This study indicated a range of 28% to 40% depending upon the performance of achieving affordable housing. The SPD has been amended to avoid a rigid “requirement” for 33% by maintaining the baseline of 30% but with a view to negotiate for a higher percentage where it can be justified. This takes into account in particular GO-East’s advice.
- Monitoring and implementation has been addressed by systems both within Strategic Housing and Planning Services, no change will be required in the SPD

- Housing Market Assessment is not part of the evidence base. These are still in the process of being developed by the DCLG and no guidance has been issued.
- Circumstances where off site provision could be agreed. It is clear in the SPD that this would only be in exceptional circumstances, and would be by mutual agreement. No change will be made to the SPD in respect of this.
- Including “key worker” and “open market homebuy” in the definition of affordable housing, is accepted and the SPD will be changed accordingly.
- Free serviced land because it is inconsistent with Government advice. It is considered that this will speed up the provision of affordable units.
- Update the SPD to reflect new Government Guidance set in PPS3 Housing. This is accepted and the SPD will be redrafted to reflect the new PPS.
- Lack of policy in the Local Plan to justify Lifetime homes and eco-rated homes. The requirement for eco homes is set out in PPS22.

The full summary of the issues raised is in Appendix 4.

How were these issues incorporated into the SPD?

- The SPD has been redrafted and updated to include commentary from/ to reflect the updated Government guidance in PPS3.
- The baseline negotiation of 30% for Affordable Housing has been clarified to state that 30% will remain the baseline for negotiations with a view to negotiate up to a higher percentage.
- The monitoring criteria has been addressed and implemented based upon the comments made, however this will not affect the content of the SPD.
- The SPD has been updated to include ‘Key Worker’ and Open Market Homebuy’ within the definition of Affordable Housing.
- The Local Plan states that developers should give consideration to Lifetime Homes Standards, and Policy H7 requires new development to take account of those with special needs.

See Appendix 4.

Section 2

Sustainability Appraisal Report

How social, environmental and economic problems were considered in developing the policies and proposals

The draft SPD and saved plan policy H5 and H6 was assessed separately against the Sustainability Objectives which were developed and approved by Harlow District Council through the finalisation of the Scoping Report. By requiring all new affordable housing to be subject to Housing Corporation Scheme Development Standards, certain sustainability objectives will inevitably be impacted upon, in particular social and environmental concerns. Therefore there are only two significant factors, which required mitigation in the draft SPD before it went out to the community for public comment.

The Main Issues Raised

The main issues that were identified through the Sustainability Appraisal exercise are:

1. The lack of detail providing information and advice in relation to biodiversity.
2. The SPD does not promote more sustainable forms of transport to reduce environmental impact.

How were these issues addressed?

Below are the proposed texts to be inserted into the Affordable Housing

Section 5 'Design':

"Affordable housing should ideally be located close to local facilities and public transport". Sites that are close to town or local centres and have good access to public transport are well suited to certain types of affordable housing, particularly where the provision is for the elderly. The proximity to services, facilities and access to public transport will be taken into account in deciding upon the level and type of affordable housing".

Section 4 'other requirements':

"All affordable dwellings will be required to conform with the general standards of development set out in the Local Plan, these include biodiversity, open space, energy efficiency, etc".

Section 3

Initial Consultation

The Harlow Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) will clarify the Council's policies on affordable housing for the benefit of informing negotiations between the Council in particular Strategic Housing Services developers and Registered Social Landlords.

This statement has been prepared so that those organisations that have submitted comments on the SPD can see how their comments have been taken into account. Furthermore, it may be of benefit to those organisations and individuals who did not submit comments but are interested in understanding how the Common Guidelines SPD Involvement has been prepared.

Who was consulted

In preparing the SPD Harlow Council consulted the following organisations to seek their involvement in the early pre-consultation stages in the development of the document.

Each of these Registered Social Landlords Partners have a specific interest in the subject of the document and affordable housing in Harlow and took part in preliminary consultations.

Moat
Circle Anglia
Springboard
Swan
East Homes
Home Group

How they were consulted

The SPD takes account of consultation undertaken through Harlow's Social Housing Partnership Agreement which our partner RSLs, and is reviewed each year. Each of our partner RSLs have been involved in discussions in developing the policy (carried out as part of the review of the partnership agreement at the beginning of summer 2006) and also through the Homes & Neighbourhoods 2020 group that is a sub-group of the Local Strategic Partnership.

Summary of the issues raised

1. The definition of Lifetime homes has not been adequately defined.
2. Not all partner RSLs have an accounting mechanism within their organisations to identify reinvestment of capital receipts in cases of low-cost home-ownership (Homebuy) where owners in the District staircase up.

3. Welcome the SPD and Strategic Housing Policy, but wish to see in practice, better communication between the Council, Developers and RSL's.

How those issues were addressed in the SPD

1. Not a hard definition included as during consultation it seemed more realistic to discuss design standards on a site-by-site basis, so intended to be flexible, and monitored to review definition if required and promote good practice in design.
2. The District Council would be flexible in our approach to the reinvestment in the District and monitor to ensure that RSLs make appropriate contributions to developments from their own resources. Comment noted, the SPD should promote better communication and understanding

Specific Consultation Bodies

- East of England Regional Assembly
- Harlow Youth Council
- Epping Forest District Council
- East Hertfordshire District Council
- Essex County Council
- Hertfordshire County Council
- Sawbridgeworth Town Council
- Eastwick and Gilston Parish Council
- Epping Upland Parish Council
- Hunsdon Parish Council
- Matching Parish Council
- Nazeing Parish Council
- North Weald Bassett Parish Council
- Sheering Parish Council
- Countryside Agency
- Environment Agency
- Highways Agency
- English Heritage
- English Nature
- The Strategic Rail Authority
- East of England Development Agency
- British Telecom
- Mobile Operators Association
- Harlow Primary Care Trust
- Princess Alexandra Hospital NHS Trust
- Essex Strategic Health Authority
- British Wind Energy Association
- EDF Energy Networks
- British Gas
- Transco
- Thames Water Utilities
- Lea Valley Water Plc.
- Three Valleys Water

Government Departments

- Go East
- Home Office
- Department for Education and Skills
- Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
- Department for Transport
- Department of Trade and Industry
- Ministry of Defence
- Department for Work and Pensions
- Department for Constitutional Affairs
- Department for Culture, Media and Sport
- Office of Government Commerce (Property advisers to the Civil Estate)

Other Consultees

- Age Concern Essex
- Age Concern Harlow
- BAA Stansted
- Civil Aviation Authority
- British Chemical Distributions and Traders Association
- British Geological Survey

- British Waterways
- Centre for Ecology and Hydrology
- Harlow and District Chamber of Commerce
- Church of England Church Commissioners
- Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment CABE
- English Partnerships
- Commission for Racial Equality
- Crown Estate Office
- Diocesan Board of Finance
- Disability Rights Commission
- Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee DPTAC
- Essex CC Historic Environment Branch
- Harlow Conservation Volunteers
- Harlow Biodiversity Partnership
- Essex Wildlife Trust
- Campaign to Protect Rural England
- Forestry Commission
- The Woodland Trust
- Friends of the Earth
- Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
- Equal Opportunities Commission
- Essex County Fire and Rescue service
- Freight Transport Association
- Gypsy Council
- Health and Safety Executive
- Help the Aged
- Housing Corporation
- Learning and Skills Council
- Arriva
- ECEL Coaches Ltd.
- MS Coaches
- Imperial Bus Company
- Olympian Coaches Ltd.
- Trust Line
- Road Haulage Association
- Highways Agency
- Rail Freight Group
- Network Rail
- Office of Rail Regulations
- One Rail
- Essex Police
- Police Architectural Liaison Officer
- Post Office Property Holdings
- East of England Development Agency
- Regional Housing Board
- Royal Town and Planning Institute RTPI
- Sport England
- House Builders Federation
- Gypsy & Traveller Law Reform Coalition
- Women's National Commission

Local Groups and Organisations

Local Business Groups (including local business forums)

- Harlow Town Centre Traders Initiative
- Harlow Town Centre Partnership
- Town Centre Management
- Harlow Cooperative Development Agency
- Harlow and District Chamber of Commerce
- Jobcentre Plus
- Employ-ability

- Tesco Distribution
 - Nortel Networks Ltd.
 - Pitney Bowes Ltd.
 - Flexible Lamps
 - Pearson Education UK
 - Raytheon Systems
 - Asda stores Ltd.
- Local Community Action Groups
- Stop Harlow North
 - Harlow Civic Society
 - Community Forum
 - Protection of Roydon Area PORA
 - The Roydon Society
 - Roydon Action Group
 - Great Parndon Community Association
 - Mark Hall and Netteswell Community Association
 - Potter Street Community Association
 - CABRA Residents Association
 - Church Langley Community Association
 - Katherines & Sumners Community Association
 - Hare Street & Little Parndon Residents and Community Association
 - The Tye Green Community and Leisure Association
 - St. John's Arts and Recreation Centre
 - Berecroft Residents Association
 - Moorfields Residents Association
 - Northbrooks Residents Association
 - Bishopsfield Residents Association
 - Maples Residents Association
 - Morley Grove Residents Association
 - Church Leys Residents Association
 - Brockles Mead Residents Association
 - Longbanks Residents Association
 - HCWAG Harlow Common Participation Group
 - Quarry Springs Residents Association
 - Rural Community Council of Essex
- Local Community Transport Groups
- Harlow Community Transport
 - Passenger Transport Group
- Local Health Associations
- Harlow Health Centre
 - The Addison Health Centre
 - Florence Nightingale Health Centre
 - Keats House Health Centre
 - Lister House Health Centre
 - Nuffield House
 - Osler House Health Centre
 - Old Harlow Health Centre
 - Sydenham House Health Centre
 - Barbara Castle House
 - St. Johns Ambulance
 - North Essex Health Authority
 - Alcohol and Drugs Advisory Service
 - Harlow Well Women Centre
 - St Claire's Hospice
- Local Housing and Associations
- Harlow Accommodation Project
- Local History and Conservations Groups
- Harlow Museum
 - Friends of Harlow Museum
 - West Essex Archaeological Group WEAG
 - Council for British Archaeology – Essex Region

- Harlow Arts Council
- Harlow Council Arts Development Unit
- Local Leisure and Sports Groups
 - Harlow and District Sports Trust
 - HOOP
 - Town Park User Group
 - Golf Club
 - Griffins Bowls Club
 - Harlow Environment and Outdoor Education Centre
 - Harlow Football Club
 - Harlow & District Football League
 - Harlow Star Youth Community League
 - Harlow Cricket Club
 - Harlow Lawn Tennis Club
 - Harlow Pool and Fitness Centre
 - Harlow Rugby Club
 - Maypole Sports and Social Club
 - Harlow Canal Boat Club
 - Essex FA
 - Essex RFU
 - 2012 Olympic Committee
 - Essex Cricket
 - National Playing Fields Association
- Local Registered Social Landlords
 - Family Mosaic
- Local Strategic Partnership
 - Harlow 20/20 Vision
- Local Older Person's Groups
 - Active Retired
 - Pensioners Action Association
- Local Youth Groups, Schools and Colleges
 - Burnt Mill School
 - Brays Grove School
 - Mark Hall School
 - Passmores School
 - Stewards School
 - St. Marks School
 - St. Nicholas Private School
 - Harlow College
 - Harlow Fields School
 - Connexions
 - Essex Youth service
 - Foyer
 - Young Peoples information centre
- Landowners and Developers with a Known Local Interest
 - Jones Day
 - Bidwells Planning Consultants
 - The Planning Bureau
 - Tetlow King Planning
 - Peacock and Smith
 - An Innovative Housing and Planning Consultancy
 - Dialogue Communicating Planning
 - Development Land and Planning Consultant Ltd.
 - Indigo Planning Ltd.
 - Wilkes Head and Eve
 - Savills
 - Bidwells
 - Drivers Jonas
 - Chris Thomas Ltd.
 - Planning Potential
 - Malcolm Judd and Partner

- Pegasus Planning Group
- Stewart Ross Associates
- Andrew Martin Associates
- Hubert C Leach Ltd.
- Countryside Properties
- David Wilson Homes
- JB Planning Associates
- New Hall Projects
- Taylor Woodrow
- Harlowbury Estates
- Circle Anglia Housing Group
- Genesis Capital Housing
- East Thames Housing Group
- Moat Housing Group
- Swan Housing Association Ltd.
- Warden Housing Association

Others

- MP Bill Rammell
- Robert Halfon PC
- HDC Councillors
- Harlow International Women Group
- Harlow Welfare Rights and Advice
- Harlow Citizens Advice Bureau
- Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Stort Valley Branch (RSPCA)
- Partnership against poverty

Hard to Reach Groups

Local Disability Groups

- Harlow Area Access Group
- Harlow Deaf Club
- Harlow and District Access Group
- Harlow MENCAP
- Harlow MIND
- Harlow Social Club for the Physically Disabled
- Harlow Council for Voluntary Service
- Harlow Handicapped Sports Foundation
- Harlow and Epping Social Club for the Blind
- Harlow Pan Disability FC

Local Education Trusts and Associations

- Harlow Education Consortium
- Burnt Mill Comprehensive School
- Brays Grove Comprehensive School
- Passmores Comprehensive School
- Stewards Comprehensive School
- Mark Hall Comprehensive School
- St. Marks Comprehensive School
- St. Nicholas Private School
- Harlow Fields School
- Harlow College
- Connexions
- Essex Youth service
- Foyer
- Harlow Youth Council
- Young Peoples information centre
- Harlow District Scout Council
- Army Cadets
- Air Cadets
- Harlow Unit of the Sea Cadet Corps
- Boys Brigade 3rd Harlow
- Girls Brigade - 1st Harlow

- Brenda Taylor School of Dance & Performing Arts
 - Harlow Ballet School
 - Harlow Youth Action Group Football For All (HYAGFFA)
 - Harlow Youth Netball Action Group (HYNAG)
 - Blue Birds Badminton Club
 - Basketball - Harlow Wildcats Basketball Club
 - South East Harlow Sports & Youth Association SEHSYA
- Local Ethnic Minority Groups
- Harlow Ethnic Minority Umbrella
 - Harlow and District Chinese Association
 - Harlow Black Culture Group
 - Harlow Philippines Culture Group
 - Harlow Vietnamese Catholic Group
- Local Faith/Religious Groups
- Salvation Army
 - Together for the Kingdom (Harlow Free Churches Together)
 - Oakwood Chapel
 - Trinity URC
 - David Livingstone URC
 - Fore Street Baptist Church
 - Potter Street Baptist Church
 - St. Marys Parish Office
 - St. Marys Church Great Parndon C of E
 - St. Paul's Church Office
 - St. Mary at Latton
 - St. Stephen's Church & St. Andrew's
 - St. Mary's Old Harlow
 - St. James Church
 - St. Andrews Methodist Church
 - St. James Church & St. Lukes
 - Church Langley Church
 - Redeemer Lutheran Church
 - Holy Cross Church
 - Our Lady of Fatima & St. Thomas More Catholic Church
 - Church of the Assumption of Our Lady
 - Essex Chinese Christian Church
 - Harlow Christian Aid
 - Harlow Jewish Community
 - Religious Society of Friends Quakers
 - Jehovah's Witnesses
 - Mormons (Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints)
 - Christian Science Society (Harlow)
 - Seventh Day Adventists
 - Harlow Northbrook Muslim Community
 - Harlow Muslim Society
 - Harlow Milan Mandel
 - Harlow Sikh Society

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

Notice of SPD Matters

Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Public Participation

Harlow District Council gives notice that it intends to publish the Affordable Housing SPD.

The Affordable Housing SPD provides guidance on Affordable Housing.

The document deals with matters that affect the whole of Harlow District.

The period within which representations on the proposals may be made is 21st December 2006 – 31st January 2007 by 1.00pm. All representations must be sent:

By post:

Harlow Council
Forward Planning Team
Freepost ANG10461
Harlow
Essex CM20 1YQ

By Fax:

01279 446639

By E-mail:

planning.services@harlow.gov.uk

Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of the adoption of the Affordable Housing SPD.

Statement of Fact

Affordable Housing SPD

Public Participation document is available for inspection at:

- The Civic Centre, The Water Gardens, Harlow, Essex CM20 1WG Mon-Fri 8.30 to 17.00
- Harlow Central Library, The High, Harlow, Essex CM20 1HJ Mon-Fri 9.00- 19.00 Sat 9.00 to 17.00 Sun 13.00-16.00
- Great Parndon Library, Staple Tye, Harlow Mon 9.00-18.00 Tue 9.00-19.00 Thu 9.00-18.00 Sat 9.00-17.00
- Old Harlow Library, 30 High Street, Harlow Mon 9.00-13.00 Tue 10.00-18.00 Thu 9.00-18.00 Sat 9.00- 17.00
- Mark Hall Library, The Stow, Harlow Mon 9.00-13.00 Tue 1.00-19.00 Thu 9.00-18.00 Sat 9.00-17.00
- Tye Green Library, Bush Fair, Harlow Tue 9.00-18.00 Thu 9.00-17.00 Fri 9.00-13.00 Sat 9.00-17.00

This document is also available on the councils website at www.harlow.gov.uk



Consultation on the Affordable Housing SPD

Harlow Council is asking local people and local groups for their views on the new Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Sustainability Appraisal Report.

Harlow Council has produced new guidelines, which are intended to clarify the Council's policies on affordable housing for the benefit of informing negotiations between the Council, developers and Registered Social Landlords.

The guidance covers a range of aspects including:

- Provision of Affordable Housing
- Design
- Management
- Developers Contributions
- Key Workers

The Affordable Housing SPD and Sustainability Appraisal Report are currently available for public inspection and comment from 21st December 2006 – 31st January 2007.

The Affordable Housing SPD, Sustainability Appraisal Report and Consultation Statement are available for inspection at the Civic Centre, Harlow Libraries and can also be viewed online at www.harlow.gov.uk. Comments on the document can be sent to: Harlow Council, Forward Planning Team, FREEPOST ANG10461, Harlow CM20 1YQ, faxed to 01279 446639 or emailed to: planning.services@harlow.gov.uk

Have your say by 31st January 2007



**Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document Public
Participation December 2006 – January 2007 Responses**

Respondent	British Waterways
Form of response	Letter
Policy/paragraph	
Response Summary	BW believes that the Affordable Housing SPD should acknowledge the potential of residential moorings in appropriate locations to contribute to the affordable housing stock. BW considers that any further guidance on the provision of affordable housing should highlight the merits of residential moorings as an affordable type of housing.
Officer Comment	These comments are welcomed and make a valid and important point about the use of the River Stort. However, identifying new residential moorings would introduce a new allocation, which contrary to current legislation with regard to SPD.
Proposed Changes	No Change
Respondent	PORA & Roydon Action Group
Form of response	Response Form
Policy/paragraph	Section H5
Response Summary	PORA and RAD believe that the proposals contained within the Affordable Housing SPD are sound and appropriate for the pressing issue of Affordable Housing.
Officer Comment	Comment Noted
Proposed Changes	No Change
Respondent	Network Rail
Form of response	E-mail
Policy/paragraph	
Response Summary	NR has no detailed comments to make on this document.
Officer Comment	Comment Noted
Proposed Changes	No Change
Respondent	Home Builders Federation
Form of response	Letter
Policy/paragraph	Foreword, 2.3-6 & 2.8-10, 2.14, 2.15, 2.21 & App 4, 2.22 & 4.6, 2.23-24, 3.4-9, 4.1-2 & 4.4 & 11.4 & 6.8.7, 4.5 & App 3, 4.8, 5.2 & 5.4, 5.3, 5.8, 5.9, 5.10-11, 5.14, 6.1-4, 8.1-3, 8.5, 10.1-6
Response Summary	Foreword Re; minimum standards set by the latest HRS, the HBF does not consider that it is the role or purpose (of HDC or the AF SPD?) to dictate precise requirements, instead it should help inform policies and negotiations. 2.3-6 & 2.8-10 The Council will need to take onboard the implications and content of PPS3 and Delivering Affordable Housing and should revise the text accordingly. 2.14 The Panel Report amended this policy, it replaced the specific target percentage for affordable housing figure with a regional aspiration figure. 2.15 The Council refers to the Housing Needs Survey but fails to refer to the role and importance of Housing Market Assessments in setting policy. The Council does not seem to have undertaken a Housing Market Assessment in order to inform housing policy. In determining levels and types of affordable housing, regard must be given to the availability and viability of grant funding. 2.21 & App 4 Is 'The Housing Strategy – Homes for Harlow 2004-2007 still relevant as a feeder document since its time span will shortly expire. The suggestion that 50% of all new affordable

housing should be one-bed roomed is at odds with government policy, which seeks mixed and balanced communities.

2.22 & 4.6 The Council's role as Local Planning Authority means that it must primarily base its decisions upon statutory planning policies and national guidance.

2.23 & 2.24 It is unclear as to why the research, undertaken by Opinion Research services on behalf of the Council in 2005 forming the basis of its policy requirements, was not taken on board in the Local Plan prior to its adoption.

3.4-9 The narrow types of tenure the Council will accept as Affordable Housing are considered contrary to the flexible and innovative types of provision advocated in PPS3.

4.1-3, 4.4, 11.4 & 6.8.7 The ORS research findings are said to be presented as either 5 years (42%) or 10 years (28%), it is stated therefore that it is appropriate to set the requirement of this policy at 33%. HBF considers that this is inappropriate; there is no reason why this should be over 5 years rather than over the entire plan period.

4.5 & App 3 It is inappropriate for the Council to dictate the content of illustrative standardised heads of terms for legal agreements, they should reflect the interests of landowners, developers and interested parties. Also the Council cannot seek to retain all units as affordable housing in perpetuity.

4.8 HBF states that the meaning of the text is unclear. It seems to suggest that the Council may seek affordable housing provision on sites below three thresholds set out in the HDC Adopted Local Plan, however, it would be inappropriate to seek provision notary to the requirements set out in HDC's own statutory planning policies.

5.2 & 5.4 Re: Pepper-Potting, regard has to be given to the needs of developers and RSL's or others that will be responsible for the maintenance of such properties, as distribution of housing over large areas can increase the costs.

5.3 Re: the provision of market housing reflecting, proportionally, the types of dwelling, design and density of site dwellings, HBF state that this does not make sense, if it did it would be dictated largely by the style and nature of the private sector rather than by the nature and extent of the affordable housing needs.

5.8 It is unreasonable for the Council to expect all developments to meet the Scheme Design Standards set by the Housing Corporation.

5.9 There is no justification in the Local Plan to support the Council's plan to introduce a new policy requirement that a minimum of 50% of all affordable housing be high eco-ratings.

5.10-11 There is no policy justification within the Local plan for the Council to introduce a new policy requirement for 25% of affordable houses to be 'Lifetime homes'.

5.14 HBF state that it is not clear what the council is seeking in this statement. It seems to indicate that the Council wishes to dictate the design layout of market housing in order to facilitate additional affordable housing provision, this is considered unacceptable by developers.

6.1-4 This text seems to be at variance with the text of paragraph 49 of PPS3.

8.1-3 The text is at variance with the contents of PPS3 regarding the importance of the availability of grant funding to the delivery of affordable housing. HBF's membership is opposed to 'open book' accounting, which requires the disclosure of confidential information.

8.5 HBF state that the basis for the calculation specified is unclear, any payments should be based upon the costs of provision directly related to individual proposed housing schemes.

10.1-6 Re; Key worker housing not being counted towards the affordable housing requirement; this is considered to be contrary to 'delivering Affordable Housing' which accompanied PPS3, there is no

	logical reason why Key worker living cannot count towards affordable housing provision.
Officer Comment	<p>Forward: It is considered that the SPD both helps and informs negotiations and is consistent with the Adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>2.3-6 & 2.8-10: The Council is bound to take on the requirements of PPS3</p> <p>2.14 Panel report superseded by Government Draft RSS paragraph to be redrafted to take this into account.</p> <p>2.15 This is reference to work that will be done for the RSS not this SPD. HDC are aware of Housing Market Assessments but these are still in the process of being developed and to date are still awaiting final guidance from Communities and Local Government. HDC have already begun to monitor local house prices and income levels together with other sources of housing intelligence to support and update our requirements.</p> <p>2.21, App4 The current Housing Strategy is drawing to an end and this was drafted prior to the most recent housing requirement survey. The Councils most recent affordable housing policy reflects this update and Government Policy.</p> <p>2.22 & 4.6 Agree that this Council must adhere to PPS's and other government policy, it should also be guided by it's own policy. Indeed the Affordable Housing Policy forms part of the evidence base of the SPD and adds substance and clarity to the SPD.</p> <p>2.23 & 2.24 It was not available</p> <p>3.4-9 The Council is following and supports PPS3 Appendix 3 definitions in that there is social rented and intermediate housing.</p> <p>4.1-3, 4.4, 11.4 & 6.8.7 The requirement has been set at a figure below the mean average with the intention of being reviewed throughout the life of the Plan in order to see whether this needs to be varied. HDC believes that this according with good practice as proposed in PPS3.</p> <p>4.5 and App 3 – The Head of Terms are intended to be illustrative and helpful to interested parties to give clarity when entering negotiations. The Council is not seeking to retain all units in perpetuity but to ensure where appropriate they remain available for such use subject of course to the options presented by Home buy and Social Home buy.</p> <p>4.8 This reflects a note attached to policy H5 in the Adopted Plan</p> <p>5.2,5.4 – Noted and RSL's have been consulted in the development of this policy.</p> <p>5.3 – HDC want to see a seamless quality of construction and design between private sector and affordable. HDC feels this supports the Governments aims as set out in the Sustainable Communities Agenda.</p> <p>5.8 – HDC would like to see all new homes built to as high a quality as possible as RSLs or others will be responsible for the maintenance of such properties.</p> <p>5.9 - HDC feels that higher targets need to be set especially in areas of growth in order to minimise the environmental impact of new homes. This accords with both local corporate priorities and national concerns. The requirement for eco homes is set out in PPS22.</p> <p>5.10 – 11 – HDC is concerned by the current lack of properties that are suitable for people with mobility problems as evidenced by those applying to the Council for housing contrasting with the number of suitable houses that become available. HDC is also aware of the growing number of older people and policies which encourage them to remain living independently in their own homes for as long as possible. The Local Plan states that developers should give consideration to Lifetime Homes Standards, and Policy H7 requires new development to take account of those with special needs.</p> <p>5.14 This paragraph will be redrafted to be less prescriptive. Although the premise that the design concept of the development is not</p>

	<p>compromised by a redesign of the affordable units is sound.</p> <p>6.1 -4 Paragraph 49 of PPS3 relates to design not management or choice of RSL.</p> <p>8.1 – 3 – HDC does not seek to undermine confidentiality but when supporting application for public subsidy such as grant funding from the Housing Corporation, has to demonstrate that the taxpayer is achieving good value for money. HDC are receptive to the idea of carrying out appraisals using bench mark figures and values and see this as a precursor to, rather than replacement of the need of an open book appraisal.</p> <p>10.1-6 Accepted, but HDC may need to make it clear that what we seek to achieve here is not to rule out the possibility of Key worker housing as a form of affordable housing, but rather to avoid the imposition of Key Worker housing in cases where there is insufficient evidence to support this need at the expense of general needs affordable housing.</p>
Proposed Changes	<p>Forward: No change</p> <p>2.3-2.6 & 2.8-2.10: Delete and replace with commentary on PPS3</p> <p>2.14 Paragraph redrafted to reflect Draft RSS</p> <p>2.15 No change.</p> <p>2.21 No change</p> <p>2.22 & 4.6 No change</p> <p>2.23 & 2.24 No change</p> <p>3.4-9 No change</p> <p>4.1-3, 4.4, 11.4 & 6.8.7 No change</p> <p>4.5 and App 3 No change</p> <p>4.8 No change.</p> <p>5.2,5.4 No change</p> <p>5.3 No change</p> <p>5.8 No change</p> <p>5.9 No change</p> <p>5.10 – 11 No change</p> <p>5.14 redraft paragraph</p> <p>6.1-4 No change</p> <p>8.1- 3 No change</p> <p>10.1-6 redraft paragraphs to reflect the comment</p>
Respondent	Pegasus Planning Group
Form of response	Letter
Policy/paragraph	2.24, 4.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.7, 5.9, 5.10, 5.14, 10.2
Response Summary	<p>2.24 Pegasus consider that the Housing Requirements Survey undertaken in 2004 is out-of-date and that a more up-to-date data base is required.</p> <p>4.1 Due to Pegasus's consideration that the HRS is out-of-date, they do not feel that the Affordable Housing target of 33% can be justified. Pegasus believe that a lower target could more appropriately meet the local affordable housing need.</p> <p>5.2 The pepper-potting of affordable housing is supported, however some consideration needs to be given to management practicalities.</p> <p>5.3 Pegasus consider that the precondition that Affordable Housing must reflect the overall design and type of dwelling across the whole site is quite restrictive. They propose that this needs to be made far more flexible.</p> <p>5.7 The stipulation that car parking spaces for affordable housing being equal to that of market housing is considered, by Pegasus, to be unreasonable.</p> <p>5.9 Pegasus believe that the target of 50% of all affordable homes to receive excellent or very good eco ratings is excessive; this target should only be encouraged not required.</p> <p>5.10 Pegasus believe that the 25% target of all new affordable houses to comply with full lifetime homes standard is exorbitant. This target</p>

	<p>should be encouraged as opposed to required.</p> <p>5.14 The requirement that variations in design to affordable housing must be applied consistently across all units on site is unjustifiable as variations in design are acceptable and anticipated within many larger developments.</p> <p>10.2 The stipulation that key workers should not be included in affordable housing requirements is unreasonable as many key workers can not afford to rent or buy houses which fall within the definition of affordable housing in circular 6/98.</p>
Officer Comment	<p>2.24 – Requirement surveys are usually commissioned every 4 – 5 years, therefore HDC feels this is still valid data.</p> <p>4.1 – HDC has noted this comment but feels that as there is still an overall shortfall in the provision of the number of affordable units suggested by the most recent requirement study to date a higher rather than lower figure may be more appropriate, but has settled for a figure of 33% in view of the anticipated growth of new homes. It is noted that the baseline for negotiation is 30% as noted to Policy H5</p> <p>5.2 – support is welcomed. HDC intends to work closely with managing RSLs</p> <p>5.3 – HDC feels that this suggestion is contrary to good practice and Communities and Local Government’s Sustainable Communities Policy. It helps to achieve quality and a complementary design over the whole site.</p> <p>5.7 County wide Parking standards are Adopted as part of the Local Plan and do not exclude affordable housing</p> <p>5.9 - HDC feels that higher targets need to be set especially in areas of growth in order to minimise the environmental impact of new homes. This accords with both local corporate priorities and national concerns. The requirement for eco homes is set out in PPS22.</p> <p>5.10 – HDC is concerned by the current lack of properties that are suitable for people with mobility problems as evidenced by those applying to the Council for housing contrasting with the number of suitable houses that become available. HDC is also aware of the growing number of older people and policies which encourage them to remain living independently in their own homes for as long as possible. The Local Plan states that developers should give consideration to Lifetime Homes Standards, and Policy H7 requires new development to take account of those with special needs.</p> <p>5.14 This paragraph will be redrafted to be less prescriptive. Although the premise that the design concept of the development is not compromised by a redesign of the affordable units is sound.</p> <p>10.2 - Accepted, but HDC may need to make it clear that what we seek to achieve here is not to rule out the possibility of Key worker housing as a form of affordable housing, but rather to avoid the imposition of Key Worker housing in cases where there is insufficient evidence to support this need at the expense of general needs affordable housing.</p>
Proposed Changes	<p>2.24 - No change</p> <p>4.1- No change</p> <p>5.2 -No change</p> <p>5.3 – No change</p> <p>5.7 - No change</p> <p>5.9 – No change</p> <p>5.10 – No change</p> <p>5.14 – redraft paragraph</p> <p>10.2- redraft paragraphs to reflect the comment</p>
Respondent	Miller Strategic Land
Form of response	Response Form
Policy/paragraph	

Response Summary	<p>Miller Strategic Land have considerable interest in the delivery of affordable housing in Harlow as promoters of land to the east of Harlow together with a consortium of three landowners.</p> <p>MSL point out that the SPD was prepared before PPS3 was published, therefore MSL suggest that document is revised in the light of PPS3.</p> <p>There are three other specific points that MSL have made:</p> <p>i. When compared to the latest Government guidance on delivering affordable housing (DAH), the SPD is not sufficiently flexible, the letter encourages all tenures of housing. MSL believe that there should be a greater alignment between the definitions used in para 30-32, particularly the two main types categorised as “social rented housing” and intermediate affordable housing” The SPD also refers to Homebuy, which MSL believe should be referred to within “intermediate affordable housing”.</p> <p>ii. Para 6.1-6.2 states that developers should work in collaboration with RSL’s that operate with Harlow’s Social Housing Partnership, as this operates within a framework to monitor standards of housing development and management. MSL refer back to DAH (para 48-50) in order to quote from the document, and explains that; DAH suggests a degree of control by advising them to discuss with potential providers how affordable housing can be provided and long term management arrangements secured. This could include information on their standards in respect of providers.</p> <p>iii. Regarding free serviced land accommodating the required number of affordable units, as the minimum requirement of an S106, MSL state that this is not consistent with current policy. MSL state that the blanket requirement of free serviced land is inconsistent and would be unduly and restrictive to the Government’s overall objective to deliver more affordable housing.</p>
Officer Comment	<p>i)The Council agrees that Home Buy is a form of affordable housing and welcomes the improved definitions of what is and what is not affordable housing as described in PPS3.</p> <p>ii)Harlow Social Housing Partnership includes an annual review of all partner RSL’s that covers standards of management as well as development. This is used to promote and inform good practice throughout the partnership.</p> <p>iii) HDC sees the provision of free service land as the most expedient way to ensure the delivery of affordable housing. Increasing the cost to procure the land for affordable housing is more likely to adversely affect the quality and quantity of affordable housing on a site.</p>
Proposed Changes	<p>i) redraft paragraph 3.4 to reflect PPS3</p> <p>ii) No change</p> <p>iii) No change</p>
Respondent	Environment Agency
Form of response	Letter
Policy/paragraph	(SAR) 5.5, 6.4
Response Summary	<p>5.5 PPG25 has been superseded by PPS25 ‘Development and Flood Risk’. Again, this section should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>6.4 EA support this sustainability objective, all developers on potentially contaminated land must be carried out in line with the guidance of PPS23 ‘Planning and Pollution Control’ and contaminated Land Regulations.</p>
Officer Comment	<p>5.5 It is not expected that the scoping report will be updated in the near future. However new PPS’s are of acknowledged importance and will be taken into account.</p> <p>6.4 Support is welcomed</p>
Proposed Changes	<p>5.5 of SA no change</p> <p>6.4 No change</p>

Respondent	Stonleigh Planning (on behalf of Newhall Projects Ltd.)
Form of response	Letter
Policy/paragraph	
Response Summary	<p>1)Newhall believe that as the SPD's are to provide further information about Local Policy Plans, therefore they believe that as the Local Plan sets out 30% affordable housing and the SPD 33% that this is inconsistent and will need to be revised.</p> <p>2) In the SPD reference is made to PPG3 and Circular 6/98, both of these documents have now been superseded by PPS3, it would be of assistance if the SPD could be updated to refer to this.</p> <p>3)(East of England Plan) Regarding target for affordable housing based on need and requirement, Newhall state that there is no policy advice in the Local Plan regarding this, but it may be appropriate for the Council to express a view on the proportions to be sought within 30% baseline for negotiation.</p> <p>Re proposals in the SPD to amend the current baseline for negotiation regarding affordable Housing, Newhall object to this proposal and consider that the policy and policy note of policy H5 of the Local Plan should remain un-amended.</p> <p>4)The reference in para 5.9, to eco-ratings suggesting a minimum 50% of affordable homes achieving ratings of very good or excellent. These requirements will have an inevitable bearing upon the financial viability of affordable housing schemes and should be taken into account. The content of para 5.9 is at variance with Appendix 3 of the SPD, which states that all affordable housing units should achieve very good or excellent eco-ratings.</p> <p>5)Newhall state that the reference, in para 7.4, to Key worker or Open Market schemes are not included in the affordable housing provision. Which appears to be contrary to the advice given in PPS3, which refers to Homebuy as one of the forms of intermediate affordable housing.</p> <p>The fifth point under the heading affordable housing in Appendix 3 of the SPD suggest that affordable housing may include provision for Key Workers which is in conflict with the approach of 7.4.</p> <p>6) Newhall consider that Key Worker, Homebuy and Open Market Homebuy should all for part of the overall provision of affordable housing.</p> <p>Regarding applications for grants from the Housing Corporation, Newhall consider that this approach should be sought from the open market units on any scheme. We consider that this approach will put at risk the Government's objectives and those of the East of England plan.</p>
Officer Comment	<p>1)HDC has noted this comment but feels that as there is still an overall shortfall in the provision of the number of affordable units suggested by the most recent requirement study to date a higher rather than lower figure may be more appropriate, but has settled for a figure of 33% in view of the anticipated growth of new homes. It is noted that the baseline for negotiation is 30% as noted to Policy H5</p> <p>2) Accepted that PPG3 has been superseded by PPS3.</p> <p>3) appendix 4 of the SPD expresses an annual requirement for Harlow</p> <p>4) HDC feels that higher targets need to be set especially in areas of growth in order to minimise the environmental impact of new homes. This accords with both local corporate priorities and national concerns. The requirement for eco homes is set out in PPS22.</p> <p>5) Apologies for any misconception caused by this paragraph. HDC may need to make it clear that what we seek to achieve here is not to rule out the possibility of Key worker housing as a form of affordable housing, but rather to avoid the imposition of Key Worker housing in cases where there is insufficient evidence to support this need at the expense of general needs affordable housing.</p> <p>6) Open market may not meet Housing Corporation Scheme Design</p>

	Standards and therefore may not be eligible for Housing Corporations public funding.
Proposed Changes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No change 2) SPD updated accordingly 3) No change 4) No change 5) Redraft paragraph 7.4 6) No change
Respondent	Roydon Parish Council
Form of response	Response Form
Policy/paragraph	App 1 6.8, para 3.2
Response Summary	<p>1) Roydon Parish Council (RPC) believe that the Harlow Sports Centre site (Gateway) is being built for another authority.</p> <p>2) RPC question if the remainder of the sites designated for housing will sufficiently reduce the already oversubscribed housing list.</p> <p>3) Regarding local income offset against local house prices; RPC question if this is a true way of defining/determining the price limit of affordable housing.</p> <p>RPC state that there is no reference to the Decent Homes Standard, which will be introduced in 2010.</p>
Officer Comment	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Gateway is not being built for another authority. 2) HDC is awaiting further guidance from Communities and Local Government Department on how to undertake and apply Housing Market Assessments that will help to support and inform the delivery of affordable housing in the Town. 3) The Decent Homes Standard has already been introduced (2010 is the date by which homes are required to meet this standard). It has not been referred to within this policy as it is not anticipated that new build homes will fall outside of the basic requirements of The Decent Homes Standard.
Proposed Changes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) No change 2) No change 3) No change
Respondent	Level Ltd. (on behalf of McCarthy and Stone Developments)
Form of response	Letter
Policy/paragraph	
Response Summary	<p>1) The Council does not make any reference to its evidence base on the Council website nor does it refer to any in the draft SPD. It does however refer to the policies contained within the Replacement Harlow Local Plan which was adopted in June 2006. Level are concerned that the Council is attempting to introduce new guidance without sufficient evidence in place and without going through the Appropriate LDF process. Therefore it is Level's contention that the SPD is being developed prior to an effective evidence base being put in place.</p> <p>2) The Housing Needs Survey (HNS) should not be the principle source used to recommend the quantum or types of affordable housing as it fails to consider the supply and suitability of sites coming forward for housing over the plan period, and the availability of grant funding. The creation of a district wide policy on housing informed solely by the current survey of housing need (when published) lacks awareness of the local and regional housing market and fails to ensure that recommendations are deliverable. An evidence base should include: i. A full housing market assessment, ii. A detailed analysis of housing supply, iii. An urban capacity study, iv. An assessment of the availability of grant funding, v. An assessment as to whether existing communities are mixed and balanced, vi. Consideration of viability to include anticipated wider planning gain costs and particular site costs. There is no evidence within the SPD that consideration has been</p>

	<p>given to these issues.</p> <p>The purpose of an SPD is to provide details of the delivery mechanisms such as tenure mix, the availability of grant funding, area specific need which is likely to be subject to change and would therefore be best served in a flexible document that can react effectively to variations on local house prices, salaries and other socio-economic factors.</p> <p>3) 2.22 Levvel would question if this is appropriate for an SPD as PPS12 identifies the intention of the SPD is to support and must relate to policies either in higher level LDD's which provide the policy framework or alternatively to saved policies. The approach of the SPD; to alter the percentage for affordable housing sough and the impact that affordable housing policy will have on land value without going through the attendant scrutiny of independent inspection associated with the production of a DPD is not in keeping with the requirements of PPS12 and as such will leave the authority open to challenge on a number of issues.</p> <p>Re: Thresholds of affordable housing; Levvel do not believe that 4.8 is in conformity with the Replacement Harlow Local Plan. The Council have done little to suggest that the reduction in the site size threshold is justifiable in terms of development economics, especially where sites are likely to be on previously developed land and may have abnormal site costs or competing planning objectives.</p> <p>Although Levvel recognise that the Council is trying to raise the delivery rate of affordable housing, however Levvel believe that this should be addressed qualitively in terms of whether affordable housing policy is likely to inhibit or encourage development but also quantatively, in terms of the size and impact on delivery. In the event that the policy is likely to impede housing growth Levvel ask the Council to consider the size of this effect and demonstrate the grounds for its confidence that the overall level of completions can be very substantially increased at the same as introducing a quantum that could act as an impediment to a developer.</p> <p>4) Regarding the provision of on-site provision, Levvel believe that the SPD would benefit from formally defining the circumstances where an off site provision or financial contribution would be applicable, however this list cannot be exhaustive. 3.21 of the SPD should be re-phased to: Exceptionally, where Borough Council accepts that on-site provision is not possible or where better outcome is agreed to be acceptable off-site, it may consider the use of off-site provision or commuted sum.</p> <p>5) Levvel have concerns regarding the way in which sums are calculated in relation to commuted sums in lieu of on-site development. Levvel object to the calculation being based upon 75% of the current local market costs of acquiring properties of the required size and type. Levvel believe that a fairer method may be the residual land value approach. In order to provide certainty the following formula should be included: Commuted Sum = Open Market Land Price – (minus) Affordable Housing Land Price.</p> <p>The Council has stated its preference that affordable housing is fully dispersed and 'pepper-potter' throughout the site and designed to the Housing Corporations Scheme Development Standards. This should be caveated with recognition that some types of development, such as flatted development, are not suitable for this type of provision.</p> <p>Regarding the Council's support of grant funding based upon the developers and RSL's provision of satisfactory financial information justifying a subsidy.</p> <p>6) Levvel request that the Council remove references to open book appraisals and carry out a series of appraisals of typical sites using benchmark figures. This should be used to calculate the amount of affordable housing that can in fact be accommodated on a typical site and this should form the basis of the Council's policy. Regarding the</p>
--	---

	<p>need for a viability exercise on a site, the appraisal should be based on agreed generic values (e.g. BCIS).</p> <p>7) Levvel also strongly suggest that the Council undertake detailed monitoring activities in order to determine the basis upon which the policy is being implemented and affect the policy is having on development volumes. Levvel believe that the the standard of monitoring that the Council should undertake should include, as a minimum; i. The total size of the development, ii. The size, type and number of market units, iii. The size, type, number and tenure of affordable units. iv. The assumptions underlying intermediate units (percentage equity sold, rent level), v. The amount of public subsidy allocated to or received by affordable units involved vi. The reason for any deviation from the policy (high alternative use value/ grant not available/ other planning priorities/ high recommendations ect.)</p>
Officer Comment	<p>1) & 2) HDC is satisfied that the most recent Housing Requirements Survey forms a sound basis for informing current policy. HDC does not agree that an urban capacity study or the availability of grant funding are a sound evidence base of housing requirements although they are linked to the delivery of affordable housing requirements. HDC will follow the forthcoming guidance on Housing Market Assessments to update and supplement this policy where appropriate.</p> <p>3) HDC has noted this comment but feels that as there is still an overall shortfall in the provision of the number of affordable units suggested by the most recent requirement study to date a higher rather than lower figure may be more appropriate, but has settled for a figure of 33% in view of the anticipated growth of new homes. It is noted that the baseline for negotiation is 30% as noted to Policy H5. With regard the threshold this is not a requirement at para. 4.8 rather it indicates that that through negotiation affordable housing can be on smaller sites.</p> <p>4) Have noted this comment and agree that as a list of examples could not be exhaustive or definite, it is felt best not to give examples in the first instance.</p> <p>5) HDC appreciates the suggested formula for calculating the value of a commuted sum but is mindful of the comparative lack of suitable alternative sites and wish to avoid situations in the future whereby commuted sums are received with no alternative land available.</p> <p>6) HDC are receptive to the idea of carrying out appraisals using bench mark figures and values as suggested and see this as a precursor to, rather than replacement of the need of an open book appraisal.</p> <p>7) The Council will as part of the monitoring incorporate all of the suggestions made.</p>
Proposed Changes	<p>1) No change 2) No change 3) No change 4) No change 5) No change 6) No change 7) No change – but take on board the suggestions as part of internal processes.</p>
Respondent	Natural England
Form of response	Letter
Policy/paragraph	
Response Summary	<p>Natural England has submitted a response towards the Scoping Report for the Sustainability Appraisal Report.</p> <p>Natural England highlight the importance for any strategic document produced for Harlow to fully reflect and support the Green Arc and Harlow Green Infrastructure Plan.</p>
Officer Comment	These changes have already been agreed by committee; therefore the

	absence of a reference to these points may be a drafting error.
Proposed Changes	No change
Respondent	GO-East
Form of response	Letter
Policy/paragraph	Section 2, Section 4, Section 8, Section 11
Response Summary	<p>Section 2: References are made to both PPG3 and the new document PPS3. In order to ensure consistency and reflect the most up to date position GO-East recommend that the draft SPD is revised to refer to the new document. Also Circular 6/98 has been made reference to which will need to be updated to reflect PPS3.</p> <p>GO-East suggest that more prominence is given to Circular 05/2005 in para 2.11.</p> <p>2.14 GO-East recommend that this section is updated to reflect the recently published SoS 'Proposed Changes', making reference to Policy H5 Affordable Housing.</p> <p>2.15 would benefit from a detailed explanation as to how the East of England Plan relates to this SPD.</p> <p>2.16-2.18 The context/ relationship of the Adopted Essex Structure Plan to the SPD needs to be clarified. It would be helpful to explain the future strategic policy context; setting out that that Structure Plan will be replaced by the RSS.</p> <p>Section 4: Regarding the discrepancy between the 30% baseline in the Local Plan and the 33% baseline in the SPD. GO-East state that the SPD must be consistent with the Local Plan.</p> <p>Section 8: 8.4 GO-East state that the paragraph would benefit from an explanation of how the council define the term 'exceptional circumstances' and set out the criteria that determines this decision.</p> <p>Section 11: In relation to the Council increasing/decreasing the amount of affordable housing dependent upon need, GO-East suggest that the Council continually negotiate from the 30% baseline as indicated in the Local Plan.</p>
Officer Comment	<p>Section 2, Section 4, Section 8, Section 11 - redraft SPD to take into account new policy guidance</p> <p>Para 2.11 give more prominence to circular 05/2005</p> <p>Para 2.14 update section to reflect proposed changes to East of England Plan</p> <p>Para 2.15 expand this section to give more detailed explanation of how the East of England Plan relates to this SPD.</p> <p>Para 2.16 to 2.18 The relationship between the SPD and the Structure Plan will be clarified</p> <p>Section 4 – Policy H5 reflects a percentage in the current Housing requirement Survey. It is a note to the policy that indicates a 30% baseline for negotiation. The section will be redrafted to better explain this.</p> <p>Section 8 para 8.4 - HDC are mindful of the comparative lack of suitable alternative sites and wish to avoid situations in the future whereby commuted sums are received with no alternative land available. The fact that it is exceptional should be taken as an indication that examples will in fact be few and far between and possibly unique to specific schemes.</p> <p>Section 11 - redraft of section 4 will take this into account.</p>
Proposed Changes	<p>Section 2, Section 4, Section 8, Section 11 – redraft policy</p> <p>Para 2.11 redraft paragraph to give more prominence to 05/2005</p> <p>Para 2.14 redraft section</p> <p>Para 2.15 expand this section</p> <p>Para 2.16- 2.18 redrafted</p> <p>Section 4 – redraft</p> <p>Section 8 para 8.4 – No change</p> <p>Section 11 redraft mindful of section 4</p>

Respondent	East of England Regional Assembly (EERA)
Form of response	E-mail
Policy/paragraph	4.3, 7.4
Response Summary	<p>EERA responded to Harlow Council's request to EERA to measure whether the Affordable Housing SPD is in conformity to the Regional Plan. EERA made two points regarding the conformity of the SPD to the Regional Plan:</p> <p>4.3 The threshold should be judged against the total eventual size of the development, not phased elements (i.e. to avoid multiple applications for 14 dwellings that avoid any affordable housing requirements on the site as a whole)</p> <p>7.4 GO-East state that this paragraph gives the impression that Key Worker or Open Market Homebuy will not be supported. The Council will need to clarify the circumstances in which it will support such means of delivering affordable housing, and in that circumstance they should be counted as contributions to affordable housing.</p>
Officer Comment	<p>4.3 This threshold was set as part of the Policy H5 of the Adopted Plan, and has subsequently been supported by PPS3 housing. Policy H5 specifically mentions "sites" not phases. Paragraph 4.3 will be redrafted to emphasise this.</p> <p>7.4 Agree that this may need rephrasing. HDC may need to make it clear that what we seek to achieve here is not to rule out the possibility of Key worker housing as a form of affordable housing, but rather to avoid the imposition of Key Worker housing in cases where there is insufficient evidence to support this need at the expense of general needs affordable housing.</p>
Proposed Changes	<p>4.3 redraft paragraph</p> <p>7.4 reword paragraph</p>

