

**ANNEX 1: Affordable Housing SPD Responses**

<b>Respondent</b>	<b>Respondent Reference</b>	<b>Document Reference</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Government Office for the North East</b>	<b>1.1</b>		General advice on the preparation of SPD's (No detailed comments provided)	Noted.
<b>English Heritage</b>	<b>5.1</b>	<b>Chapter 5: Meeting Local Needs – the cascade mechanism</b>	If those seeking affordable housing have no clear reason or imperative for living within a particular parish of family or social purposes, or for business needs, provision should be made in a nearby principal settlement where goods and services, community facilities and employment opportunities can be found without the need to travel unnecessary distances by motorised transport.	Noted.
	<b>5.2</b>	<b>Chapter 6: Teesdale Affordable Housing Targets</b>	Paragraph 6.2 advises that where odd numbers of dwellings are proposed the target of 30% will be rounded down to the nearest number. I question why the target would be rounded down only where odd numbers of dwellings are proposed. What, for example, would happen where 4, 6, or 8 dwellings are proposed? 30% of both 5 and 6 is less than 2, therefore the number of affordable units to be provided need only be 1 to satisfy the formula. I would suggest that where the number of dwellings is not clearly divisible by 3, the target is rounded	Noted.

			up or down to the nearest whole number.	
	<b>5.3</b>		The RSS allocation for Teesdale is 75 dwellings per year to 2021. 30% affordable housing equates with less than 25 per year. Small though this number may be, it is important for the majority of them to be located in the high level settlements within the hierarchy or where overriding need is demonstrated.	Agreed.
	<b>5.4</b>	<b>Section 2: Delivering Affordable Housing</b>	Paragraph 14.1 deals with providing affordable housing on-site. I am unclear as to whether the affordable housing requirement applies in respect of schemes of conversion, for example, farm ranges.	The SPD will be applied upon the provision of any new housing units above the threshold in a particular part of the District, should this be considered inappropriate for a valid reason, eg sub division of a Listed Building, and agreed with the LA, then off site or a commuted sum payment may be considered.  Given that land supply is such a key issue in Teesdale, then an alternative site may not always be available within reasonable time
	<b>5.5</b>		Paragraph 15.1 concerns itself with off-site provision. I can see some merit in providing affordable housing off-site if that component is in a more sustainable location and within easier access to employment opportunities,	

			shops and schools etc.	frame. Affordable housing will only ever be supported in sustainable locations, but this is also about supporting specific rural communities and location of the units is key in a rural area.
	<b>5.6</b>		Paragraph 21.4 advises that every planning application must now be accompanied by a Design and Access Statement. This is not correct. Some types of application remain exempt.	Noted.
	<b>5.7</b>	<b>Appendix 3</b>	This appendix sets out Policy H13 of the Adopted Local Plan. Criterion H refers to the need to avoid harm to sites of environmental or archaeological importance. When this policy is revisited I would suggest the word “archaeological” is replaced with “cultural heritage”. It is necessary to recognise that harm could potentially be caused to a range of important heritage assets.	Noted.
<b>England and Lyle (George Wimpey North Yorkshire)</b>	<b>6.1</b>		GWNY do not object to the provision of an element of affordable housing as part of new housing developments where the need is clearly demonstrated through a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) as defined in PPS3 and Strategic Housing Market Assessments Practice Guidance Version 2 (August 2007). The 2004 Housing	The SPD is based on robust evidence gathered specifically for this purpose, locally based evidence is also a key component listed in PPS3 as a means of identifying need and demand. Since publication of the SPD, the Strategic Housing Market

		<p>Needs Assessment undertaken by Teesdale Council and the subsequent review do not constitute a SHMA and do not therefore provide an adequate evidence base to justify the proposed requirement for affordable housing in Teesdale, as detailed in the Draft SPD. Housing Needs Assessment exhibit a number of weaknesses in terms of methodology and assumptions not least the assumption that housing need can only be met through the use of RSLs and the lack of consideration of the role of private sector housing in meeting affordable housing needs. Other concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessment is over three years old;</li> <li>• Reliance on the Housing Register held by the Council</li> <li>• The failure to define a specific numerical target of affordable housing units;</li> <li>• The lack of justification for the 30% target in certain market sub areas;</li> <li>• The use of parish boundaries to delineate housing market sub areas which leads to a range of unfortunate anomalies e.g. the area between Barnard Castle and Streatlam and Stainton Parish falling within a different Housing Sub area.</li> </ul> <p>It is appreciated that Parishes provide a useful administrative unit for controlling the cascade mechanism but they are inappropriate in terms of defining market</p>	<p>Assessment has also been published and confirms the critical need for range of new affordable housing opportunities in Teesdale. The need for and content of the SPD is therefore timely. RSL's are recognised a key provider of affordable housing in Teesdale, but the SPD also recognises the role of the private sector which is likely to grow upon the implementation of the SPD. The 2007 Interim update of the 2004 survey confirmed both the need for affordable units in Teesdale, but also that we are failing to meet it. The target for affordable housing across the District is 25 units per annum, or 35% of completions as set out in the Authorities Corporate Plan. The target of 30% is applied consistently across all market areas, as we monitor the implementation of this SPD we may be in a position to change the target but this must be based on the meting of identified need, together with housing supply that</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>sub areas. • The number of market sub areas identified in the District • The lack of guidance on monetary values to be attached to affordable units; • Lack of information on whether RSLs active within the district are willing to accept further affordable units • Lack of a mechanism to deal with circumstances where no RSL, Community Land Trust or other is willing to accept further affordable units.</p>	<p>will be published in out SHLAA in the summer of 2008. WE have also recently re-commissioned a full housing needs survey that may also inform the application of this target across the District. The target will remain in the mean time as long as we ensure that there is not oversupply of affordable housing in any given market area. The market areas were defined in the 2004 survey produced. As we move into a market based approach to housing delivery the Authority considers this approach to be not only robust, but sensible given the geographic extent of the district, and the variety of communities and housing catchments within it. The market approach also provides a clear mechanism to match need with supply and may allow for variations in requirements across the District.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.5 sets out the financial mechanism at any given time to determine the financial affordability of particular unit, by providing the mechanism rather</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				<p>than a figure the equation can more easily reflect changes in the market.</p> <p>The RSLs active in the area are all part of the Local Strategic Partnership and constantly seeking new opportunities to deliver more units in Teesdale, as is the Community Land Trust. Given that the private sector will increasingly play its part also in meeting these needs it is unlikely that mechanism would be required to deal with these circumstances, we will however take this to the LSP and seek advice on how this situation should and could be addressed</p>
<b>Staindrop Parish Council</b>	<b>10.1</b>		<p>The Parish Council had promoted a scheme for affordable housing in the village and supports the general intentions of the two housing documents. We were glad to note that the current Local Plan Policy H13 is saved for the time being, as this seems to have served its purpose satisfactorily. It is hard to see the value in these documents of the inclusion of the Sub-Housing Markets described as being as part of the 2004 Housing Needs Assessment (see remarks made under settlement hierarchy in Core</p>	<p>Noted – the market areas were defined in the 2004 survey produced. As we move into a market based approach to housing delivery the Authority considers this approach to be not only robust, but sensible given the geographic extent of the district, and the variety of communities and housing catchments within it. The market approach also provides a clear mechanism to</p>

			Strategy Response.	match need with supply and may allow for variations in requirements across the District.
<b>CPRE</b>	<b>11.1</b>	<b>Section 1 Para 4.2</b>	What genuine evidence is there to substantiate the claim that “we are not delivering adequate numbers of affordable units which threatens the viability of our rural communities”? Housing list figures may be part of the justification but not all. Where are the jobs which are not being filled? Or do we simply want to induce unemployed people to remain unemployed just because they want to continue to live in the area?	The 2007 Interim Housing Needs Survey when compared to the 2004 demonstrates that we are not delivering affordable housing at a rate that matches need. It is widely documented through surveys, census data Community Strategy etc that we are as a District losing our young people to the conurbations and not necessarily through choice, but lack there of. At the same time we are acquiring an ever aging population. The presumption that those in need of affordable housing are always the unemployed is inaccurate. We have the highest single person household figure in the County, and yet evidence suggests that to purchase a house at the lower end of the market, a single person would need to earn in excess of £25, 000 and probably nearer £30,000. Many working people in the District do not and will not achieve these income levels. The

				provision of affordable housing in sustainable locations is not therefore about perpetuating unemployment, but rather maintaining a workforce for existing employers, and allowing local people and their families to stay within their communities should they wish to do so.
	<b>11.2</b>	<b>Policy H13</b>	Is the system of demonstrating need robust enough? In B if we are overriding planning policies it should only be for small developments; the word “normally” should be removed	We consider the needs to be well evidenced in Teesdale, the recent publication of the Sub Regional Housing Market Assessment confirms the need for affordable units in the District and supports our local evidence base. We have also recently commissioned a full household survey to keep our local information up to date. Policy H13 is a saved Local Plan policy that cannot be amended at the current time, but the comment is noted.
	<b>11.3</b>	<b>Appendix 4</b>	Shouldn't a report on the need accompany the planning application. This should of course be current and not using old figures.	It could be, but the need is already evidence in our survey work and the SHMA, this would only be necessary if the applicant felt that the requirements of the policy were to meet a need that did not



				exist. The submission of a housing pro forma seeks to raise the issue of addressing need at an early stage in site negotiations rather than leaving this debate until the submission stage.
	<b>11.4</b>	<b>Sustainability Appraisal of SPD</b>	Although issue could be taken on a number of points, the general impression is of a thorough and well considered document	Noted.
<b>Jackson Plan</b>	<b>14.1</b>		<p>Sustainable Rural Villages (tier 3 in Core Strategy) should cater for small groups of both affordable and private housing to accommodate the known demand for housing.</p> <p>The village of Whorlton is a classic example of the type of village/community being referred to. The village of Whorlton, in theory compromises an unsustainable community in which it could reasonably be expected that no further growth would be permitted. Not only is such a proposal considered to be inappropriate, it is contended that if the village continued to be placed in an “conservation bottle”, existing housing in the village would become unaffordable for the great percentage of the existing population of the district. It could therefore eventually become a retirement village for the wealthy, a “tag” which the</p>	<p>The settlement hierarchy will be determined through Core Strategy and no the Affordable Hosing SPD, the capacity and constraints of settlements and their ability absorb new development in terms of its character and layout, particularly where conservation issues apply will be factors in this process and evidenced through the SHLAA process.</p> <p>The planning process is not responsible for house prices and other than providing affordable housing in accordance with the definition (as set out in the SPD) cannot control the market price of private new build in any location.</p>

			existing community would abhor.	
<b>Environment Agency</b>	<b>18.1</b>	<b>Section 2 Delivering Affordable Housing Site Viability Para 13</b>	This should be in accordance with the strategic Flood Risk Assessment, regardless of tenure	Noted.
	<b>18.2</b>	<b>Appendix 2 Relevant Policy Documents</b>	Could included PPS 25 and the Tees Valley SFRA could be added	Noted.
<b>One NorthEast</b>	<b>21.1</b>	<b>Section 7 Thresholds</b>	One NorthEast welcomes TDC's intention to prepare an SPD to address the provision of affordable housing within the District. The Draft document indicates a target of 30% affordable housing provision. The site / size number of units for Barnard Castle is high compared with other areas of the District – the Agency would want justification for the reasoning behind this differential.	This is reflective of the fact that sites development in Barnard Castle are generally larger than those in the villages as evidenced in Appendix 1, the higher trigger allows for a supply of market housing, but also offers greater viability on the development of larger sites.
<b>Home Builders Federation</b>	<b>27.1</b>	<b>Section 1 Negotiating Affordable Housing</b>	Whilst the HBF accepts that the SPD is based on the Council's saved Local Plan policy H14 we are concerned that this SPD does far more than simply expands or supplements that existing adopted policy. Rather it introduces a raft of onerous and prescriptive policy requirements on the house building industry which should be	TDC consider that the mechanism set out in the SPD merely clarifies the requirement of H14, in light of the evidence need. The different requirements merely reflect this – and the need to ensure that the units to be provided as “affordable housing” are able to be retained

			<p>more properly included in a DPD in order that their implications can be tested through the process of independent examination.</p>	<p>as such. It may be the case in the future, as the Countywide LDF and Core Strategy emerge, that this subject is addressed at that level. Along with other Authorities, we would have no objection to that approach, but until then (and with evidence from the SHMA), we have real needs to address that, if left to a later date, will only worsen and result in even more stringent policies. We would be happy to discuss the concern in this regard further with the HBF.</p>
	27.2	4. Local Housing Needs	<p>The HBF is concerned that the evidence that the Council has formulated the affordable housing policy from is not robust and credible. Whilst we recognise that the Council had updated the original 2004 Housing Needs Assessment recently in 2007, the “Interim housing Needs Assessment” current Government Guidance states that Strategic Housing Market Assessment should be conducted to inform affordable housing policies. PPS 3 (Annex C) gives the requirements of the outputs from Housing Market Assessments and states assessments should be prepared collaboratively with stakeholders, suggesting that the involvement of the</p>	<p>We consider the needs to be well evidenced in Teesdale, the recent publication of the Sub Regional Housing Market Assessment confirms the need for affordable units in the District. Locally based evidence is also a key component listed in PPS3 as a means of identifying need and demand. We have also recently commissioned a full household survey to keep our local information up to date.</p>

			<p>industry is a key part of the methodology. The housing Market Assessment is particularly important since, to a large extent, the achievement of the delivery of affordable housing is very much dependent on the delivery of market housing, as a large proportion of the annual supply of new affordable housing comes on the back of market housing, and is funded and delivered by the house building industry.</p>	
	27.3	8. Tenure	<p>Whilst the HBF accepts that the Council states it is prepared to be flexible with the affordable housing targets of 80% for rental units and 20% for intermediate tenures, it is concerned that these targets will be applied in every case. PPS 3 paragraph 22 makes it clear that local authorities should only seek to influence the size and type of affordable housing required based on the findings of strategic housing market assessment and other local evidence. Government policy appears to encourage home ownership and one way to do this would be to increase the proportion of shared ownership properties to be constructed to incentivise home ownership in the long term.</p>	<p>Para 22 of PPS 3 encourages LA's to provide information on the proportions of affordable housing verses market housing required. These figures are based on the identified need of the affordable provision and are based on locally derived evidence as advocated in the same paragraph. However TDC can already demonstrate that these recommendations are not applied arbitrarily and that each application in each area has its own merits. TDC also recognise that the intermediate tenures can help with the viability of schemes. This clarification in the SPD is also useful on rural exception sites where no market housing is involved and stair casing out</p>

				prohibited.
	<b>27.4</b>	<b>8.4 Intermediate Housing</b>	<p>The Council will be aware that it cannot seek all units to be retained and used in as affordable housing in perpetuity as paragraph 38 of PPS 3 allows purchasers of shared equity schemes to buy the final share and staircase out.</p> <p>Furthermore the HBF believes that the Council should include discounted cost market housing as part of its requirement as it provides a housing for those households at the lower end of the market who would otherwise be concealed or occupy a social rented or intermediate dwelling. This should be offset against the affordable housing requirement.</p>	<p>Para 29 of PPS 3 allows LA's to set actual targets for the intermediate affordable housing. The definition of affordable housing in PPS 3 specifically excludes " low cost market housing" unless some form of mechanism is in place to ensure that discounted units continue to remain so at the point of re-sale. Low cost does not necessarily equate with affordability, particularly in the Teesdale housing market where prices are amongst the highest in the region. The Council does however treat each case on its own merits and will consider applications that make provisions across the range of needs in the District.</p>
	<b>27.5</b>	<b>12. Pre-application Advice</b>	<p>This section states that applications will not be validated if the applicant does not complete your proforma. Failure to validate an application, which otherwise meets the national requirements for a planning application is considered to be illegal. Inadequate provision of affordable housing can be a valid reason for a refusal of an</p>	<p>The purpose of the Pro Forma is to ensure that early discussions take place where we are seeking affordable housing as part of a private scheme. The use of such an approach is stipulated by government in guidance on the validation of planning applications and in DCLG</p>

			<p>application but not for refusing its validation. Signing up to a particular form of affordable housing is not a requirement necessary to determine a planning application and indeed acting in this way would prejudice the applicants right to subsequently put forward their case to an independent inspector.</p>	<p>Circular 02/08 Annex A. Our approach is therefore considered, reasonable and legal. Opening discussions about affordable numbers after submission of an application would conflict with the guidance.</p> <p>In using the Pro Forma we are seeking to ensure that the debate around the provision of the affordable housing is well advanced at the planning application stage, demonstrating both the developers commitment to delivery, but also will assist in reducing the delay between the potential approval of an application, and the signing of Section 106 agreements where they are necessary.</p> <p>It was never the intention that the content of the Pro Forma would be binding, although it is hoped that the content would reflect early negotiations and discussions. This situation will be clarified by an additional statement that the signing of the Pro Forma is of no contractual effect, which should meet some of the concerns from the industry.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

	<b>27.6</b>	<b>13. Site Viability</b>	<p>Whilst the HBF accepts that the Council is prepared to take into account site viability when negotiating a target, any viability model will be subjective and will not take into account the funding structures available to national builders, compared with local builders.</p> <p>We are concerned that the target of 30% affordable housing will act as a serious disincentive to landowners and potential developers to bring sites forward.</p>	<p>The propose viability model is that preferred by the Housing Corporation, and readily used by a number of developers. If a developers seeks to employ the use of a viability model to demonstrate that the provision of the affordable element makes a site unviable, then all figures would be have to be provided to the LA and assessed independently by a specialist in the field, this mechanism is not new and is transparent.</p> <p>The affordable housing need in Teesdale is no well established, and landowners are aware that this situation is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future, our monitoring will demonstrate and identify any issues around a constrained housing supply as a result to the SPD.</p>
	<b>27.7</b>	<b>17. Integration</b>	<p>Whilst the HBF supports the principles of integration of affordable housing and ensuring that any affordable housing provision is tenure blind we have concerns in relation to the principle of pepper potting</p>	<p>The distribution of affordable housing can be negotiated on a site by site basis, including the proportions and scale of clusters.</p>

			which is now being discredited on a national basis. The HBF supports the view that the affordable housing should be provided in small clusters.	
	<b>27.8</b>	<b>22. Build Standards</b>	<p>It is good to see the government's acknowledgement of the challenges facing the housing industry in meeting the needs of an ageing population. The private sector is responding to these demographic changes in an a positive way, providing many new and innovative products. It will continue to do so. However, intervention and regulation from central government in this market is both unnecessary and unwarranted.</p> <p>With regard to the requirement that a proportion of the housing development should be "lifetime homes" there are a number of means of providing access and flexibility without specifically requiring lifetime homes. The option should require the provision of flexibility without detailing the need for "lifetime homes".</p>	The SPD has no formal requirement for the provision of Lifetime homes as this would go beyond the remit of this document. Rather the document merely reflects that TDC will seek to influence developments in this regard given the overwhelming evidence of our ageing population, and in recognising that commercial and dedicated provision of specific housing for the elderly may in itself not be affordable. TDC also recognise that the Code for Sustainable Homes, the build standard achieved by RSL's does already contain a number of elements that allows for the changing needs of a potential residents over time.
<b>Durham County Council (Planning Policy)</b>	<b>32.1</b>		The document sets out a clear approach to the provision of affordable housing in different parts of the District supported by evidence of housing need from recent studies. The former coalfield area is	The summary is accurate.



			<p>excluded from the requirement for affordable provision, but in Barnard Castle and other parts of the District the target is for 30% of dwellings to be affordable.</p> <p>Departure from the target on the grounds of financial viability will require submission of a development appraisal. Information on housing need will be supplemented once the County-wide Strategic Housing Market Assessment is completed early in 2008.</p>	
	<b>32.2</b>		<p>National guidance in Planning Policy Statement 3 on Housing (PPS3) sets a minimum site threshold size to 15 dwellings but allows local planning authorities to set lower thresholds where viable and practicable, including rural areas. This approach is reflected on the Teesdale SPD given the small scale of many sites, with a threshold of 10 or more in Barnard Castle and 3 or more in other sub-housing market areas, other than the former coalfield.</p>	The summary is accurate.
	<b>32.3</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<p>The requirement (para 2.1) for development to be used in accessible locations that reduce the need to travel and support the use of sustainable forms of transport accords with Objective 6 of the Local Transport Plan and is supported.</p>	Noted.
	<b>32.4</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<p>The County Council welcomes the fact that access to services, facilities and public</p>	Noted.

			transport are factors taken into account when assessing tenure and wishes to see the importance of this consideration maintained.	
	<b>32.5</b>		The RSS figures in appendix 2 now require updating, as does the appendix to reflect the publication of the Durham sub regional housing strategy.	Noted.
	<b>32.6</b>		In conclusion the District Council's approach to affordable housing provision reflects local circumstances supported by an evidence base, in accordance with national and regional policy, and is worthy of support.	Noted.
<b>Mr F H Clarkson &amp; Mrs J E Richardson</b>	<b>36.1</b>		From reading the TDF we felt that a great deal of work and thought had been expressed for the future of the dale in deciding where and what developemtn could take place without spoiling the landscape and beauty. The report realises the need for some developemtn both for industry and accommodation. This crucial to any area and especially in providing for young families.	Noted.
	<b>36.2</b>		We are therefore prepared, at Cotherstone, to provide a site for the provision of affordable housing for 40% for dwellings of one and two bedroom types and the rest of	The site has been included for assessment in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Study.

			<p>the site for the private sector. The reasons for putting this site forward are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A roadway already exists to the boundary of the site</li> <li>2. the site is level</li> <li>3. No soil would need to be removed off site</li> <li>4. It is enclosed on three sides by existing buildings and on the fourth side the recreation ground</li> <li>5. Any children resident on this site would have safe access to the recreational area.</li> </ol>	
<b>Dr Robin Gibson</b>	<b>46.1</b>	<b>Chapter 1 Background Para 1.3</b>	<p>Within Policy H13 or in the supporting notes references should be made to statutory duties such as those defined by the Town and County Planning Act 1990 Section 106 and Planning (listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 2009 Section 72.</p>	<p>Policy H13 and the supporting text are extracted from the saved Local Plan which cannot be amended at the current time although the comment is noted.</p>
	<b>46.2</b>	<b>Chapter 4 Sustainability Appraisal of SPD</b>	<p>SA Objective 8 would chime with the Planning Act c9 Section 72 if it read, "Preserve and Enhance" rather than "protect and enhance"</p>	<p>The term "preserve" has generally been replaced across the board and is not longer favoured by those such as English Heritage with a statutory to protect the natural and/or built environment. The term preserve is considered to be unduly restrictive, and in practise so limiting that it can actually work against the very</p>

				thing you are trying to achieve.
	<b>46.3</b>	<b>Appendix 1</b>	The document “Teesdale District Housing Strategy 2006-9” was not available upon request from TDC	Although not in the public domain, Mr Gibson was provided with a draft copy of the Strategy, once approval to do so was granted
<b>Gladedale (Signet Planning)</b>	<b>47.1</b>	<b>General</b>	Signet Planning are acting on behalf of Gladedale (Newcastle) Ltd who have interests in the Teesdale District Council Area. It is noted that the emerging Core strategy Issues and Options document refers to the Affordable Housing SPD however considers that affordable housing is an intrinsic element of the Core Strategy approach and should be led through the Core Strategy in the first instance. This gives the opportunity for independent testing of the Policy to ensure its robustness and appropriateness. In this regard, it is our view that affordable housing should be dealt with through the Core Strategy and that reduced weight will be given to the Affordable housing SPD, due to the lack of independent scrutiny.	It may be the case in the future as the Countywide LDF and Core Strategy emerges that this subject is addressed at that level, and we would have no objection to that approach, but until then along with other Authorities and evidence in the SHMA, we have real needs to address that will only worsen and result in even more stringent policies if left to a later date. The use of SPD is therefore an essential interim measure.
	<b>47.2</b>	<b>Para 3.2</b>	This paragraph refers to affordable homes normally being managed by RSL or Community Land Trusts and that affordable homes should be wholly for rent or on a shared equity basis. This does not accord	Paragraph 3.2 merely reflect the reality of the local situation in Teesdale, hence the term “normally”. We will however amend the text to reflect the fact

			with the definition of affordable housing set out in PPS3 which is more accurately reflected in paragraph 8.4 of the SPD. It is considered that paragraph 3.2 needs to be amended to reflect national guidance and true definition of affordable homes/intermediate housing, which shared ownership and discounted provision in perpetuity.	that in certain circumstances the private sector may also manage in part the supply of affordable housing.
	<b>47.3</b>	<b>Para 8.3</b>	Refers to rented accommodation being either purposefully built by the RSL or an RSL purchasing completed property from a builder as a specified process. It also refers that homes be constructed to meet Eco Homes Standard. Eco Homes Standard are not compulsory and in any event have been superseded by the Code for Sustainable Homes which becomes mandatory in April 2008. In this regard the implementation of the Code will be progresses through Building Regulations and whilst it is acknowledged that there is a need to address sustainability/climate change issues through the planning process it is not appropriate to replicate policy requirements that will be adhered to through other mechanisms. In any event the Draft SPD is inaccurate in its reference to Eco Homes Standard.	We recognise that the Code for Sustainable Homes has become the recognise build standard. The SPD recognises here that RSL housing is usually constructed to a higher standard than private housing as the Code for Sustainable Homes standard is a pre cursa to the issue of Housing Corporation funding, and this can be a factor in an RSL's ability to acquire properties form private developers to rent.  No reference is made in this section to private housing, nor
	<b>47.4</b>			

			<p>In regard to complying with the housing standards as they emerge, PPS 3 and its supporting document Delivering Affordable Housing do not require affordable housing provision to automatically comply with other housing standards. Whilst it is acknowledged where housing Corporation grant funding is being implemented as part of a provision compliance with such standards is necessary however in the case of development brought forward and funded solely by the private sector it is felt excessive to insist that such standards are automatically met. Whilst the authority's aspirations may well be to address all housing corporation and other housing standards as they emerge there needs to be a pragmatic approach to this.</p>	<p>would it be within the remit of this SPD to require all housing to meet the Code for Sustainable Homes Standard. This is however an issue that is raised in the TDF Core Strategy Issues and options Paper as a mitigation factor in relation the evidenced high carbon footprint of Teesdale residents.</p>
	<b>47.5</b>	<b>Para 8.5</b>	<p>Relates to the intermediate tenure and whilst the quote in 8.4 is accurate in terms of provision the references in paragraph 8.5 to intermediate tenure being provided solely by an RSL is not accurate and does not reflect the definition as set out in PPS 3 and its supporting document. In addition it does not acknowledge stair casing in the long term which accords with PPS 3 subject to the recycling of revenue released.</p>	<p>Agree that the private sector can play a role in delivering intermediate housing and that the text should be amended to reflect this.</p>
	<b>47.6</b>	<b>Para 9.1</b>	<p>There are issues in respect of the authority</p>	<p>The RSL's referred to are merely</p>

			insisting that provision in terms of RSL being through the RSL partners with the Council. Whilst it is likely that developers may be able to secure a deal with these RSL's the Authority cannot be prescriptive in terms of who the developers seek to promote development with. In this respect the SPD needs to be reflected that an RSL shall be agreed with the Council but does not necessarily need to come from RSL partners.	those most active in Teesdale and members of our Local Strategic Partnership. TDC does not have a dedicated preferred partner, nor will it seek to dictate which RSL a private developer may partner with. Para 9.1 merely seeks to offer assistance in sourcing an RSL where this is required and is based on local experience.
	<b>47.7</b>	<b>Para 9.4</b>	This paragraph is supported in recognition of the role that private sector developers play in the delivery of affordable housing and that there is scope for discounted sale of housing where the discount is passed on in perpetuity. Signet planning have delivered such mechanisms with their client Gladedale (Newcastle) Ltd on a number of schemes throughout the region and welcome the opportunity to progress this form of provision.	Agreed.
	<b>47.8</b>	<b>Paras 12.2 &amp; 23</b>	It is noted in these two paragraphs that the SPD requires housing pro forma detailing the affordable housing provision to be submitted with planning applications and without such pro forma, which requires sign off by senior officers within Local Authority, applications will not be validated. This goes	The purpose of the Pro Forma is to ensure that early discussions take place where we are seeking affordable housing as part of a private scheme. The use of such an approach is stipulated by government in guidance on the validation of

		<p>excessively beyond the requirements set out in guidance on validation of applications. In addition the progression of applications through the application process result in schemes being revised to respond to consultation responses and as such there are a number of factors that may impact upon the scheme in terms of layout and mix and ultimately the aspect of affordable provision provided. The approach being proposed by Teesdale Council requires extensive staff resource prior to an application being submitted and there will be significant concerns that this would not be adequately resourced to enable matters to be resolved prior to submission of the scheme. Whilst there are no objections to the requirement to identify within the application that affordable housing is provided to refuse to validate an application unless there is a countersigned agreement on affordable housing is contrary to each application being judged on its own merits through the planning process. There may be circumstances where the officer's position is not agreed with by developers in which case the appeal process is a recognised route to address these issues. A refusal to validate an application without agreement and sign off</p>	<p>planning applications and in DCLG Circular 02/08 Annex A. Our approach is therefore considered, reasonable and legal. Opening discussions about affordable numbers after submission of an application would conflict with the guidance.</p> <p>In using the Pro Forma we are seeking to ensure that the debate around the provision of the affordable housing is well advanced at the planning application stage, demonstrating both the developers commitment to delivery, but also will assist in reducing the delay between the potential approval of an application, and the signing of Section 106 agreements where they are necessary.</p> <p>It was never the intention that the content of the Pro Forma would be binding, although it is hoped that the content would reflect early negotiations and discussions. This situation will be clarified by an additional statement that the signing of the Pro Forma is of no contractual effect, which should meet some of the</p>
--	--	--	--



			on the affordable housing pro forma circumvents the entire planning system and process. This element of the SPD is fundamentally objected to.	concerns from the industry.
<b>Philip Hunt - Barnard Castle Branch Labour Party</b>	<b>48.1</b>	<b>Affordable Housing for Families in Barnard Castle (especially families with young children)</b>	<p>My comment concerns the general availability of housing, especially in the Barnard Castle area, that is in a price bracket affordable by many local families with young children. The situation outlined below addresses issues identified by members of Barnard Castle Branch Labour Party who instructed me to make representations on the Development Framework.</p> <p>The number of children starting school in the four Barnard Castle Primary Schools in September 2007 is below 40, and that number is barely sufficient to sustain two schools, let alone four. If this trend is to continue it would be followed by school closures and a detrimental effect on many features of the local community.</p> <p>It would seem that that reason for this dramatic drop in this segment of population is due to the lack of housing that is suitable for families with young children at reasonably affordable rents or purchase prices.</p> <p>The "Affordable Housing" built in Barnard Castle in recent years seems to be of</p>	<p>The SPD is relevant to those who cannot afford to access the market regardless of income, we are aware that to access the market a household income of in excess of £25,000 is required, substantially more to acquire a family home. The need for affordable homes is not limited to any "category" of person other than those who cannot afford to access the market, regardless of income. The range of tenure options that now come under the banner of affordable housing including intermediate tenures and discounted sale where the discount is passed on may well suit a number of families if they wish to stay in Teesdale.</p> <p>In delivering new housing both the Local Plan and the TDF will seek to ensure that a range of housing opportunities is provided to meet the needs across the population. However, other than through the</p>

		<p>excellent quality, but little if any is appropriate to families with young children and , in my experience the great majority of the residents are of an older generation whose children now have their own families. Having read the Population and Housing sections of the Development Framework, the issue does not seem to be addresses except in relation to affordable housing which clearly has a specific definition and relates to the provision of housing for families and individuals whose income is significantly below the national average. I believe that many of the families and individuals with young children whose emigration fro the area has caused the drop in the school population do not come in to the category of people whose needs are intended to be met by “affordable Hosing” but have higher incomes. However their income is still too low to allow them to buy family houses in the local area. It seems that the housing aspirations of many of these families are being met by the housing market outside Teesdale District. If Teesdale does not deliver competitive housing opportunities, the emigration trend will continue.</p> <p>It is the view of members of the Barnard Castle Labour Party that the Developemtn</p>	<p>affordable housing provision the planning process has no control over the price of these units, which naturally given the necessary quality of the build in many of settlements, based around their high quality built environment, and the limitation of land availability will be charged by developers at a premium market rate. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Study will be published in Summer 2008 and should free up the land supply for the area, but even so, it is unlikely that these units will be for sale at process found in other districts.</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>Framework needs to be amended so that it plans and delivers the sort of small family houses that are available at competitive process elsewhere in the wider South Durham Area.</p> <p>Their view is that the only way to resolve the emigration situation outlined above is for TDC to adopt policies that lead to the identification and approval of sites for building smaller family homes, especially in the environs of Barnard Castle. It was suggested that one potential area of development is the land broadly along the line of the former Darlington railway line between the A688 road and the Glaxo factory. A development here could also have the potential of creating a road link to the B6278 and reducing congestion in the vicinity of Teesdale School.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--