



Colchester Borough Council

**Affordable Housing
Supplementary Planning Document**

Statement of Consultation

Spatial Policy
Strategic Policy and Regeneration
Colchester Borough Council
PO Box 885
Town Hall
Colchester
Essex CO1 1ZE
01206 282473/76
planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk

Adopted 15th August 2011

Introduction

The Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is one of the planning documents that make up Colchester's Local Development Framework. The overarching Core Strategy DPD was the first document to be produced, in line with Government guidance on priorities for the LDF. The Core Strategy sets out the spatial vision, strategic objectives and policies for the Borough up to 2021. The Core Strategy was declared 'sound' by a Government-appointed Planning Inspector and was adopted by the Council in December 2008. The Site Allocations and Development Policies Development Plan Documents were subsequently adopted in October 2010 and provide further policy details within the Colchester LDF. The policy direction set primarily within the Core Strategy, Site Allocations and Development Plan Documents has been used as the cornerstone for the production of subsequent planning policy documents including this SPD.

In preparing the Affordable Housing SPD for adoption, the Council are required to comply with the Town and County Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and 2008 amendments. Regulations 18 and 19 of the 2008 amendments provide that the Council should not adopt a SPD until they have prepared and published a statement setting out:

- who was invited to be involved in the plan preparation,
- how they were invited to be involved in the plan preparation,
- a summary of the main issues raised and how they have been addressed.

The following statement addresses these points and also is in accordance with Colchester's Adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The SCI stipulates the level of consultation to be undertaken, which includes a wide range of media and publicity to engage the general public, hard-to-reach-groups, community groups, councillors, businesses and governmental bodies.

Consultation Process

In line with Government regulations, the Council consulted on the Affordable Housing SPD from 15 May 2009 until 12 June 2009. The consultation provided the public and stakeholders with the opportunity to comment on the Council's preferred approach to securing affordable housing and associated planning contributions for affordable housing on below threshold sites.

Letters and/or emails were also sent to more than 450 individuals recorded on the Local Development Framework List of Consultees compiled by Colchester Borough Council. The list was drawn up in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004 and therefore included "specific consultation bodies" such as GO EAST, The Regional Assembly, and Government agencies like Natural England and the Highways Agency. In addition, in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, a large number of "general consultation bodies" were consulted representing voluntary groups, ethnic minorities, religious groups, disabled

persons and business community representatives. The list of stakeholders is attached as Appendix 1 and the letter sent to stakeholders is attached as Appendix 2.

In accordance with regulations, a statutory advert was posted in the Borough's weekly newspaper (The Essex County Standard) notifying people of the consultation details. A copy is attached as Appendix 3.

26 organisations and individuals responded to the Affordable Housing consultation. The views received reflect the wide ranging nature of responding consultees and are summarised in Appendix 4.

In response to consultation comments and following further analysis of Government guidance and best practice elsewhere, the Council modified the final adoption version of the Affordable Housing SPD to take into account consultation responses, improve clarity, ensure a consistent policy approach and address policy gaps.

Key changes in the adopted version include:

- The removal of the below threshold contributions aspect of the SPD. Changing national guidance, the economic recession and the lack of appropriate information regarding a justifiable charging schedule meant it was inappropriate to introduce a set figure as a financial contribution on below threshold sites.
- Updating of national guidance following changes resulting from the government's Comprehensive Spending Review in 2010 to reflect the latest position and best practice guidance.
- Introduction of the 3 Dragons Model to calculate site viability which is being used by local authorities across the Haven Gateway sub-region to provide a consistent approach.
- All new dwellings to be subject to the contribution charge in line with the Core Strategy and a new sub-section added clarifying the circumstances where exceptions to the SPD provisions are considered appropriate;
- The wording on renewal applications was amended to reflect the provisions introduced by central Government on 1 October 2009 relating to an extension of time limits for extant planning permissions.
- An intention to revisit the SPD and the below threshold contributions at a time when the economy improves and the number of dwellings being brought forward increases.

Appendix 1: List of Consultees

Statutory Consultees	
Alresford Parish Council	Lancaster University Network Services Ltd
Anglian Water Services Ltd	Maldon District Council
Anglian Water Services Ltd.	Natural England
Ardleigh Parish Council	Nayland with Wissington Parish Council
Babergh District Council	Neos Networks Ltd
Bradford Cable Communications Ltd	Network Rail
Braintree District Council	North Essex PCT
Brightlingsea Town Council	NTL Group Ltd
British Gas Connections Ltd	NWP Spectrum Ltd
British Telecom	Omne Telecommunications Ltd
Bures St Mary Parish Council	Opal Telecom Ltd
Colchester STW	Orange Personal Communications Ltd
Colt Telecommunications	Regional Communications Team O2 Airwave
Doncaster Cable Communications Ltd	Sheffield Canal Company Ltd
East of England Development Agency (EEDA)	South East Water Plc
Easynet Telecommunications Ltd	Sport England (East Region)
EDF Energy	SSE Telecommunications Ltd
EERA	Stoke By Nayland Parish Council
Eircom UK Ltd	Stratford St Mary Parish Council
Energis Communications	Suffolk Constabulary
English Heritage	Suffolk County Council
Environment Agency	Telia Sonera International Carrier Ltd
Essex & Suffolk Water	Tendring District Council
Essex County Council	Tendring Hundred Water Services Ltd
Essex Police	Thames Water Utilities Ltd
Essex University	The Coal Authority
Essex Wildlife Trust	The Highways Agency
Feering Parish Council	The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England
Fibernet Ltd	The National Trust
Gamma Telecom Holding Ltd	The Planning Inspectorate
Gemini Submarine Cable System Ltd	The Secretary of State for Transport
Global Crossing	T-Mobile (UK) Ltd
Go-East	Tollesbury Parish Council
Great Braxted Parish Council	Tolleshunt D'Arcy Parish Council
Haven Gateway Partnership	Tolleshunt Major Parish Council
Hutchison Network Services UK Ltd	Tolleshunt Nights Parish Council
Kelvedon Parish Council	Vitesse Networks Ltd
Kingston Communications (Hull) Plc	Wireless World Forum Headquarters

Other Stakeholders	
1st Church of Christ, Scientist, Colchester	Januarys
A S Planning Ltd	Jaygate Homes Ltd
Abberton & Langenhoe Parish Council	John Grooms H.A Ltd
Addendum Ltd	Keith Mitchell Building Consultancy Ltd
ADP	Kendall C E Primary School
AERC	Kent Blaxill & Co Ltd
Age Concern Colchester	Knowles Associates Ltd
Aldham Parish Council	La Farge Aggregates Ltd
Allegro Music	Langham Parish Council
Allen & Son, St Botolph's Butchery	Lawson Planning Partnership Ltd
AMA Planning	Layer Breton Parish Council
Andrew Martin Associates	Layer de la Haye Parish Council
Anglian Pumping Services Ltd	Layer Marney Parish Meeting
Army	Layer Road Surgery
Army Welfare Services	LCO Consulting Ltd
Ashwell Property Group Plc	Learning & Skills Council
ASM Logistics	Leith Planning
Atisreal UK	Level Ltd
Atkins Telecom	Lexden Restorations Ltd
Bags o Fun	Lind Automotive Group
Balkerne Gardens Trust	Little Horkesley Parish Council
Banner Homes	Living Streets, Colchester
BAP Transport Ltd	Long Tall Sally
Barratt Eastern Counties	Loofers Food & Coffee Place
Barton Willmore	Malcolm Judd & Partners
Barton Willmore	Malting Green Surgery
Bavestocks Chartered Accountants	Man B & W Diesel Ltd
BDG Design (South) Ltd	Marguerite Livingstone Associates
BDO Stoy Hayward LLP	Marks Tey Parish Council
Beaumont Seymour & Co	Mayfair Investments
Bidwells	McDonald's Colchester
Bidwells	McLean Design Services Ltd
Birch Parish Council	Merchant Projects
Birkett Long	Merrills Electrical
bloc Kilmartin/Hanover bloc LLP	Mersea Island Society
Bowhill Planning Partnership	Messing cum Inworth Parish Council
Boxted Parish Council	Mite Property Services Ltd
Boxted Village Hall	MOD - Estates
Boydens	MOD (Colchester Garrison)
Braiswick Resident Association	Morley Richards & Ablewhite
Britannia Storage Systems Ltd	Motorcycle Action Group
British Telecom	Mount Bures Parish Council
Broadfield Planning	Bob Russell MP for Colchester
Brown & Co	Bernard Jenkin MP for North Essex
C H Lindsey & Sons Ltd	Mumford & Wood Ltd
C2 Fire Protection	Myland Parish Council
CABE	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners
Cadman Contracts	National Grid
CAPITA	National Playing Fields
Catten College	Naylor Property Ltd

CF Anderson & Son Ltd	NCP Ltd
Chairman Mersea Island Trust	Newman Commercials
J Sainsbury Veterans Colchester Local Association Voluntary	Nicholas Percival
Chappel Parish Council	North Essex PCT
Chartered Surveyors	Old Heath County Primary School
Childrens Day Care Centre Charity	Orchard Baptist Church
Colchester & District Jewish Communiyt	Ormiston Trust
Colchester & Tendring Women's Refuge	Owen Partnerships
Colchester and North East Essex Building Preservation Trust	P Tuckwell Ltd
Colchester Access Group	Painters Corner Residents Association
Colchester Archaeological Group	Paragon Legal Services Ltd
Colchester Archaeological Trust	Parliamentary Spokesman for Colchester
Colchester Area Community church	Parsons Heath Residents Association
Colchester Arts Centre	Paul & Company
Colchester Buddhist Centre	Peacock & Smith
Colchester Bus Users Support Group	Peldon Village Hall Management Committee
Colchester Chamber of Commerce	Pertwee Estate Ltd
Colchester Civic Society	Peyton Tyler Mears
Colchester Conservative Club	Philip Morant School
Colchester Credit Union Ltd	Planning and Regeneration Consultant
Colchester Croquet Club	Planning Design Building Consultant
Colchester CVS	Planning Potential
Colchester Cycling Campaign	Planware
Colchester Dental Care	Plater Claiborne Architecture & Design & Royal Institute of British Architects Colchester Charter of chartered Architects
Colchester Friends of the Earth	PMR Electrical Ltd
Colchester Furniture Project (The Shake Trust)	Post Office Property Holdings
Colchester Institute	Prettygate Dental Practice
Colchester Learning Shop	Prettygate Library
Colchester Mind	Priory Residents Association
Colchester PCT	Purcell Miller Tritton
Colchester PCT	Queen Elizabeth Hall
Colchester PCT	R & P Taylor Carpets
Colchester Primary Care Trust	R G Carter Colchester
Colchester Quaker Housing	R H M Joinery
Colchester Rural Age Concern	Ramblers Association - Colchester
Colchester United FC	Rapid Electronics Ltd
Colchester Zoo	Rennison Consultants
Colne Harbour Project Group	Richard Fordham Tree Surgeons
Colne Housing Society	Ringway Group Ltd
Commission for New Towns and English Partnerships	Riverside Residents Association
Consensus Planning Ltd	Road Haulage Association
Copford with Easthorpe Parish Council	Robinson and Hall
Corporate Associates Ltd	Rollerworld
Countryside Properties	Rose of Colchester Ltd
Countryside Properties	Royal London
CPREssex	Royal Society for the protection of Birds
CRCL	Royal Yachting Association (Eastern Region)

D F Clark Contractors Ltd	Rural Community Council of Essex
David Wilson Estates	RWCL
Dedham Parish Council	Rydon Homes Ltd
Dedham Vale AONB Project	Sales Manager
Dedham Village Design	Saxon House Ltd
Defence Estates	Scott Wilson
Defense Estates	Seatrade
Dentistry	Secretary, The Strood WI
Diocese of Chelmsford Colchester Area team	Sexton Construction Ltd
Disability East (EDPA)	Shea Properties
DPDS Consulting Group	Shelter
Dr D Bateman & Partners	Sloppy Joes
Driver Jonas	Smith Stuart Reynolds
Dudley Anderson Ltd	Smythies Avenue Residents Association
East Anglian Chambers	Soroptimist International
East Donyland Parish Council	St Anne's Church
East Mersea Parish Council	St Georges New Town Junior School
East of England Tourism	St James C of E V A Primary School
Edward Gittins & Associates	St Johns & Highwoods Community Association Ltd
EEDA	St Johns Ambulance
Eight Ash Green Parish Council	St Johns Church
Emmaus Colchester	St Johns Residents Association
English Partnerships	St Mary Residents Association
Equality Estates	St Mary's Church
Essex & Suffolk Gliding Club	Stanley Bragg Partnership
Essex & Suffolk Water	Stanway Library
Essex Army Cadet Force	Stanway Parish Council
Essex Chambers of Commerce	Stanway Residents Association
Essex County Cricket Club	Stephen Egerton Associates
Essex County Youth Service	Stephen Hayhurst Chartered Town Planner
Essex Fire & Rescue Services	Strutt & Parker
Essex Fire & Rescue Services	Sustainable Environment Consultants Ltd
Essex Rivers Healthcare NHS Trust, Colchester General Hospital	T J Evers Ltd
Essex Roofing Company Ltd	Taylor Woodrow Developments
Essex Strategic Health Authority	Tesco
Estuary Housing Ltd	Tesco Stores Ltd
Etiss Ltd	The Barton Willmore Planning Partnership
Evening Gazette/Essex County Standard	The British Wind Energy Association
F & C Commercial Property Holdings Ltd	The C M Cadman Group Ltd
Facility Development Manager	The Craftsman
Federation of Small Businesses	The Food Company
Fenn Wright	The Guinness Trust
Fenn Wright	The Gypsy Council
Fingringhoe Parish Council	The Inland Waterways Association
First Essex Buses Ltd	The JTS Partnership
Fisher Jones Greenwood	The Philip Morant School
Fitness First	The Planning Bureau Ltd
Five Poets Residents Association	The Planning Bureau Ltd
Flagship Housing Group	The Rose and Crown Hotel
Flakt Woods Ltd	The Royal Association For Deaf People
FMA Ltd	The Sixth Form College, Colchester

Fordham Parish Council	The Stanway School
Forestry Commission	The Theatres Trust
Freight Transport Association, HR Department	The Thomas Lord Audley School & Language College
Friends of the Minorities	The Wine Centre
G P Practice	Thompson Smith & Puxon
George Wimpey UK Ltd	Thurstable School
Gilberd School	Tiptree Library
Gladdale Group	Tiptree Parish Council
Godden & Rudling Building Services	Transco
Great Horkesley Parish Council	Transport for London
Great Tey Parish Council	Turley Associates
Greenstead & St Andrews Nursery & Infants	Turners for Men & Women Ltd
Greenstead Library	Underwoods of Colchester
Gypsy & Traveller Law Reform Coalition	University of Essex
Hall Duncan Associates	University of Essex Dept of Biological Sciences
Hamilton Lodge Trust	University of Essex Students Union
Harwich International Port	Vaughan & Blythe (Construction) Ltd
Hazlemere Infants School & Nursery	Volunteer for Mind
Health & Safety Exec	W A Hills
Help the Aged	Wakes Colne Parish Council
Higgins Construction Plc	Warden Housing
Hills Residential Ltd	Warren Insulation
HLL Humberts Leisure	Welshwood Park Residents Association
Holiday Inn	West Bergholt Parish Council
Holmwood House School	West Bergholt Parish Planning Group
Hornburys	West Mersea Library
Housing Corporation	West Mersea Town Council
Hutton Construction Ltd	Whybrow Chartered Surveyors
Hythe Community Centre Association	Wildlife and Countryside Link
Hythe Residents Association	Wilkin & Sons Ltd
Hythe Residents Association & Colne Harbour Group	Winstred Hundred Parish Council
Ian R Matthers B.S & D	Wivenhoe Dental Praticce
Iceni Homes	Wivenhoe Sailing Club
Iceni Projects Ltd	Wivenhoe Town Council
Indasa Abrasives (UK)Ltd	Womens National Commission
Indigo Planning	Wordwrite Associates
Inntel	Wormingford Parish Council
Jacks Famous Supplies Ltd	Young Essex Assembly
James & Lindsay Life & Pensions Ltd	Youth Enquiry Service

Appendix 2

Colchester Borough Council

PO Box 885, Town Hall, Colchester, CO1 1ZE
Telephone (01206) 282222 DX 729040 Colchester 15
*Textphone users dial 18001 followed by the full number
that you wish to call*

Strategic Policy & Regeneration

Contact Karen Syrett

Phone (01206) 506477 Fax (01206) 282711

E-mail karen.syrett@colchester.gov.uk

Your ref

Our ref KS/CA/spd

Date 14th May 2009

Address

Dear Sir/Madam

Consultation on Draft Supplementary Planning Document – Affordable Housing

Colchester Borough Council has prepared a further consultation document to supplement policies in the adopted Core Strategy. This latest document relates to the provision of affordable housing. Policy H4 in the Adopted Core Strategy sets out the key expectation that the Council will seek to secure 35% of new dwellings as affordable housing on sites that meet the following thresholds: 10 or more dwellings in the case of Colchester Town, Stanway, Tiptree, Wivenhoe and West Mersea; and, 3 or more dwellings elsewhere. The Core Strategy also states that an equivalent financial contribution will be sought for developments below these thresholds. The Supplementary Planning Document sets out how the policy will be implemented. The consultation lasts for 4 weeks until the 12th June 2009.

We would welcome your comments on all aspects of the document but in particular the following points;

1. Should social housing be 'pepperpotted' throughout the site? (Section 5.5)
2. Does the guidance for rural exception sites adequately address the particular circumstances of Colchester villages? (Section 6)
3. Have the correct criteria been selected for evaluating viability? (Section 8)
4. Is the methodology for below-threshold contributions clearly presented and justifiable? (Section 9)
5. Is any further detail or clearer explanation required on any element of the affordable housing contribution process?

There are two other documents we are already seeking your views on and you may have heard from us about these 2 weeks ago. The consultation period for these started on 1st May and lasts for 4 weeks, until 29th May 2009. They are;

1. Backland and Infill Development - which provides guidance to members of the public and developers of the Borough Council's approach to backland and infill development.
2. Provision of Community Facilities – this informs developers and other interested parties about what the Council will expect regarding contributions to community facilities.

In accordance with the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' and the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, a Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report has been prepared for each SPD and was sent to statutory consultees and selected interested parties in February 2009. The results of that consultation have informed the production of the Sustainability Appraisals which accompanies these documents.

The draft SPD's do not contain any new policies but expand upon and provide guidance on existing policies in the Adopted Review Colchester Borough Local Plan, the Core Strategy and in time new policies in the emerging Development Policies Document.

The documents and the Sustainability Appraisal are available on the Councils website (www.colchester.gov.uk/ldf) and at the Council Offices in Angel Court and in local libraries.

Representations can be made by email to planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk or by post to Planning Policy, Colchester Borough Council, FREEPOST NAT4433, PO Box 885, Colchester, CO1 1ZE

If you have any questions or would like to discuss any elements of the SPD please contact a member of the Planning Policy Team on 01206 282473/6 or alternatively email planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk

All representations received will be reported to the Local Development Framework Committee and will help inform the final documents. A Statement of Consultation will be published alongside the final adopted SPD and will summarise all the comments we receive. Once adopted the documents will be a material consideration in the planning process to which considerable weight will be attached.

We have written to you because at some time you have indicated you wished to be consulted on the Local Development Framework. We are now updating our database and would appreciate you confirming that you are still interested in hearing from us. Please email or write to the addresses above to ensure you remain on the list and if possible provide us with an email address.

Yours faithfully

Karen Syrett
Spatial Policy Manager

Appendix 3

COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL


**NOTICE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN
THE PREPARATION OF SUPPLEMENTARY
PLANNING DOCUMENTS (SPDs) UNDER
REGULATION 17 OF 'THE TOWN AND
COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL
DEVELOPMENT) (ENGLAND)
(AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2008'**

Colchester Borough Council is inviting representations on Supplementary Planning Documents covering Affordable Housing; Community Facilities; and Backland and Infill Development. When finished, these documents will form part of Colchester's Local Development Framework and support the recently adopted Core Strategy.

The consultation period for the documents will run from Friday 1st May 2009 until Friday 29th May 2009 (Friday 15th May 2009 to Friday 12th June for the Affordable Housing SPD). The deadline for responding is 5.00pm. The Council may not be able to consider your views if your representations are received later than this time.

Copies of the documents, along with their supporting papers, are available at Colchester Borough Council Customer Service Centre, High Street, Colchester, between 8.30am and 5.30pm (Monday to Friday) and all Colchester District Libraries during normal opening hours, including evenings and weekends.

All of the documents and response forms can also be downloaded from the Colchester Borough Council website at www.colchester.gov.uk


Colchester

Representations should be made on the response forms provided only and sent to the Spatial Policy team, at FREEPOST NAT4433, PO BOX 885, Colchester, Essex CO1 1ZE or by email to planning.policy@colchester.gov.uk

Further information can be obtained from the Spatial Policy team on (01206) 282473/282476.

Colchester Borough Council www.colchester.gov.uk

Appendix 4: Consultation Responses to Draft Affordable Housing SPD and CBC Response

	Respondent	Summary of Comments	CBC Response
1	Anglian Water	No comment	N/A
2	Cllr E Blundell	Pepperpotting should continue as leads to more harmonious relationships on site. Role of Rural Housing Enabler should be clarified (are there several trusts involved? Should Parish Council be arbiter for eligibility queries?). Criteria allowing support for public subsidy bids in viability cases should be emphasised. Methodology for below threshold contributions clear, but can they be modified when market conditions change? Relief for single dwellings should be emphasised as want residents to provide homes for themselves or other family members. Is mention of a 45% AH contribution necessary?	Noted. Section 6 amended to clarify role of Rural Enabler. Parish Councils/ elected members should not be arbiters over eligibility. These issues covered by allocations policy. Methodology for below threshold contributions to be re-examined. Relief for single dwellings contrary to CS; however annexes for dependent relatives would get relief.
3	Coal Authority	No comment	N/A
4	Colchester Institute	No comment	N/A
5	Dedham Village Design Statement Team	Should be pepperpotting. Support guidance for rural exception sites (emphasis on parishioners and close relatives). AH for 1 st time buyers/young/key workers adequately dealt with subject to retaining shared ownership as affordable when 1st buyer moves on; however, small developments to cater for the elderly should be catered for within the 35% to allow them to downsize and remain within the community: sections 8 and 9 should be adjusted accordingly.	Noted. Section 6 amended to clarify no right to buy in rural exception sites. The need for smaller homes to allow elderly residents to downsize within the community is recognised – however, existing house-owners would not ordinarily qualify for affordable housing, so an adjustment to AH requirements not appropriate.
6	Defence Estates	SPD should be amended so that provision of MOD housing is exempt from providing AH (as Service Families Accommodation and Single Living Accommodation is by definition affordable). Nor should MOD be required to make a financial contribution. Welcome recognition that decontamination may affect viability of brownfield sites.	New subsection 5.7 clarifies that residential accommodation outside Class C3 to be excluded from affordable housing contributions.
7	EEDA	No comment	N/A
8	East England Regional Assembly	SPD is in general conformity with the policies of the East of England Plan.	Noted

9	Environment Agency	Higher densities will make it more difficult to incorporate SuDS	Issue not directly relevant to this SPD
10	Essex County Council	Policy context could be improved by ref to EERHsg Strategy 2005-10/ Greater Haven Gateway Hsg Strategy 2006-10/ Colchester's SCI and Hsg Strategy. Evidence base should refer to Fordhams Site Viability Study as the 80:20 affordable rented: intermediate split reflects this rather than the SHMA. The SHMA refers to greatest need for 4-bedroom properties; however the SPD seeks a proportional split according to market provision. SPD should set out size and type of AH required in specific locations or confirm that this will be cited in Site Specific Allocation DPD. Recommend last sentence of 5.2 amended to read: 'development while meeting density requirements should not sacrifice long term sustainability and high quality design and build standards'. Recommend ref to the Essex Design Initiative in 5.5. In section 5.6, recommend: 100% of AH to Lifetime Homes Standard; 10% to facilitate wheelchair accessibility or easily adapted for wheelchair users; secure and covered space for mobility scooters cos of fire risk if parked indoors. In section 9, should clarify how the contribution will be applied if the developer seeks to reside on one of the new dwellings.	The policy context relates to all relevant strategies. The GHG Strategy is being rewritten currently. The 80:20 split relates to the 79:21 split identified in the SHMA not the Viability Study. The SHMA identified that just over 20% of affordable need could be met with intermediate products at the right price and up to 80% would need to be affordable rented in order to meet need. Considered that achieving a proportionate mix of the market housing is the best and simplest way of achieving a need for AH which is across the board in terms of sizes – NB H3 in the CS expects a mix of house types. Wording of S5.2 amended. All affordable housing complies with the HCA building standards which are generally higher than the building regs - a specific percentage of all homes to meet wheelchair users need would be inflexible and may present viability problems. Currently we source specific properties for individual households and in the design and build stage would take account of fire risks. S9 amended so that it applies to all new dwellings other than annexes for dependent relatives.
11	F Fergus	Rural Exception Sites should not encroach upon wildlife or greenbelt land especially in smaller villages (such as Peldon) where there is limited infrastructure / transport to offer young families.	These sites by definition likely to be on greenfield. Each site will require a balanced appraisal between meeting need and satisfying ENV1 in the CS which gives protection to the countryside.
12	N Harrison	Pepperpotting should be encouraged to avoid 'ghettos'. Threshold for Wivenhoe should be set at 3 dwellings not 10, as no apparent sites for the latter.	Noted. Wivenhoe threshold already set by Policy H4 in the Core Strategy.
13	Highways Agency	No comment	N/A
14	Iceni Homes (on behalf of Iceni Homes & Colne Housing Society)	Section 5.5 generally supported, provided very small clusters not required: provision of supported housing alongside other tenures can be difficult – could the scope of the section 9 mechanism be widened to apply to such schemes; developments targeted at the high end of the market could place occupants of AH in fuel poverty; on larger strategic sites any lack of infrastructure or services could cause difficulties for occupants of AH; blocks of units are easier to manage and achieve cost efficiencies for the RSL's, especially for high density flatted schemes; difficult to deliver	S5.5 amended to allow single clusters on small sites where less than 15 dwellings in total to be provided; elsewhere the policy seeks to deliver mixed tenure sustainable communities - providing different types of housing within the same development is key to this. We would expect all homes to become more and more fuel efficient in line with already set out government policy in order to avoid the risk of fuel poverty and damage to the environment. There is still a need for larger family homes which would be expected to be of a similar standard to those

		<p>special needs units and bungalows whilst making up the numbers for the 35%. Section 6 should be modified after the Taylor report; vendors to be offered nomination rights when they are local employers; strategic greenfield land should be released for AH if location more sustainable than brownfield; voices against development often outweigh those in favour of Rural Exception Sites – an up-to-date assessment of housing need for each of the rural wards and a housing action plan based on this would help. Section 8 is pragmatic: it may be worth considering taking serviced land rather than units on some sites, as would allow RSL's to design schemes targeted at specific housing needs; competition between RSL's can reduce AH nos. – on strategic sites, LA could undertake selection process to identify the preferred RSL, to be written into the S106. Section 9 is positive and entrepreneurial: however, may give rise to challenge and suggest that a valuer from the developer and the LA negotiate to provide a joint value. Could the mechanism in Section 9 be applied to larger sites where development has stalled due to economic climate, or where the mix and composition does not readily deliver AH (see text of response for details). Would welcome an additional section that gives flexibility and/or encouragement to an RSL providing 100% AH on marginal sites. Recent successful challenges to AH contained in s106 at Kent and Congleton due to diminished profit from lower sales values: to maintain nos. of AH the contractor to receive their full value by a combination of private finance and capital grant.</p>	<p>provided for market sale. As stated in the policy viability would be a consideration in supporting the application for grant from the HCA as long as developers are willing to comply with the open book scrutiny process required to apply for grant on grounds of viability. To undertake a full Housing Needs Survey of every parish would be prohibitively expensive to conduct and update frequently enough in order to make it a meaningful useful tool. Instead The Rural Housing Enabler is supported by Colchester Borough Council and partners to deliver Housing Needs Assessments in partnership with Parish Councils for their area at a time which is relevant to likely development. Accepting serviced land rather than developed properties may be worth considering although a Value for Money Assessment would need to be considered and the implications for grant rate and build costs. Colchester BC would still expect developers to provide a relevant mix of land dependent on the mix of dwellings on the site overall. Where sites have been stalled due to the economic climate it is preferable to release this land and deliver units of affordable housing through the tools already employed by CBC and RSL partners rather than by accepted commuted sums on sites over the threshold. Any developer or Housing association with viability concerns should approach the council in the first instance. We welcome efforts to deliver as much affordable housing possible including increasing beyond the percentages of affordable housing set out in the SPD and elsewhere but feel that our ambitions to create mixed tenure sustainable communities is paramount to having single tenure sites. We also feel that should the identified need for supported housing schemes become apparent this will be explored with an evidence base for need and a consideration of funding opportunities but that these issues are not appropriate for inclusion in this policy.</p>
15	Kelvedon Parish Council	Only concerns relate to developments in Tiptree and impacts on traffic and A12 access/egress.	Noted. ECC Highways would be consulted on each application.
16	M Livingstone	Threshold for provision of AH in urban area too onerous: should be set at 15 in line with PPS3.	Threshold of 10 was considered sound for the Core Strategy.
17	Motorcycle	No comment	N/A

	Action Group		
18	Cllr G Oxford	Threshold of 10 units (section 4) in urban areas should be reduced to 3. Roads to be wide enough to cater for refuse and emergency vehicles and adequate off-road parking. Concern that developers leave AH till the end of schemes. Is there a list of RSL's providing custom built disabled accommodation besides Colne Housing? Provision of wheelchair accommodation is poor: can we require 2 such units between 2 and 4-beds on each site as part of the AH quota? Comments more pertinent to the Sustainability Appraisal relating to low nos. of AH relative to Housing Needs Register and provision of Travellers Sites.	Threshold of 10 has been adopted by Policy H4 in CS. Delivery times for AH/ trigger points now set out in S106 agreements. A specific requirement for wheelchair adapted homes on every site would be uneconomical and is unlikely to meet need effectively. Instead we take a targeted approach based on need rather than risk wheelchair standard adapted dwellings being left empty because they are not chosen by those with a housing need on the register. This has been successful at delivering the right kind of homes needed in sustainable locations and there is no evidence to suggest that delivery is poor compared to actual identified need.
19	D Palmer	Not clear who will own the AH when schemes complete; nor how necessary infrastructure and services, including open spaces and community facilities, will be funded.	Wording in Section 7 clarified - Housing Associations will normally take over AH; and additional sentence added to make clear that other policies/ contributions appropriate to all housing proposals (e.g.DP1).
20	A Pritchard	Where RSL's mentioned can we refer to our own ALMO Colchester Borough Council? Are the reasons for not providing 35% level of AH drawn as tightly as possible?	Not appropriate to refer specifically to Colchester Borough Homes, although they will not be precluded from taking part in development activities subject to Council approval.
21	R Ratcliffe	Pepperpotting can cause problems due to type of occupancy. Further development in Tiptree will overload sewerage and water services.	Noted. Provision of appropriate infrastructure would be considered by the relevant Utility bodies (Anglian Water Services).
22	Cllr P Smith	Error in Section 4.2 of the Sustainability Appraisal: there are no wards in bottom 20% for deprivation, 3 in the bottom 40% according to the 2008 Colchester Health profile.	Noted. Sustainability Appraisal to be reviewed.
23	Tendring DC	Pepperpotted clusters are a good idea. Might be value in providing standard s106 'heads of terms' as an appendix as RSL's have different approaches. Council will need to make resources available to Officers for viability negotiations. Further guidance on dealing with small sites forming part of a larger one would be helpful.	Noted. Council in negotiation to resource an economic appraisal tool.
24	Theatres Trust	No comment	N/A
25	English Heritage	The historic environment should be taken into account in planning such developments. EH has recently published guidance entitled " <i>Affordable Rural Housing and the Historic Environment</i> " covering successful delivery of housing schemes in small historic settlements.	Noted – Policy DP14 in the DPD deals with all development proposals that affect historic environment assets.

26	Mersea Homes	<p>75:25 affordable rented:intermediate split should be adopted as assists viability (or 78:22 as per the SHMA); Mix of units should be more flexible (S4). Means of calculating nos. of AH needs refinement; Quality of design is important, but requiring AH to match market housing increases expense of provision; Is their evidence that peppercotting causes social issues? There can be good reasons for not peppercotting (S5). Outline consents do not always give enough details to agree mix etc (S6). All schemes should be considered against a standard model (such as 3 Dragons) that can be made available to developers (S7). Calculations used to justify contributions for below threshold-level sites are difficult to understand –figs need to be reassessed and further sample cases run (using 3 Dragons model) before SPD is adopted; once a robust figure ascertained for present this should be adjusted according to the house price index; there should be a different effective cost for both intermediate and affordable rented types; consistent approach between rounding and using decimal point calculations; single plots should be subject to the same contribution: this appears to contravene the Core Strategy; contributions should be prior to first occupation so that first sales proceeds will cover such costs (S9).</p>	<p>20% is easier to calculate than 22% and past experience has shown that take-up of new build intermediate takes time - there is a more pressing need for affordable rented. Minor amendment to the wording of S4 on mix. Rounding principles are standard practice and easy to apply, whereas charging contributions for fractions entails more complicated financial input, including alternative formula – if rounding up introduces viability issue, developers can discuss. Matching quality relates to external residential environment rather than internal quality –wording to be amended to reflect this. Agreed that schemes of less than 15 units can provide the AH element in one cluster – policy as worded will allow flexibility, albeit objective is to achieve mixed sustainable communities. Wording amended with regard to requirements for outline applications, to reflect Validation Requirements. Methodology for below threshold contributions to be re-examined. Agreed single plots should be subject to same contribution – wording of Section9 amended.</p>
----	--------------	---	---