

Housing Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Statement

Adoption

April 2019

Planning & Sustainable Development



Contents

Introduction	3
Regulations	3
Housing SPD	3
Consultation	4
Who did we consult?	4
What issues were raised?	4
How the issues were addressed	4
Appendix 1 Consultation Representations	6

Introduction

1. This report is the consultation statement for the adoption of the Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The SPD was published in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. This statement sets out how the public and other stakeholders have been consulted upon the SPD.

Regulations

2. The SPD is produced in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The relevant regulations relating to the consultation process are explained below.
3. Regulation 12 (a) requires the Council to produce a consultation statement before the adoption of the SPD, this should set out who was consulted, a summary of the issues raised and how these issues were incorporated in to the SPD. The requirements of this regulation are set out in the remainder of this report.
4. Regulation 12 (b) requires the Council to publish the documents (including a 'consultation statement' for a minimum of 4 week consultation, specify the date when responses should be received, and identify the address to which responses should be sent.
5. Regulation 13 states that any person may make representations about the SPD and that the representations must be made by the end of the consultation date referred to in Regulation 12.
6. The requirements of regulation 12 (b) and 13 are set out in the accompanying 'Statement of Representation Procedure'.
7. As set out in Regulation 12 when seeking representations on an SPD documents must be made available in accordance with Regulation 35; which requires the Council to make documents available by taking the following steps:
 - Make the document available at the principal office and other places within the area that the Council considers appropriate;
 - Publish the document on the Council's website.

Housing SPD

8. The adopted Cornwall Local Plan provides the overarching strategic policies for the provision of housing. The aim of the Housing SPD is to provide additional guidance on how the affordable housing policies in the Local Plan will be implemented. The SPD contains information on the various affordable housing products (such as rented homes, shared ownership and discounted ownership); design of affordable housing; local need and cluster parish approach; specialist housing and self-build.

Consultation

9. The draft Housing SPD was published for public consultation between 19th October 2018 and 30th November 2018 and views were sought on the draft.
10. The SPD was made available online, in the Council's main offices and libraries along with details of how to respond to the consultation.

Who did we consult?

11. The Council sought the views of the relevant statutory and other key consultees on the draft Housing SPD, in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement. The Local Plan database of consultees contains approximately 1,300 statutory and individual consultees and all these were notified of the consultation via email or letter.

What issues were raised?

12. A total of 77 individual responses were received and no significant in-principle objections were made and there was broad support for the principles. The following key issues were raised:
 - Rounding up of affordable housing provision;
 - Leasehold houses;
 - Conformity of Cornwall Local Plan policies with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
 - Mix, size and accessibility of homes;
 - Phasing the delivery of development;
 - Phasing of off-site contribution tariff, triggers for payments and how this is set and reviewed;
 - Need for certain affordable housing products to be retained in perpetuity;
 - Defining local need
 - Scale of rural exception sites
 - Guidance on the distribution (clusters) of affordable housing is too prescriptive;
 - Bedspaces/ unit size requirements too prescriptive/onerous.

How the issues were addressed

13. Following the consultation the SPD has been amended to address the issues raised, the representations and Council's response are set out in Appendix 1.
14. In particular, further information has been given on the requirements for certain affordable housing to remain as such in perpetuity. Guidance on planning obligations and the types of development which are subject to affordable housing obligations has been included. A new section has been included on how the Council defines local need, the context and methodology. Information has been added about leasehold and ground

rents. Clarification has been provided on the scale of rural exception sites. The documents has also been redrafted to ensure it is easy to read and understand.

Appendix 1 Consultation Representations

Consultation Representations and Cornwall Council considerations.

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
1	Mr W Holman	Para 5	<p>The proposed form of wording fails to comply with the policy wording of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>Change Amend wording to: “The Local Plan seeks to address Cornwall’s whole market need through the delivery of a minimum of 52,500 new homes by 2030 across Cornwall. (Policy 2a).”</p> <p>Reasons/Evidence : Policy 2a of the adopted Local Plan identifies the <u>minimum</u> housing target of 52,500 homes to 2030 across Cornwall.</p>	Agree, amend text to reflect LP policy
		Para 8 & 9	<p>Concerns Absence of any reference to The Right to Buy Scheme as a factor which varies the level and maintenance of an Affordable Housing Stock. The Right to Buy scheme is a policy in the United Kingdom which gives secure tenants of councils and some housing associations the legal right to buy, at a large discount, the council house they are living in. There is also a Right to Acquire for assured tenants of housing association homes built with public subsidy after 1997, at a smaller discount.</p> <p>Change Amend wording to: The Right to Buy scheme is a policy in the United Kingdom which gives secure tenants of councils and some housing associations the legal right to buy, at a large discount, the council house they are living in. There is also a Right to Acquire for assured tenants of housing association homes built with public subsidy after 1997, at a smaller discount. This policy is a factor which varies the level and maintenance of the Affordable Housing Stock. The stock level will be subject to ongoing monitoring and measurement by the Council’s Affordable Housing Team.</p> <p>Reasons/Evidence : To indicate that the supply of affordable housing is fluid and will not always be increasing and will be subject to ongoing monitoring and measurement.</p>	<p>Noted, although the ‘Right to Buy’ scheme is not a planning matter</p> <p>Add a link to ‘useful links’</p>
		Para 75	<p>Concerns Absence of a map to indicate the Local Housing Allowance Areas in Cornwall referred to in paragraph 75 as an aid to understanding and completeness</p> <p>Change Amend wording to: Insert “The Local Housing Allowance area map relating to Cornwall is provided at Appendix ???”</p>	Agree, consider inclusion of a map

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			Reasons/Evidence : An aid to understanding and completeness.	
		Para 110	Concerns Absence of footnote or link to HAPPI principles as an aid to knowledge, understanding, completeness and ease of search. Change Amend wording to: Include a footnote or reference link. Reasons/Evidence : As an aid to knowledge, understanding, completeness and ease of search.	Agree, add link to HAPPI principles as set out in 'useful links'
		Para 146	Concerns Clarity of intention and operation required. The wording implies that serviced plots would be sold by the Council at less than "zero cost!" Change Amend wording to: Difficult to insert suggested wording as the intention of the Council is unclear other than a possible requirement to recover the Enabling Activity Fee Reasons/Evidence : Existing wording is confusing and misleading.	Noted, amend text to provide clarity. CC would provide plots at less than market value.
		Pg 42	Concerns Insert self and custom build register link as an aid to knowledge, understanding, completeness and ease of search. Change Amend wording to: Include a reference link to the Cornwall council custom build register at https://www.cornwall.gov.uk/environment-and-planning/planning/planning-policy/adopted-plans/evidence-base/self-and-custom-build/register-of-interest-in-self-and-custom-build-for-cornwall/ Reasons/Evidence : As an aid to knowledge, understanding, completeness and ease of search.	Agree, add link to self-build register
2	Crantock Parish Council	Para 4 (and throughout)	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF – 2018) should be used rather than "revised NPPF" as it is now the definitive policy document.	Agree, amend where necessary
		Para 7 (and throughout)	The term "viability" is used in a variety of possible meanings throughout the document. It should be clarified as "financial viability" or otherwise.	Noted, refers to economic viability

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 9	The mechanism(s) through which affordable housing needs are quantified should be identified in this section. Perhaps reference to the HomeChoice register and how it is assembled and maintained/reviewed. It appears to be the basis for defining the need for Rural Exception Site developments and thus it must be robust and accurate.	Noted, make reference to HomeChoice Register in 'useful links'
		Para 23	".... For purchasers to purchase additional...."	Agree, amend text
		Para 50	"This is typically within Parish boundaries". In terms of Neighbourhood Development Plans, the boundary is that within the Designated Area.	Noted, amend text to add 'or in a Designated Area for NDPs'
		Para 52	There are two distinct examples. First, a Parish may deliver a number of affordable units to meet the affordable needs. However, when offered to those with a local connection, there may be surplus units (and an affordable need could remain). The surplus units can be offered to adjoining parishes on a cascade principle. Second, there may be a deliberate decision to build more affordable units within a Parish in order to deliver the affordable needs, not just of that Parish but also adjoining Parishes – the Cluster approach. These should be very clearly differentiated and, in the latter case, a Neighbourhood Plan for the "Hub" Parish must contain a policy through which this can be delivered.	Noted
		Para 53	"...particularly if those areas are unlikely to provide much affordable housing of their own.". First, what is meant by "much" – especially in the context of a small parish/community. Second, there should be a logical set of criteria through which the judgement is made that it is "unlikely to provide". Propose that this should be changed to "unable to provide... ". For instance, is there developable land, and if so how much and how many units can it sustain? If any Parish falls within a potential Cluster of parishes, this must be reflected in their Neighbourhood Plan.	Agree, amend to 'unable provide'
		Para 67	"..... assessment to be submitted for a Policy 8 site in unusual circumstances.". Some idea of what would constitute "unusual" should be cited.	Noted, this is a requirement of the NPPF.
		Para 72	"..... merely causes stalled sites.....". This appears to be a Cornwall Council designation as the NPPF has a clear glossary definition of "Deliverable". If "Stalled" is to become a recognised definition then it must be defined and included in the Glossary. Should it be presumed that there are no current approved sites in Cornwall that have "marginal viability assessments"?	Noted, include definition of 'stalled sites' in glossary

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 73	<i>... in relation to access to key services."</i> . This requires more definition in terms of the services that are considered to be necessary for a sustainable development. E.g. employment, schools, medical facilities etc. There must be a balanced assessment of travel to work/school/etc and the impact on the environment vs distance at which people are accommodated from their Local connection. In addition there should be consideration to the scale of the proposed development in proportion to the existing size and nature of the community in which it is to be built.	Noted
		Para 84	<i>"....providing affordable housing to meet local needs."</i> . There needs to be a very clear definition (in the Glossary?) of what is meant by the term "local". Perhaps there is a "Local" – referring to Cornwall and a "local" referring to a parish/town/designated area? Throughout this document the term "local" appears to reflect a parish or small community. The introduction of the Cluster of parishes is useful – but also needs definition in a Glossary.	Agree, consider inclusion of a definition of 'local' within the glossary
		Para 94	<i>"... with low or marginal need..."</i> . This is a welcome statement but, it needs more clarity in how the need is defined (Homechoice?) and when a unit can be counted towards meeting that need. From outline approval? When all reserved issues have been cleared? When fully built? Clearly, there has to be a judgement but, with a 3 year "window" for potential applications, this could lead to a continuous stream of affordable led rural exception site developments. Suggest the first sentence should be re-worded to read: <i>"...a parish with low or marginal need or where there are existing and current approved plans to provide sufficient affordable housing and/or a sensitive site....etc"</i>	Noted, consider amending text to include reference to 'an allocation'.
		Para 96	This relates to the above but suggest there should be a financial penalty for delay in delivering.	Noted, the SPD cannot set new policy.
3	Mr G M Jones		<p>Building 52,500 homes by 2030 implied an expected population increase of circa 24% on the 2011 census of 536,000 people. This is not sustainable unless infrastructure improvements are made in parallel.</p> <p>The plan, as drafted, does not adequately demonstrate "housing need".</p> <p>Cornwall is attractive due to its coastline, large open, green spaced, loose unit housing, quaint harbours and relatively clean air. This must not be negatively impacted for profit and an inadequately justified need.</p> <p>The plan is silent on the lack of employment opportunities for the significantly increased population expected.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Make reference to HomeChoice Register in 'useful links'</p> <p>The aim of the SPD is provide additional guidance on the housing</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			The plan must include parallel plans for additional capacity in health, education, transport, water, sewerage, population and social services for adults and children. Please ensure these points are properly considered proceeding adoption.	policies in the LP. Other LP policies deal with employment, transport etc.
4	Highways England		Thank you for providing Highways England with the opportunity to comment on your draft Housing SPD, which will support the policies within the Adopted Local Plan and the Site Allocations DPD currently subject to examination. Having reviewed the draft document, I can confirm that we have no comments.	Noted
5	Illogan Parish Council	Page 24 Entry Level Exception Sites – paragraphs 97-98	Illogan Parish Council notes that not all land adjacent to settlements is the same, the Council does not agree with the blanket statements being made as some sites are more sensitive than others.	Noted, the SPD provides guidance However, each site will be judged on its merits.
6	Lanner Parish Council	Foreword	Line 1: I suggest the phrase “housing market” is replaced by “housing stock”. The “market” represents only a small part of the housing requirement as the size, quality and adaptability of dwellings change in relation to personal circumstances. The relationship of the number of bedrooms to household size and the opportunities for extensions, improvements (including opportunities for adaptation to support the elderly, disabled or chronically sick) all require to be factored in to an overview of how housing is meeting needs. Paragraph 3: The term “Affordable Homes” now has a quasi-legal meaning which actually reduces the commonly understood meaning of the word “affordable”. It is also an umbrella phrase to classify several types of social housing or housing where price/rent is fixed below “market value”. For clarity, I suggest that “Affordable Homes” and those various types of Affordable Home should all open with capital letters to avoid confusion by the reader.	Noted
		Introduction	Paragraph 1: Building new homes is, of course, not the sole means by which our communities’ housing needs will be met (see comment on Foreword above). Building new homes caters no less for what might be termed “inward migration” into our communities: often a necessity for maintaining sustainability of the existing community and its infrastructure but also sometimes with the capacity to create frictions. Thoughtful planning can help to overcome or mitigate these frictions.	Noted, planning’s role is limited to the delivery of homes

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 5	<p>Paragraph 5: The Local Plan calls for the delivery of 52,500 new homes to meet total market need by 2030. We are not yet half way through the Plan period but released statistics show that completions, permissions (with a 10% allowance on smaller sites), allocations and “windfalls” (anticipated smaller sites) total 57,993 at April 2018 – a 10% excess over the base housing requirement.</p> <p>This SPD seeks to provide guidance on how the (housing) policies in the Local Plan will be implemented: yet it might be argued that its function is, in part if not in whole, redundant since the primary target has been met. It is important to revisit and review the Plan target, not least because this SPD discusses applying percentages to figures which may not come to fruition in seeking to deliver an appropriate amount of Affordable Housing.</p> <p>The Cornwall Council document “Delivering the Cornwall Local Plan” anticipated at an early stage (March 2017 – four months after the Plan’s adoption) that the number of houses to be provided would exceed the figure in the Plan. This would be in providing a new “garden village” “in addition to the current Local Plan requirements” and linked the provision of further new homes for greater devolution to the Unitary Authority. In other words, housing has become a political currency.</p> <p>The SPD refers to the new NPPF. This requires the assessment of housing need (that is, total new housing requirement rather than local need for Affordable Homes) to be made by applying a nationally prescribed formula. It was anticipated that application of the formula would result in an increase in need for Cornwall by about 10%. However, the latest statistics released by Office of National Statistics (ONS) suggest that the figure for Cornwall should actually be reduced by about 23%. This would have a major impact on the Local Plan and how it is implemented but also on the likely availability of Affordable Housing over the Plan period because that projection leans heavily on being calculated as a percentage of total houses built. Consequently, it would produce a dramatic upswing in the number of “exception sites” coming forward with a heavy environmental cost.</p> <p>But this all forgets the politics of the situation. The government is now not happy with its standard formula as it undermines its declared goal for national housebuilding: so the formula may yet change in the New Year.</p> <p>There is the reality though of a weakening housing market and fewer large sites being activated: evidenced by Cornwall Council looking to provide “on site” infrastructure to tempt developers to press ahead on approved sites. Developers will look to secure sites in areas they prefer versus areas the Plan wishes to direct them. The fear is that “exception sites” will be their leverage.</p> <p>The absence of clear guidance on the total number of new homes required 2020 – 2030, detail of the population growth within that period, and the total number of Affordable Homes needed (a measure of the</p>	Noted, the LP is considered up to date as a recently adopted plan.

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			competence of the Plan in securing more and better paid jobs) all show potential weaknesses in the SPD and expose it to challenge later.	
		Para 6	There needs to be a definition of “affordable housing led”. At the very least it requires to be 51%. 50% does not demonstrate that the Affordable Homes are leading the scheme. Experience suggests that many developers are simply working from 50% and adjusting residual valuations from that presumption. Hopefully, publicising future viability valuations will go some way to eliminating any such practice. However, particularly with exception sites, a strong pursuit of 70%+ should be the norm.	Noted, LP policy defines ‘affordable-led’ and sets out the policy requirements
		Affordable housing products Para 10 & 11	Paragraphs 10 and 11 appear to be essentially the same. Is this repetition necessary? In paragraph 11, the words “housing is” should read “housing are”: rented homes being the subject of the sentence.	Noted, amend as suggested
		Social rented housing Para 13 Para 14	Presumably “people on low wages” also includes those who are “un-waged”? An indication as to how Social Rented Housing is to be encouraged would be useful – otherwise it seems simply a paper aspiration. Is it being suggested that by providing Social Rented Housing the percentage of open market housing in a development is more likely to be increased? Could this precipitate an increase in open market housing outside recognised settlement boundaries through exception sites?	Noted
		Affordable rented housing Para 15	It is not clear whether the maximum rent of 80% includes service charge or whether service charge is on top of the 80%. Certainly, it would seem difficult to include service charge within the 80% as it can vary year to year and different services may be provided. Does the SPD need to require a cap on service charge: either by restricting it to a percentage of rent or by referring increases to the Council or independent review?	Noted, para 15 states that 80% should include any service charge
		Intermediate rented housing Para 16	It is not clear whether “local open market rents” refer to local as in Cornwall or as in the locality/parish. Is there a clear protocol to be followed if there are insufficient “local” comparison rentals to be found?	Noted
		Shared Ownership Para 22 Para 23 Para 25	The words “product will not be affordable” should be changed to “product will be affordable” otherwise you have a double negative and kill the meaning. In line 1, change “can purchase” to “to purchase”. Is there evidence to show that Shared Ownership is indeed popular (in contrast to, say, Discounted Ownership?	Agree, amend as necessary Shared Ownership is one of the Council’s preferred options for

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
				discounted home ownership
		Discounted Ownership Para 26 Para 27	Can we say “more affordable” or “Affordable” in line 4? It would be helpful if a full, direct link could be provided rather than one simply to the Cornwall Council website.	Agree, consider amending as necessary
		Cluster Parish Approach Para 50 Para 52 Para 53	The accent here though must be that rural exception sites are for the need of the immediate local community. This must be explicit. This paragraph is disturbing in that it is not “cluster group” specific but applicable generally. Thus, the previous mantra that rural exception sites should be to meet the demonstrable needs of the local community is broken. What seems to be being promoted is that exception sites will be provided for all in need who have a local connection whether or not they want to live locally: the shortfall will be absorbed from adjoining parishes without a second thought. Or worse: exception sites will be developed to the capacity which they afford irrespective of actual local need. This is a change in policy: which is not what an SPD should do. It is an approach which is repeated in various forms throughout the document. For the avoidance of doubt, the approach described here is actually welcome and has merit.	Noted, the SPD explains an approach which is appropriate across Cornwall
		Viability assessments Para 67 Para 71	In line 2, insert the word “plan” after “development”. It should be made clear that a viability assessment will be required for all rural exception sites where the amount of affordable housing is less than 100%. How will the Council determine what is a reasonable rate of return? For example, the rate of return accepted in CIL calculations (20%) is excessive and has been successfully challenged in other parts of the country (15 – 17.5% proving acceptable).	Agree, amend as necessary Noted
		Off-site contribution tariff Para 80	It is unclear as to how often the tariffs will be reviewed: will this be at set intervals or triggered in some other way?	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Rural exception sites Para 84	Paragraph 84: There continues to be no clear definition or description as to what constitutes a “small” site for the purposes of a Rural Exception Site. It is suggested that (as is the case for CIL and other purposes) it should be given as 10 or less.	Noted, consider defining ‘small site’ in line with any CIL definition
		Affordable housing led Para 86	It seems that, logically, at least 51% of a site must be Affordable if it is Affordable led. As said, for most exception sites it will need to be substantially greater. Evidence suggests that developers are looking to start at 50%. Public scrutiny of viability assessments should limit such strategies but 50% is contrary to the primary goal.	Noted, consider amending para as suggested
		Para 90	The construction of this paragraph gives entirely the wrong perception of what is required. A viability assessment should be made not to determine the percentage of affordable housing but to determine the amount of open market housing to secure viability. The scheme is – always – Affordable Home led, so viability assessment is to secure something less than 100% not something above 50%. Start off on the right foot.	Noted, information on CCs consultation process is set out in the adopted SCI
		Para 91	Any pre-app for a rural exception site should go through the PACE process and ensure full community engagement appropriate for the scale of the proposal.	
		Glossary Housing needs survey	In our view, a contemporary HNS is more useful than the Homechoice Register which can be up to a year out of date. When carrying out a HNS we have always worked with the Affordable Homes Officer so that every household with a local connection on his register also gets a copy of the survey which would have gone to each household in the parish. This provides about as accurate a picture one can hope to get. Anything more is conjecture.	Noted
7	Acorn Blue	Para 45	Vacant Building Credit (VBC). The technical guidance that accompanies the SPD states that a building will have to be vacant for 12 months before VBC can be applied. This has no precedent in national policy or guidance and defeats the very purpose of the policy as it would encourage vacant buildings. ACTION delete the reference to a 12 month period of vacancy.	Noted, CC will consider reviewing the VBC technical Guide
		Local need definition	Local Need Definition. There are numerous references to ‘need’ and ‘local need’ in the SPD but nowhere are these terms actually defined. The Council should utilise the views of a judge examining grounds for Judicial Review against a recent affordable led development in Crantock: The meaning of the term “local needs” is not limited to the needs of a particular settlement since such a meaning would run counter to meeting the affordable housing needs of Cornwall as a whole. The fact that the	Noted, HNS is explained in the glossary and identifies local need.

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			Crantock Neighbourhood Plan Policy H2 is consistent with Cornwall Council Local Plan Policy 9 must apply equally to Policy H2. ACTION define 'Need' or 'Local Need' in the glossary of the SPD in accordance with the above.	
		Para 54	Whilst it is desirable to see a mix broadly in line with that of the open market dwellings it is entirely unrealistic because the open market dwellings need to be of significantly greater value in order to subsidise the affordable dwellings. In an idealistic world the affordable would be the same as the open market (in terms of mix and size as well as design), but in the real world the open market funds the affordable and relies on larger/more valuable dwellings to do so. ACTION delete third bullet of paragraph 54.	Noted, however the Council wishes to see sites which provide a mix of housing
		Para 70	Review Mechanism – The Council having the right to implement a viability review mechanism in the event of an improvement of market conditions seems reasonable as long as the opposite also applies in the event of a market downturn or an increase in construction costs. It is entirely unreasonable for The Council to be able to seek additional revenues unless the opposite also applies. ACTION Add a viability review mechanism that reduces contributions in the event of a market downturn or an increase in construction costs OR delete reference to a viability review mechanism. It has to work both ways.	Noted, however this is not considered appropriate.
		Para 80	Off site contribution tariffs. Whilst the methodology used to calculate the tariff is not unreasonable, the impact on current and future sites will be huge (i.e. many of them will no longer be deliverable). Currently an allowance of £57,000 is made when factoring off site contributions, but we understand Committees are already (wrongly) giving weight to this SPD and seeking £102,000. This is a near 80% increase, and if applied wipes out most of the profit on some of our schemes, rendering them unviable. ACTION We pragmatically suggest the new figure is not applied to any applications determined before the SPD is adopted, including those refused that are at Appeal. We also suggest that the new tariff is introduced on a phased basis to allow the industry to adjust, rather than introduce it with immediate effect and render many sites unviable, quite possibly impacting on 5 year land supply at the same time (see NPPF 2018 definition of 'deliverable'). We suggest: £70,000 in 2019, £90,000 in 2020, and £102,000 in 2021.	Noted, the off-site contribution tariff will not be implemented until the adoption of the SPD but not on a phased basis.
		Para 81	The requirement for 30% of off-site contributions being liable on commencement is unfeasible (at least for small to medium size developers such as ourselves). The huge additional commitment from cashflow before any sales commence will have a significant impact on viability, effectively rendering many sites unviable. It would also result in most applications being accompanied with a Financial Viability Appraisal to either demonstrate a reduced level of contribution because of the phasing of payments or an alternative payment phasing structure. A sensible solution would be to mirror the phasing of onsite delivery set out in paragraph 66. Offsite contributions would be paid as follows:	Noted, consider amending as suggested but caveated to take account of schemes which provide

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			25% of contribution (+ enabling fee) on 25% of occupation 50% of contributions on 50% of occupation 100% of contributions on 75% of occupation. This would be reasonable and pragmatic and protect the deliverability of sites, which is surely fundamentally important.	100% leasehold flats
8	Cornwall Custom Build Ltd Blue 2 Kite	Para 144	I am concerned at the Policy statement that Custom Build will not be permitted within the Cornwall (or Tamar Valley) Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is our view that this approach is too restrictive and should be removed. Settlements within the AONB have a key role to play in their character and appropriate development must be enabled to maintain the social and economic viability and cohesiveness of these settlements. Clearly design must be of a high standard and reflect the national quality of the landscape in the AONBs but there is a demonstrable need for housing provision across all sections of the housing market. Settlements such as St Mawes, St Just in Penwith and those on the Lizard, for example, are experiencing significant issues due to the high cost of open market housing. By a careful and considered approach in such localities from the Planning Authority and housing providers working in close collaboration the use of both affordable and custom/self-build can create a highly beneficial social, cultural, economic and environmental benefit on the viability of these communities.	Noted, consider removing reference to AONB as LP policy aims to protect the AONB and its setting
9	D2 Planning on behalf of Bovis Homes Ltd	Para 54-59	Mix, Size & Accessibility Standards It is recognised and accepted that a range and mix of house types is sought to meet affordable housing provision. It is noted in Paragraph 57 that on sites of 10 or more affordable homes that a number of bungalows will be sought. However, the advice in the SPD is overly prescriptive and does not take into account site specific conditions e.g. topography. It may be that in attempting to provide bungalows on sites that this impinges on the overall viability of the site. At present we believe that the SPD is overly prescriptive and consideration needs to be given to site specific issues. The SPD should make reference to these factors.	Noted, however the SPD provides guidance and is flexible stating 'in suitable locations...'
		Para 60-62	Design & Distribution of Affordable Housing It is a well-established principle of the design of affordable housing should be 'tenure blind' and indistinguishable from open market properties. With regards clusters of affordable housing, the advice is overly prescriptive and we believe that there will be circumstances where clusters greater than 6-8 dwellings will be appropriate. Furthermore, larger clusters which will be tenure blind have greater efficiency in terms of management for the Registered Providers.	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			The cluster of affordable housing and its position in relation to open market dwellings is extremely important particularly with regards the overall viability of schemes. This is an important consideration which must be taken into consideration.	
		Para 63-66	Phasing The principle of phasing the delivery of open market and affordable housing is acknowledged. However, once again the SPD should not be overly prescriptive in the phasing of affordable housing. The issues should be considered on a site by site basis depending on the circumstances of the site and the nature of infrastructure that needs to be delivered.	Noted, SPD provides guidance and phasing is an important issue
		Para 67-72	Viability Assessment The Cornwall Local Plan predated the publication of the NPPF in July 2018. It is therefore wrong to suggest that no viability assessments would be accompanied with any applications. Clearly, once the Local Plan review has followed the advice in the NPPF then that represents a change in circumstances but it would be incorrect to adopt such an approach now. Indeed, rather than accept the delivery of affordable housing it would be the opposite effect.	Noted, however the SPD is clear that this is in relation to sites considered under Policy 8.
		Para 47	Rounding Up the Affordable Housing Provision It is recognised that Policy 8 requires between 25% - 50% affordable housing to be provided on a site depending on the Value Zone the site is located. However, where a site is situated on the edge of a settlement and clearly the houses are being provided for that settlement, then the rate to be applied should be that which applies to the settlement even though the site may be located in the higher value zone.	Noted, however the SPD cannot set new policy.
		Para 7-12	Housing Definition The NPPF 2 published in July 2018 sets out the definition of Affordable Housing in Annex 2 Glossary. It is defined as: - "housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market (including housing that provides a subsidised route to home ownership and/or is for essential local workers); and which complies with one or more of the following definitions: - a) Affording housing for rent b) Starter homes c) Discounted market sales housing d) Other affordable routes to home ownership" It is important to ensure that the SPD covers all of these definitions for affordable housing and that provision is made for all types of affordable housing. It is unclear that the SPD does that at present.	Agree, the SPD seeks to address all the types.

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 50-53	Cluster Parish Approach It is accepted that the need for affordable housing in rural areas should be for the benefit of the local households. It is also accepted that where these local households do not come forward for affordable housing then a wider search should be undertaken e.g. Parish wide etc. However, there should also be a recognition that in some circumstances, the affordable houses will not be occupied and accordingly consideration should be given to changing the tenure of these properties to say open market.	Noted
10	Cavanna Group Ltd	Para 6	The comments should clarify that specialist housing and extra care housing (where demand exists) relates to sites of 200 or more dwellings.	Noted, LP policy sets out the requirements
		Para 47	The principle is understood. However, where there is 0.7 of an affordable dwellings short (using the 8.7 house example provided) how is the 0.7 valued? Without clear guidance the Council and Applicant may not agree, which will hold up the delivery of housing. Will the Council keep an up to date register of affordable housing values on its website in order for applicants to plan ahead?	Noted, based on off-site contribution tariff
		Para 57 1 st bullet point	The Council should provide details of suitable locations and need for each sustainable location on its website in order for the applicant to plan ahead. It is not good practice as part of a live application where a registered provider is happy with the proposed mix for the Council to request a change to the affordable housing mix late in the day.	Noted, this will be on a case-by-case basis and take into account topography, services, location etc. The SPD provides guidance and is flexible by stating 'generally'
		2 nd bullet point	What if there is a need for more than 15% flats? The previous bullet point talks about need but this bullet point is dismissive of a possible need. In addition why should there be a requirement for a proportionate number of open market flats if there is no market demand? Again this should be based upon separate affordable and open market demands in order to provide a sustainable housing mix.	
		Para 58	Please provide clarification that the Council should not request sites of dwellings that exceed NDSS requirements. This should only occur where the applicant wishes to over provide.	Noted, para 58 explains the requirements of Policy 13
		Para 59	Based upon need and providing for a broader range of accommodation the table should consider all bed spaces (persons) and have those set out in the NDSS document. The persons size set out by the NDSS document should be evenly split per bed sized dwelling.	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment																																	
			<table><tr><td>1b</td><td>1p</td><td>50%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>2p</td><td>50%</td></tr><tr><td>2b</td><td>3p</td><td>50%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>4p</td><td>50%</td></tr><tr><td>3b</td><td>4p</td><td>33%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>5p</td><td>33%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>6p</td><td>33%</td></tr><tr><td>4b</td><td>5p</td><td>25%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>6p</td><td>25%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>7p</td><td>25%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>8p</td><td>25%</td></tr></table>	1b	1p	50%		2p	50%	2b	3p	50%		4p	50%	3b	4p	33%		5p	33%		6p	33%	4b	5p	25%		6p	25%		7p	25%		8p	25%	
1b	1p	50%																																			
	2p	50%																																			
2b	3p	50%																																			
	4p	50%																																			
3b	4p	33%																																			
	5p	33%																																			
	6p	33%																																			
4b	5p	25%																																			
	6p	25%																																			
	7p	25%																																			
	8p	25%																																			
		Para 61	There is no clarification on the number of dwellings which triggers a smaller scheme. This should be provided. In addition cluster sites of 6-8 on large sites (i.e. not on a small site) is particularly onerous in comparison with other Councils where it is appreciated that registered providers require larger cluster sites due to maintenance and management issues and costs. As a general rule of thumb, in the South West, Councils generally accept cluster sites of around 12 in number within larger sites.	Noted, the guidance is flexible recognising that design & distribution should be proportionate to the size of development.																																	
		Para 62 First bullet	This is a different stance to other Councils in the South West. Other Councils within the South West acknowledge that a coach house does not need to have all ground floor garages to be allocated to it. Otherwise a potential scenario is a 2 bed coach house with 3 garages. This is not efficient use of land when trying to meet housing targets and should be dropped.	Agree, consider removing 1 st bullet																																	
		Para 65	Clarification must be provided on what constitutes a smaller scheme. A scheme of 50 dwellings or less should be considered a smaller scheme.	Noted																																	
		Para 66 Final bullet	The 75% trigger for open markets is out of kilter with the previous targets, being earlier than in relation to open market delivery. It is understood that the Council wants to see all affordable housing delivered and could still be achieved through an 85% trigger.	Noted																																	
		Para 81	The viability of a scheme operates on the timings of payments as well as the overall margin. The series of triggers being pre-commenced, 30% of open market and 70% of open market are premature. The contributions are for	Noted, however the Council feels that the payment																																	

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			off-site works. There is no need for so early triggers as they are not site specific. The three triggers should be changed to 30% 70% and 80% being broadly reflective of the open market delivery.	points are appropriate for an off-site contribution.
		Para 83	A three year time period should also apply to the “anywhere in Cornwall” sentence after which if the money has not been spent after a total period of 9 years it is returned to the applicant due to a lack of demand/ability to provide the housing in question.	Noted, the SPD makes it clear that if the money is not spent within 10 years it is returned.
11	Coastline Housing	General	Grammar: there are various typos throughout the document so would advise that it is thoroughly proof-read.	Noted, the SPD will be proof-read.
			In line with the portfolio holder’s title, and to reflect what we’re working for it might be better to refer to “homes” rather than “units” throughout.	Noted, change units to homes
		Para 11	Coastline has an overarching agreement with the Council to provide 50% of nominations to all homes, so this means that we wouldn’t necessarily provide 100% on first letting of new homes with public subsidy. The SPD should provide some flexibility for other arrangements with RPs.	Noted
		Para 15	The link to the LHA throws up some anomalies which I think merit some further consideration. Most of Cornwall is covered by Kernow West. However, the east of the county is covered by the Plymouth, and North Cornwall and Devon Borders LHA areas. These areas have LHA rates which are significantly below Kernow West and this therefore makes it less financially viable to provide affordable rented homes in these areas. However, incomes in these areas are not necessarily lower than in Kernow West. Also, the LHA rates have not been increased for a significant period of time, despite wage growth. My suggestion would therefore be that an upper limit for affordable rents is agreed that applies across the whole of Cornwall. The starting point could be rates which are broadly in line with the current Kernow West rates but these would be linked to annual increases of CPI + 1%.	Noted, however using the LHA is considered appropriate.
		Para 21	Should be clear that the 2.5% rent is charged over a period of a year. No rental period is currently stated.	Agree, consider amending text
		Para 22	Should state “one of Homes England’s model leases”, as there are more than one available. What is meant by “accessing”? Presumably renting?	Noted, consider amending text

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 24	It is welcome that RPs may retain staircasing receipts (by agreement).	Noted
		Para 37	The proposal to recognise Starter Homes as a form of affordable housing is not supported. It is not clear how the Council will ensure that developers do not provide Starter Homes in lieu of other, more affordable housing products. Starter Homes are also not supported because they will not remain affordable in perpetuity and there is no mechanism for the discount to be recycled to provide more affordable housing.	Noted, however, NPPF recognises Starter Homes are a form of affordable housing and therefore guidance on their provision is included in the SPD.
		Para 42	It is welcome that RPs may retain rent to buy receipts (by agreement).	Noted
		Para 48	The principle of windfall sites for affordable housing on the edges of main towns is supported.	Noted
		Para 53	<p>The cluster parish approach is welcome. However, as the SPD recognises that need in adjacent parishes may not be met by new developments, I am not sure it is appropriate to still apply a cascade approach or give priority to the primary parish. It would be better for all of the cluster parishes to have the same ability to apply from day one.</p> <p>Whilst the SPD focuses on new homes, could it also address the issue which we have raised previously, which is that priority on re-lets should be given to the primary area, but that people with a wider local connection can apply and be considered <u>from day one</u> if there are no applications from the primary area?</p>	Noted
		Para 59	Whilst this paragraph is well intentioned, this requirement would have a significant impact on the viability of RPs to provide 100% affordable housing schemes. The impact of this requirement has not been viability tested. The SPD should clarify that those size requirements only apply to the minimum amount of affordable housing required on Policy 8 sites. The size requirements should not apply if RPs are providing additional affordable housing on Policy 8 sites or on Policy 9 sites. In such cases, 2 bed houses should be evenly split between 3 and 4 persons, 3 bed houses should be evenly split between 5 and 6 persons and 4 bed houses 65% 6 person, 20% 7 person, 15% 8 person.	Noted, however as required by policy, NDSS apply.
		Para 62 Fifth bullet	It is not clear if the reference to “shared blocks” is to blocks of houses or blocks of flats. The SPD should clarify (for the benefit of developers) that communal flats will incur significant service charges, which will reduce the income if sold to a RP.	Agree, amend text to clarify
		Para 68, 87 & 95	The reference to a base land value on exception sites of £10,000 per plot is very welcome.	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 79	The Kernow West rate is incorrect. It should be £132.32.	Noted, amend text
		Other	There is no reference in the draft SPD to leasehold houses and ground rents. The draft circulated previously to RPs included efforts to prevent unscrupulous developers from selling leasehold houses and this would be welcome in the SPD, provided it is recognised that leasehold is appropriate for certain forms of affordable housing, including shared ownership and CLTs.	Noted, consider inclusion of information on leasehold
12	Transition Constantine	General	<p>We have a generic concern about the open-ended use of the word sustainable and want it to be clear that this not simply a matter of viability but includes a wide range of environmental criteria including energy and transport. Therefore we suggest that in the SPD reference is made to non-housing Local Plan Policies that address this.</p> <p>It would appear that the DSPD could go further in drawing attention to Policy 6 in the Local Plan which sets out the need for new housing to respond to local need whether affordable or not.</p> <p>We have serious concerns around the minimum site size of 10 and consider that there may be scope under Policy 5 of the NPPF to address this.</p> <p>We are aware that in a parish such as Constantine there will be very few opportunities for meeting special needs and affordable housing within the constraints set by the NPPF and look to Cornwall County Council to find ways of helping us achieve this.</p> <p>There is an understandable emphasis on development adjacent to and within villages but in a large parish such as Constantine where there is just one village we consider that there may on occasions be developments on public transport routes but next to small existing developments that could be suitable for small-scale housing schemes.</p> <p>We would be interested to know the extent to which the Council is prepared to use its CPO powers to assist local communities to meet their needs.</p> <p>We would like to see reference to the scope for 'live to work' homes.</p>	<p>Noted, amend text to reference non-housing LP policies.</p> <p>Reference is made in the SPD to P6.</p> <p>SPD cannot set new policy but provides guidance on LP policies</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>This is not the remit of the SPD Noted.</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 50-53	Cluster Parish Approach: We wholeheartedly support this because of the importance it has for maintaining a cohesive community that includes people with strong local ties. We would wish to see included in here a reference for the need for affordable housing for elderly and young people to enable them to continue to live where they have existing family and non-family ties.	Noted
		Para 54-59	Mix, size and accessibility standards: We have concerns that the provision of affordable housing is very dependent on having an accurate and up-to-date housing needs assessment that accurately reflects our situation rather than that of the wider community.	Noted
		Para 57	We have a concern that on small sites this could result in insufficient accommodation for the young or elderly unless they are specifically referred to here. We also consider that on all housing sites of less than 10 dwellings, affordable or otherwise, it should be made clear that the issue of mix and the need for accessible housing should be addressed.	Noted
		Para 68	Viability Assessments: This paragraph refers to a typical base land cost of £10,000. The experience of Constantine Community Land Trust in the neighbourhood of Constantine is that this limit of £10,000 per plot may be insufficient to encourage landowners to engage with an affordable housing project, even when there is no prospect of commercial development. It is noted that dwelling sizes can vary enormously and could distort the implications for land value, perhaps site plot size is more relevant than the number of plots.	Noted, the SPD is considered flexible; stating 'typically...' recognising that there may be differences across Cornwall
		Para 84	Rural exceptions sites: We support this policy but wonder how the word 'primary' is to be interpreted.	Noted
		Para 85	Affordable housing-led: We support this policy but again question the significance of the word 'primary'. Does this mean over 55% of units or what it takes to make a scheme viable?	Noted, the SPD cannot set new policy but provides guidance
		Para 97	Entry Level Exception Sites: We would like to know whether there is scope under this part of the NPPF for housing for the elderly who have previously rented.	Noted, this reflects Government policy in the NPPF
		Para 101-105	Specialist Housing: We are aware that there is a desire for this in the Parish of Constantine but question where the funding will come from. Para 105 mentions the need for homes suitable for the elderly but we are concerned that no mention appears to be made for accommodation for the carers who enable people to stay in their own homes. We consider that there is a need to make specific provision for their accommodation within reach of their clientele.	Noted, para 121 makes reference to need for staff space

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 124	Supported Living and other housing types requiring staff: The need for accommodation for carers needs to be recognised for a wide range of housing types and we suggest requires a specific policy in the SPD.	Noted, reference is made to the need for staff space
		Para 136-147	Self-build: We support this section of the SPD but would like to see mention of the value and role of co-housing.	Noted
		Para 146	We are concerned that limiting community-led self-build exception sites to no more than 6 dwellings could seriously reduce the scope for developing these initiatives because of the viability limitations. We would be interested to know the implications for the use of Community Land Trusts under these policies.	Noted
13	Cornwall Wildlife Trust	Para 62	Bullet point 4 should be changed to: 'Gardens provided within the property should be designed to maximise usability, practicability and retain wildlife corridors in terraces...'	Agree, amend text as suggested
		Para 68	Green infrastructure should be a given more weight throughout instead of being considered simply a 'site-specific infrastructure cost'. As referenced in the National Planning Policy Framework, point 171: 'Plans should... take a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure'. Such an important point in the NPPF has been given barely any mention in the Draft Housing Supplementary Planning Document.	Noted, however the remit of this SPD is to provide guidance on housing, other documents address biodiversity and GI
		General	The document misses the opportunity to make the most of green infrastructure and the work done by Cornwall Wildlife Trust, Cornwall Environmental Consultants Ltd and Cornwall Council to begin offering the Building With Nature initiative. The standards outlined have a positive impact on many areas mentioned throughout the document from water management to health and wellbeing of eventual buyers and renters. By encouraging the scheme and prioritising applications who demonstrate their willingness to develop with the standards in mind, their will be a positive impact on wellbeing, water and wildlife.	Noted, however the remit of this SPD is to provide guidance on housing, other documents address biodiversity and GI
14	SW HARP Planning Consortium	Affordable housing products	Paragraph 9 of the SPD refers to the broad tenure split requirement of 70% rented affordable housing tenures and 30% intermediate affordable housing for rent or sale in adopted Local Plan Policy 8. Whilst the policy is based on the recommendations in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) prepared alongside the Local Plan, the policy must also be read in the context of the revised national policy which contains a new definition of affordable housing, incorporating a number of new tenures which the policy will not have accounted for.	Noted, LP considered up to date and SPD provides guidance on delivery of affordable housing

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>Until such time as the Council reviews and revises its Local Plan policies to reflect those many changes within the NPPF it is important for the Council's planning guidance to interpret the adopted policy in the context of the national policy which is a material consideration in determining planning applications. It will be important as part of the Council's review of its policies to consider whether a new assessment of housing need in a new SHMA will be the most appropriate mechanism to assess the needs for the more diverse affordable housing tenures now recognised in the NPPF.</p> <p>For the purpose of this proposed supplementary guidance to the Local Plan we note that the Planning Practice Guidance states that SPD should be prepared <i>"only where necessary"</i> and should <i>"build upon and provide more detailed guidance on the policies in the Local Plan. They should not add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development."</i> (Paragraph 028 Reference ID: 12-028-20140306).</p> <p>As the Council has yet to review its Local Plan it would be useful for this proposed supplementary guidance to set out how the Council intends to implement the Government's new definition of affordable housing, enabling delivery of a wider range of affordable tenures to greater assist in meeting needs and make the step change in delivery that is so clearly needed across the county.</p>	
		Definitions	It is well known within the industry that Supplementary Planning Documents should not replicate national policy. Paragraphs 11 to 44 unnecessarily replicate affordable housing definitions set out in Annex 2 of the NPPF. To ensure the document's longevity and consistency the SPD should only refer to the national definition.	Noted, SPD addresses provision of affordable housing in line with NPPF
		In perpetuity	<p>We note the SPD repeatedly references the need for affordable housing to be retained in perpetuity. The Local Plan makes just a single reference to affordable housing in perpetuity at paragraph 2.58, which exclusively relates to rural exception sites, in line with provisions made in Annex 2 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Through attempting to retain all new affordable homes in Cornwall in perpetuity, the SPD is guilty of trying to introduce new requirements to the Council's existing affordable housing policy. Supplementary Planning Documents cannot set policy and therefore should not endeavour to introduce further requirements to existing policies, especially when these new requirements have not been viability tested or undergone scrutiny at examination in public.</p> <p>Restricting affordable housing in perpetuity can cause a number of issues for affordable housing providers and purchasers when attempting to secure mortgages for properties restricted in this manner. This kind of policy instrument is likely to create barriers to affordable home ownership and negatively impact much needed affordable housing delivery throughout Cornwall. In order for the SPD to be capable of adoption, all references</p>	Noted, however the SPD recognises that this is not always the case, e.g. shared ownership properties.

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>to retaining affordable housing in perpetuity should be removed unless explicitly relating to rural exception sites.</p> <p>Furthermore, Paragraph 13 notes that social rented housing can be “<i>helpful to those that are looking to save a deposit to buy their first home</i>”. This statement could be applied to most tenures of affordable housing and consequently provides no real benefit or guidance to the reader. As the statement provides no planning guidance it should be removed.</p>	Noted, delete as suggested
		Cluster Parish Approach	We support the Council’s approach to allowing for a cascade approach to clustering parishes for determining households in need with local connections. This not only helps those households in need now but secures more homes and helps to sustain those villages for the longer term.	Noted
		Mix, size & accessibility standards	Paragraph 59 essentially sets policy by requiring specific house types and sizes. This is inappropriate and should instead be worded as the guidance at paragraph 57 is, with proposals expected to consider the provision set out in that section. This is equally important for ensuring that the guidance remains relevant and effective over the longer term, enabling development that meets the specific needs of an area and reflecting specific site circumstances, to come forward without unnecessary planning barriers.	Noted, the SPD provides guidance on LP policy 13
		Entry level exception sites	As with our comments above, guidance in this SPD should not seek to introduce policy or replicate policy from the NPPF but complement the existing Local Plan approach to allowing development on the edge of settlements. The bullet points at paragraph 98 should not explicitly refer to Starter Homes as this is not specifically referenced in the NPPF as the main tenure for delivery on such sites. The reference to entry-level exception sites not being permitted within the AONB should be removed, as this is already specified in the NPPF at paragraph 71b), footnote 34.	Agree, consider amending text
		Glossary	We support the definition of affordable housing within the Glossary as consistent with that provided in the NPPF Annex 2 Glossary.	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
15	Church Commissioners	Para 57	<p>We have concern that the requirements set out within draft paragraph 57 are overly prescriptive in terms of the proposed set proportions for the delivery of bungalows and flats.</p> <p>It is not the role of the SPD to prescribe house types. It is important that each site is considered on a case-by-case basis to reflect the site's constraints, including the character of the surrounding area, associated build heights, housing needs of the locality and site viability. There is no need or role for a policy specifying the number of flats and/or bungalows within a site and it should be removed.</p> <p>We would also comment that it's fairly standard practice to have a small block of affordable tenure flats on development schemes in areas where there may not necessarily be market demand for open market flats. Any requirement for open market flats will need to be led by the market to limit the potential for impacting viability. RSLs also generally prefer affordable flatted units to be provided in a single block and this is also accepted under paragraph 61 of the SPD.</p> <p>Paragraph 57 is unnecessary, overly onerous for a developer and has little regard to need or market demand in a specific area. There is also clear conflict with paragraph 61 of the SPD. It is requested that Paragraph 57 be deleted in its entirety.</p>	Noted, the SPD provides guidance and each site would be considered on a case-by-case basis
		Para 61	<p>Paragraph 61 discusses the clustering of affordable units, stating that typically there should be clusters of no more than 6 – 8 dwellings.</p> <p>In our experience, this figure is extremely low and will be very difficult to achieve across almost any size of site given the relatively high percentages of affordable housing being sought across the authority. It is recommended that if a clustering policy is required, a more realistic range would be 12-15 dwellings.</p> <p>This paragraph also states that individual affordable blocks of flats should not normally exceed 6 units. Again, we consider this too restrictive and to reflect the above comments, consider this should be amended to 'not normally exceed 12 dwellings'.</p>	Noted, the guidance is flexible recognising that design & distribution should be proportionate to the size of development. Consideration will be given to the wording in this paragraph
		Para 63-66	Paragraph 63 is clear that the phasing and timing of the delivery of affordable homes should be set out in a S106 agreement along with any trigger points for occupation and transfer. We completely support this position.	Noted, subject to agreement with CC

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>However, Paragraph 65 and 66 are overly prescriptive as to what delivery should typically be. We do not support the inclusion of an affordable housing phasing specification within an SPD, even if it's indicative. As stated in paragraph 63, this detail should be subject to negotiation with the Council and included within the S106 agreement for a development.</p> <p>Every site brings its own challenges and it is essential that flexibility is provided to ensure the timely delivery of viable schemes. The phasing specification as drafted is too restrictive and does not give the required level of flexibility should a developer need to alter their build programme / cash flow. For example, the first two bullet point requirements under paragraph 66 will be particularly challenging from a cash flow perspective for developers to meet.</p> <p>Furthermore, if schemes are to be tenure blind (paragraph 60), then there is no need to be this prescriptive. For the purposes of phasing, paragraph 63 and 64 are sufficient and therefore it is requested that paragraphs 65 and 66 be deleted in the interests of securing affordable housing and facilitating delivery of sites expediently. As drafted, these paragraphs are not in the interests of allowing development to come forward. This is particularly the case in light of potential market uncertainty in the event of an economic downturn.</p>	
		Para 81	<p>Under paragraph 81, the Council requires a significant proportion of any off-site contribution to be provided up-front and prior to the commencement of development (including 100% of the Enabling Activity Fee). This blanket approach is unacceptable and will place even greater strain on development viability.</p> <p>The requirement for off-site affordable housing contributions will be captured under the S106 agreement for the development scheme and suitable trigger points for the contribution will be agreed through detailed negotiation with the Council.</p> <p>We wholly object to paragraph 81 and in the interests of securing full affordable housing contributions and facilitating the delivery of sites expediently, it is requested that this paragraph be deleted.</p>	Noted, however the Council feels that the payment points are appropriate for an off-site contribution.
16	G Linnington	Para 19	<p>Whilst this para mention sale of freehold, there should also be covenants/planning consents limiting potential change in use of the properties from permanent residential to temporary, second home and empty/unoccupied investment. I am aware across the SW region, where such new build properties have been snapped up by investors, and left empty, and by housing associations from e.g. Manchester and Liverpool. That is not acceptable; as building affordable and low cost rentable accommodation must be for local need, otherwise why build it here? My home has covenants placed on it in the 1970s to in theory prevent my changing use to a chip shop or business or a holiday home or a holiday let or a B&B! Similar covenants could easily be placed on new build properties. Though rejected by Labour and Conservative parties (would appear to be supportive of</p>	Noted, however the use of covenants is not in the remit of the SPD.

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			builders and developers not local communities needs), the Lib Dems did suggest a few years ago in 2015, that planning consents be placed on new builds to prevent change of use to e.g. second home.	
		General	<p>Lack of mention of off road parking facilities. Whilst there are already some planning requirements on this, it is likely that even affordable or low rent cost housing will have several cars per household. Too often I see modern housing developments where cars are parked on the public paths/pavements due to lack of space! The density of modern developments is such that space is a premium. Just because affordable and low rentable cost accommodation is small, does not mean there will be a proportionate reduction in vehicles per household.</p> <p>Lack of mention of development of infrastructure, such as road expansion, town bypasses etc. There is already some recognition of this in planning, but where developments become piecemeal and additional as time passes, there is eventually a point at which local roads cannot cope with increased population. Bodmin is a good point in question, where development has started and more is planned, yet the town is already congested at peak times due to having only one main through road. There must be evidence backing and supporting a likely impact on traffic congestion, and what measures are needed to limit the likely negative road traffic congestion. Add to that future developments in nearby towns like Wadebridge, and more pressures are placed on Bodmin's through road. The reality is, that anything from traffic calming, speed reduction limits, traffic control (e.g. roundabouts and traffic lights), to road widening, upgrading and even a bypass may be needed.</p>	Noted, however this is not the remit of the SPD and will be dealt with by other policies and guidance
17	Mr G Oldrieve Vickery Holman	Para 68	<p>The typical plot value of £10,000 or 10x agricultural value is slightly low. From our data base the average purchase price of exception sites is closer to £13,000 per plot.</p> <p>I think the LPA needs to be <u>a little</u> flexible on this price if what has been a really successful policy is to continue to supply houses.</p> <p>The idea of publishing the viability assessments and undertaking post application reviews is supported.</p>	Noted, para 68 states 'typically' thus allowing flexibility
		Para 146	I propose an alternative to the Council intervention which sells plots direct to custom-builders in return for making an appropriate off-site AH contribution or on-site provision.	Noted, the Council is exploring other ways to address the need for self-build and custom build
18	Eco-Bos Terence O'Rourke Ltd	Para 57	<p>Mix, size and accessibility standards</p> <p>This paragraph provides guidance on the affordable housing mix expected for sites of 10 or more affordable homes. It states that a minimum of 10% of affordable units will be sought as bungalow or ground floor flats, and that no more than 15% of the affordable housing mix should be provided as flats - the number should be</p>	Noted, it is felt that the guidance is flexible in its current wording

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>proportionate to the number of open market flats provided. Whilst the need to ensure that affordable housing provision meets local needs, it is felt that this is an unduly prescriptive approach, particularly for sites with a unique set of development constraints and opportunities. Some flexibility in the mix of units is sought in these instances.</p> <p>Suggested wording – “on sites of 10 or more affordable homes, the following should be considered, <i>with some flexibility where specific circumstances can demonstrate that an alternative approach is more appropriate:</i>”</p>	
		Para 63-66	<p>Phasing Paragraphs 63-66 of the draft SPD consider the timing of the delivery of affordable homes. It is considered that the requirements set out in these paragraphs might be unrealistic in some circumstances. In particular, paragraph 66 sets out thresholds for the occupation/transfer of market homes linked to the completion of affordable homes. These thresholds are quite onerous, given the complexities in bringing forward some sites. Eco-Bos is committed to the timely delivery of affordable homes, however it is important that there is some flexibility built into the delivery rates of the affordable element of development, otherwise there is a danger that development is prevented from coming forward. This is particularly the case for brownfield sites where there may be significant upfront costs in preparing the site for development due.</p> <p>Additional paragraph inserted after bullets – “The phasing of affordable housing may be varied in specific circumstances where it can be demonstrated that an alternative approach is more appropriate to secure the overall delivery of the scheme.”</p>	Noted, it is felt that the guidance is flexible in its current wording
		Para 67-72	<p>Viability Assessment Paragraphs 67-72 considers Viability Assessments. Paragraph 67 emphasises that affordable housing targets are based on viability, and any applications coming forward that differ from the policy requirements should be accompanied by a Viability Assessment that explains why the Local Plan policy is not viable. However this statement does not recognise that over time, circumstances may change and proposals that were viable become less so, and vice versa. Although it is understood that the Local Plan policies have been tested, there needs to be some degree of flexibility to reflect more recent changes, for example in local economic conditions.</p> <p>Viability Assessments on sites that are difficult to bring forward due to their previous use, accessibility or location for example, are important as they form the base from which more detailed discussions can take place regarding viability and, for example, development contributions. This is crucial on sites where the up front costs</p>	Noted, para 72 is consistent with the NPPF definition of deliverable

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>may be significant. The assertion in paragraph 72 that schemes with a marginal viability will not be supported seems counterintuitive, since in our experience a Viability Assessment has a valuable contribution to make in bringing a site forward.</p> <p>Suggested additional text - “It is recognised that in some specific instances, Viability Assessments can be useful in identifying particular challenges to development and this greater understanding can lead to further negotiation and, ultimately, development coming forward. In these instances, schemes with marginal viability may be supported, depending upon the evidence presented by the applicant and the overall development package”.</p>	
		Para 103	<p>Specialist Housing Eco-Bos note the Council’s comment regarding the change in emphasis from traditional care homes to more flexible specialist housing, and supports this approach to delivering older living/extra care housing across the county.</p>	Noted
		Para 144	<p>Self Build Eco-Bos supports the recognition that self-build can provide a valuable contribution to affordable housing provision, since this approach will typically cost less than buying the market equivalent. In addition self build homes can lead to higher quality architecture, more diverse building design and stimulate the local economy.</p>	Noted
19	Galliford Try	Para 20	Issue with statement “ <i>widely supported by the main lenders</i> ”. Shared ownership is not widely supported by lenders. There are a few lenders which will accept the product and even then they often place restrictions on numbers that they will accept on a site/ in an area. The extent to which the lenders will entertain the product is greatly affected by the terms of the S.106. all restrictions reduce the number of lenders and some will result in no lenders.	Noted
		Para 24	Restrictions on staircasing can be one of the issues which prevent lenders using the SO product. Reduces numbers of lenders and affordability of the product. If buy back is solution could CC purchase?	Noted
		Para 25	Leasehold mortgages are very standard. Is there evidence that SO lenders would not be interested?	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 30	Discounted flats could well be popular with older and downsizers. Urban schemes may well be flatted. Soften restriction.	Noted, the text as currently drafted is considered flexible
		Para 57	<p><i>"Generally no more than 15% of the affordable housing mix should be provided as flats, with the number being proportionate to the number of open market flats provided".</i> This is unrealistic restriction for urban or flatted sites.</p> <p><i>"Homes that can be easily extended or adapted over time"</i> This is ambiguous. If you mean future proofing with attic trusses, this is a substantial cost and will require bespoke designs. This is an aspiration for CC own developments, it is not reasonable to expect developers to supply.</p> <p><i>"Units that meet a 1 bed need but provide more space than a typical 1 bed/2 person home to encourage downsizing"</i> CC have requirement for NDSS. This is over specifying and too ambiguous to enforce. Viability, houses or no oversized houses.</p> <p><i>"One and a half bedroom homes which have an addition modest room for use as an office or ancillary accommodation for visiting family or carers".</i> Again who is paying for this, choose a spec and stick to it, mission creep will lead to non-delivery.</p>	Noted, it is felt that the guidance is flexible in its current wording
		Para 59	Over sizing could result in under occupancy. Bedroom tax / affordability. As previous points over provision and sizing will reduce viability. Schemes will not proceed.	Noted
		Para 60	The affordable units are already bigger than open market, CC are enforcing differences	Noted
		Para 61	This should reflect the open market. If it is a flatted scheme it is not reasonable to limit the number of affordable flats in a block.	Noted
		Para 62	<p><i>"Within the development, well-located shared ownership units can help Registered Providers manage homes most effectively and efficiently;"</i> This does not mean anything</p> <p><i>"Not provide any 2 bedrooms units above 1st floor level (other than in exceptional circumstances and accessible by a lift);"</i></p>	Noted, these are consideration which may help viability

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			Too restrictive. RPs do not want lots of 1 bed flats in blocks, a 2 bed is a normal housing unit, why should it not have stairs to it. <i>"Coach houses are only acceptable if a garage below is part of the property and allocated/sold to the same household. Coach houses are considered to be flats."</i> RPs often do not want garages.	
		Para 67	General response. Build costs are especially high in Cornwall and values relatively low. CC are requesting v.large units in large numbers. These unit are relatively low value to developers (grant is not sufficiently used or adequate to offset). Schemes which are not viable will not proceed so either will not be delivered or will not be permitted. Either way delivery goes down. Houses are better than no houses. Or make the schemes deliverable by reducing the affordable numbers or cost (not oversized) / reducing CIL.	Noted, however the SPD cannot set new policy
		Para 108	<i>"The provision of extra care housing is subject to affordable housing requirements"</i> Is this to be as paragraphs 54-63? Extra care is not the same as general needs. <i>"but viability will be considered in the same manner as with other schemes"</i> Previous paragraphs have said that viability will not be accepted unless exceptional circumstances. What about visitors/ carers	Noted, extra care housing is subject to affordable housing requirements
		Para 118	Pharmacies now have postal services.	Noted
		Para 120	What parking requirements?	Noted, however, this is not the remit of the SPD
		Para 121	Need to add 2B3P, 2B4P and 3B5P sizes to table	Noted, the table sets out considerations
		Para 123	Unit sizes should be driven by need, why limit to 1B2P. This might be the most required, but the paragraph restricts delivery of other sizes.	Noted, the text reflects the NDSS
		Para 124	These could also be provided as ground floor flats or flats with lifts on upper storeys	Agree
		Para 135	M4 (3)(2)(b), who will pay for bespoke alterations for an allocated person. If the person is not already living there accessibility grants are not payable. It will then fall on the RP or the developer to provide the scheme in line with the planning requirement to provide M4 (3)(2)(b), but without knowing the cost or extent of doing so.	Noted, the para states 'where a

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			This needs to be worked out, it is a regularly occurring problem.	specific need is identified...'
		Para 144	There is clear evidence of housing need. It must be demonstrated that there are sufficient local people in housing need who both qualify for affordable housing and have access to finance to fund a self-build project ; Are these two not mutually exclusive? How can the plots be passed to the eligible persons at lower cost than nothing which CC pays?	Noted, consider wording to clarify. CC would provide plots at less than market value.
		Para 146-147	If community led schemes are limited to 6 units and minimum 50% must be gifted to CC that only leaves 3 units for the community, or is the idea that all the community members would be eligible persons? If exception for 3 units the developer / landowner will need to deliver at least 2 units to CC as serviced. Pay for roads and services and be worthwhile off the back of a single land sale. Is the model two modest plots in return for a valuable large open market plot? The paragraphs refer to (excluding any infrastructure) does this mean CC will pay for infrastructure? Elsewhere the paragraph says serviced plots, surely the servicing is infrastructure. This needs clarification. Even affordable housing provision has a return against part of the cost, currently there looks like no return to mitigate cost to developer or landowner.	Noted, freehold is transferred to CC Consider including wording to clarify

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
20	Gulval Village Community Association	Para 48-50	<p>GVCA is part of a consultative group contributing to the Penzance parish Neighbourhood Plan, and fully supports an approach that all opportunities for the delivery of affordable housing that is related to local needs and incomes within the various settlements in the parish are maximised, both within allocated housing sites and on other appropriate sites, and that the housing will be retained for local people in the future.</p> <p>Cornwall Local Plan refers to “local needs” and “local connection policies”.</p> <p>Policy 9 in the Cornwall Local Plan Strategic Policies document (Rural Exception sites) refers to the first and future occupation of the affordable housing provided being secured for those with a housing need and a local connection to the settlement or parish in line with the Council’s local connection policies..</p> <p><u>The Draft SPD does not include details of local connection policies in either the text or the Glossary. “Housing Needs Surveys” in the glossary refers only to a Parish.</u></p> <p>While many rural parishes are focused on one small town or village others include a number of separate settlements. Penzance parish, for example, includes Newlyn, Mousehole, Paul, Heamoor and Gulval as well as Penzance town and a number of smaller hamlets.</p> <p>Different affordable housing policy approaches are relevant to the different communities within Penzance parish and community support, especially for exception sites on the edge of villages, is a significant factor. Community support is likely to be dependent on the housing to be provided being directly related to people with a need in, and connection with, the community. Equally it is important that people with a need to live in the town or in a specific village are provided for in or on the edge of that settlement rather than in a locality where they have no specific connection or family support.</p> <p>It is important, therefore, that the definitions of “local need” and “local connection”, and how they are to be implemented, are included in the SPD and are related to individual settlements.</p> <p>Evidence: individual community vision statements to be included in the Penzance Parish Neighbourhood Plan refer to affordable housing being related to local need and local connection <u>in that community</u>. Some enquiries or proposals for rural exception sites have not received community support where they have been of a scale that is related to the need in the parish as a whole rather than in the relevant village; lack of support is also related to future occupation being determined at a parish level not at the village level. There is also evidence through consultation that, where families have been allocated housing in a village (albeit within the parish) when their family support is in the town or a different village, there is a significant impact in terms of travelling (and related cost) and inconvenience.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, consideration will be given to the inclusion of a definition of ‘local needs’</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>Change required: The Draft SPD should include definitions of local need and local connection that relate to the relevant settlement or parish. <u>In parishes that include more than one settlement, including those focused on main towns, “local need” and “local connection” should relate to the relevant settlement or community rather than to the parish.</u> <u>In such parishes Housing Needs Surveys, and other evidence of local need, should also be related to the relevant settlement, not the parish as a whole.</u></p> <p>These definitions should also relate to the percentage of affordable housing to be sought on allocated or other relevant housing sites i.e. where a percentage of affordable housing is sought on an allocated site in a village (in parishes that include more than one settlement as above) first and subsequent occupation should be related in the first instance to need and local connection to that village, before cascading to nearby villages or the parish as a whole.</p> <p>Add to text, and amend Glossary, accordingly.</p>	
21	Hayle Town Council	Para 79	<p>Hayle Town Council would like an explanation regarding how the figures were arrived at for the Hayle average open market value for a two-bedroom property – it is surprised that it is the highest average for all the main towns in Cornwall.</p> <p>On a more general note, the town council would like to know how this draft document differs from earlier relevant documents.</p>	Noted, the figure is based on available data which will be published on adoption of the SPD.
22	Launceston Town Council		<p>The Draft Housing Supplementary Planning Document, gives detail and explains the mechanisms of how the council will put into practice that part of the Cornwall Local Plan which requires a sustained supply of new homes. In the main the Housing SPD fulfils this brief well. There are however some concerns:</p>	Noted
		Para 7	<p>Referring to Policy 10 of the Cornwall Local Plan: Managing viability in Affordable housing, <i>Importantly, provision of affordable housing is not absolute and must be considered in the context of the viability of individual schemes.</i></p> <p>Also Paragraph 1 of Policy 9 of the Cornwall Local Plan: Rural Exceptions Sites: Development proposals <i>whose primary purpose is to provide affordable housing to meet local needs.... Par 4: Market housing must not represent more than 50% of the homes or 50% of the land take.</i></p> <p>All the above highlights the desire of the council to meet the local need for affordable homes</p>	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 73-74	<p>Off-site contributions, Off-site contribution tariff on paragraph 73 and 74, The NPPF guidance is that affordable housing should be provided on-site.</p> <p>However the concern is there are in the CLP strategic policies, areas where a developer may negotiate with the council to provide fewer or no, affordable housing in any given site. Too many loopholes and get out clauses which enable developers to pay a tariff and not provide the full quota of the affordable element of the development.</p> <p>When a development has a potential for higher end market properties, which could lose some value with the inclusion of a percentage of affordable housing, the developer may prefer to pay a tariff.</p> <p>This may enable an improved number or range of affordable homes on another local site. But unless these other homes are within the parish or relatively close by, they may not fulfil the local need for affordable homes.</p>	Noted, however CC position is to provide on-site affordable housing. Para 83 sets out how the Council will spend any off-site contribution
23	Bodmin Town Council		<p>These comments are made from the perspective that Bodmin Town Council is one of the largest and most proactive town councils in Cornwall. The Town Council provides a range of high quality services and facilities throughout the town and has a budgeted operational expenditure of £1.5 Million in the financial year 2018/19.</p> <p>Bodmin Town Council welcomed this paper and the overarching strategy to outline the bedrock by which an appropriate mix and ratio of housing is to be provided to be able to address current needs and to cater for Cornish communities into the future.</p> <p>Bodmin Town Council is supportive of new methods to address local housing need whilst looking at in perpetuity measures to ensure that people can access homes that are affordable to them. Bodmin Town Council is therefore supportive of the move by Cornwall Council to look at local purchasing power to bring open market purchase within the reach of a typical household based on local incomes and up-to-date house price data. This should go hand-in-hand with other policy to ensure that discounted homes for sale are applied with the local connection test / requirement to ensure that homes are being provided to address local housing need and / or to assist local residents to support close relatives with a network of care and support (it is noted that family members with a network of care and support can significantly assist with health and wellbeing of that individual(s) and reduce the burden upon the health system).</p> <p>Extra Care A further observation with the document would be on Extra Care – section of the paper commencing from paragraph 106 on page 26. It is noted that there is reference to Cornwall Council supporting the development</p>	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>of extra care and specialist housing in Cornwall for people with dementia, physical disabilities, learning disabilities and older people, which Bodmin Town Council would strongly support as independent living can strengthen communities.</p> <p>However, Bodmin Town Council noted the absence of a direct comment in relation to people who may be suffering with mental health issues who could benefit from extra care and the facilities outlined in this section of the paper. As a matter of completeness and inclusivity, it is considered that this section should be appropriately re-worded to reflect the opportunity to include people with mental health issues, as not all mental health problems require intervention or residential care support (it is noted that a number of mental health issues may preclude an ability for some people to lead independent lifestyles and an assessment on a case-by-case basis will be required). An extra care option would, for a large majority of people, provide them with the community support and independence that would be most beneficial to them and their relatives.</p> <p>Older people's accommodation</p> <p>The Town Council considers that there needs to be appropriate schemes coming forward to assist people in later life with downsizing which helps release family properties (3 and 4 bed) onto the market. Without this life cycle and without new properties being built to cater for later living, the sustainable community model falters. Bodmin Town Council would therefore welcome a wider policy being considered around community housing to provide opportunities beyond simply affordable homes.</p> <p>Specialist residential care housing, similar to Bederkesa Court in Bodmin, is much needed and ensures that older people can live in a safe, warm and close support network environment (offering a close knit, social community) which can assist with mitigating the impact to decreasing health and social care budgets. It is noted that the Prince Charles house in St. Austell underwent recent refurbishment (around 5 years ago) and would be another good model for best practice.</p> <p>For older people looking to downsize, as and when their current home becomes too large to maintain and upkeep, there needs to be an option to support them and their later living needs whilst opening up larger properties for families who may have outgrown their current property. Later living property options can greatly assist with more appropriate accommodation, which includes appropriate home adaptations, which can support people to live independently for longer and stave off earlier access to NHS services.</p> <p>This model of housing also ensures that elderly or more vulnerable people live within the community and close to relatives or family carers to remain in employment and reduces their journey times to visit their loved ones. This can significantly reduce worry, anxiety and stress for all parties concerned.</p>	<p>Noted, however the remit of the SPD is to provide guidance to inform planning decisions in relation to housing not how that housing is allocated</p> <p>Noted, the SPD recognises the need for a mix of dwellings to meet the community needs</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>A viable option for any new scheme being considered could be the former Athelstan House site in Bodmin as that has become vacant following recent demolition work by Cornwall Care. This would present an excellent town centre site with relatively level access via Priory Road and through Priory Park to a range of local shops and services and would be an exciting option for any shovel ready projects.</p> <p>Second Homes Whilst considering this paper Members discussed the concerns they have with regards second home ownership across the County and the inevitable impact that this has on access to housing for local people. In particular, there was significant concern for policy to better address the impact of second home ownership on Cornish Communities as the cumulative impact can have long standing and devastating impacts on schools and businesses (such as post offices, shops and pubs) as many retire to an area and / or only occupy a property during the summer months. Members were also very concerned with the exploitation of the system by second home owners given rate exemptions that can be applied and navigated to their benefit, whilst putting increased pressure on local services and continuing the trend to out-price local people from the housing market.</p> <p>Members were cognisant of the fact that Cornwall's tourism contributes significantly to the Cornish economy and that a number of properties offer holiday rental opportunities for visitors which need servicing by local people / firms. However, the general consensus was for some better control mechanisms to be in place to strike an acceptable balance between second home ownership and retaining a community's spirit and sense of place.</p> <p>Further policy work should be robustly considered, constructed and implemented to safeguard communities from the social erosion that is being experienced in a number of villages and towns reflected in the out of season 'closed for winter' effect that has and is occurring in some villages. If the rate of this effect continues, the very reason for people wanting to 'buy-into' the Cornish way of life will be lost and restricted to summer trade – assuming of course that that business model can support the local pub, shops and the remaining local people feel able to continue to live in that type of flux and transience (and assuming that there are local jobs to continue to support them and their families). This latter point is of particular concern for smaller communities where second home ownership has been at a higher rate of uptake.</p> <p>Self-build Bodmin Town Council considers self build to be an important and cost effective option which should be further encouraged through appropriate planning mechanisms with emerging allocations / schemes, as this can be a route to assist local people to get onto and subsequently move up the housing ladder.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>Bodmin Town Council is extremely concerned with the quality of the housing schemes being delivered in Bodmin by some of the national developers as they continue to push high density schemes that follow a standard style of design and utilise a minimalist approach to the use of local materials (if any), often citing the barrier being on the grounds of economic viability. The schemes coming forward are generic and lead to an erosion of house style in Cornish communities.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that self-build would offer a more favourable approach when compared to purchase prices and build style / quality offered by housing companies / property developers. Self-build would also give scope for a more bespoke and personalised approach to be followed which would better cater the needs of owners, achieving space standards more in-keeping with their requirements and potentially affording more adaptability into the future (internal and external reconfigurations).</p> <p>Landlords Good responsible landlords make a valuable contribution to the social housing stock. It is imperative that reasonable and responsible landlords are retained and not disengaged through the system. Tenants who mistreat rented accommodation and cause damage whilst in situ or on vacating should not be entitled to a full deposit reimbursement or provided with a full grant towards their next tenancy / rent. People who are model and exemplary tenants should be encouraged and those who mistreat their home should be penalised through some form of appropriate and meaningful measures.</p> <p>Bodmin Town Council considers that there should be greater emphasis on supporting landlords so that they can be part of an inclusive system that encourages their continuing role and function as part of the housing mix and solution for communities.</p> <p>Sustainable communities Linked with the above paragraph regarding self-build plots, the Town Council would be strongly supportive of lower density developments where higher value properties could be built, either by a developer or through self-build as this would offer a range and mix of properties within the town and reduce the trend for managers and executives etc. to buy property in the rural hinterland for the commute into towns such as Bodmin for employment purposes. This would in turn assist with the local economy as money earned from local employment is put back into the local shops, cafes etc. This would also assist with reducing vehicular movements on the local highway network and ameliorate issues with air quality and traffic congestion along the A389 corridor.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>Given Bodmin's unique central geographical location and strong transport links adjacent the conflux of the A30 and A38, the town needs to be able to provide the right mix of housing to not only assist first time buyers access the housing market, but also to retain higher wage earners in the town to stimulate the local economy and redress any imbalance with a range of property options for purchasers to assess against their own personal circumstances.</p> <p>Bodmin Town Council is therefore supportive of a system which looks to achieve a true affordable model taking into account local purchasing power to access the housing market. There should also be the right kind of mix so that as many local people as possible feel able to access the housing market in their community, which includes higher spec developments to stimulate growth and underpin a range of shops and an evening economy. It is only right that as many local people as possible have an option to access housing in their village / town, rather than contemplating moving to other areas of the County in order to access a home.</p> <p>Whilst writing this consultation response, Bodmin Town Council considered that the planning system should be cognisant of some issues created by high density housing schemes which can lead to local frustration and conflict. It is not uncommon for there to be disagreement between local residents on any allocated parking spaces and the limited availability of parking generally. This can lead to congested on-street parking and in turn create restricted access for emergency services. It has been known for issues such as this to escalate to neighbour disputes as inconsiderate parking can result in obstructions to property and / or footpaths and pedestrian areas. It is not uncommon to see vehicles parking extremely close together in new and existing developments given space constraints. Some drivers also choose to park on communal (public) areas restricting access and use with a resulting impact upon the visual amenity of the area. The use of these areas as additional parking space can also cause harm through wheel damage to sites and inevitable erosion of grassed areas which has ongoing maintenance implications to any management company and / or local councils. Bodmin Town Council considers that this should be addressed through developers being encouraged to adopt good design principles with appropriate provision of parking spaces given the county's reliance on private forms of transport.</p> <p>There is a correlation between the increased number of new homes being built and community infrastructure not being able to keep pace with demand. The issues commonly being reported back to the Council relate to the need for further provision of schools, dentists, doctors and fairly basic improvements and enhancements and to community infrastructure such as parks and open spaces, increased cemetery capacity and facilities for young children and teenagers. There needs to be a joined-up approach through any site allocation process to provide more parks and open spaces and cemetery space for a growing town. Without these areas of publicly</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, this is an aim of the SPD</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>accessible areas for informal play, together with more formal sports pitch provision, the future health and wellbeing of our communities is at risk of harm.</p> <p>There is a growing concern that given the ongoing austerity measures being experienced across the public sector, which is compounded by the uncertainty around any UK Brexit deal (which may well add to the trend for ongoing budgetary constraints), the Town Council is concerned that public services such as Fire and Police will not be able to match growing populations and spikes in the demand on their services. Bodmin Town Council would therefore urge a multi-agency approach to a review and re-evaluation on the county's emergency services so that these vital services have a concomitant growth model to keep pace with the estimated population increases over the coming plan period to 2030 as a minimum.</p>	<p>Noted, CC is developing guidance on parking standards</p> <p>Noted</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
24	Cornwall Community Land Trust	General	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Cornwall Community Land Trust (CCLT) welcomes Cornwall Council's Housing SPD and looks forward to its early implementation. It will provide a large number of measures which help to reinforce the broader objectives of the Council and its housing partners to create an environment and set of planning tools which encourage the increased provision of affordable housing to meet the significant and persistently high level of housing need in the Duchy.</p> <p>CCLT seeks a Housing SPD which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closes off any potential "loop-holes" which might enable the less scrupulous whose primary objective is to maximise market return of their land and attached planning permission through a "Trojan horse" misuse of a policy intended to enable affordable homes; • Confirms that Policy 9 will always operate to maximise the number and proportion of affordable homes and discourage those who seek to maximise the proportion of open market properties on these sites; • Operates in a manner which discourages speculative land pricing on projects which should be for affordable housing; • Extends the application of Policy 9 ("rural exceptions") to the edge of all communities – including all towns – where the local community seeks to maximise affordable homes for local people. • Celebrates the reduction in Housing Need and not just delivery of units. <p>Whilst we welcome the majority of proposals in the SPD we remain concerned and unconvinced by some aspects of the proposals in respect of self/custom build homes which we perceive to be potentially counterproductive; ie in that it provides a route for the less scrupulous to subvert the purpose of Policy 9, drive projects which would fail to ensure homes on these sites remain affordable for locals in perpetuity and therefore choke-off the supply of sites for genuine schemes which do meet the need for affordable homes in perpetuity, like those advanced by CCLT.</p> <p>Community Land Trusts</p> <p>We urge Cornwall Council to afford Community Land Trusts (CLTs) in general and Cornwall CLT in particular a status equivalent to that granted to housing associations/registered providers and are grateful for the inclusion of the Cornwall CLT in the list of Delivery Partners.</p>	Noted, the SPD aims to provide guidance on the implementation of LP policies

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>CCLT is a fully constituted Community Land Trust; a charitable organisation and a registered society under the Co-operative and Community Benefits Society Act 2014. It is governed by a Board of volunteers elected by Cornwall CLT's shareholders/members at each AGM and has generated 236 properties to meet local housing need either through projects on its own, with local CLTs and/or with registered providers during the last 10 years. This accounts for around 25% of the volume delivered by CLTs nationally.</p> <p>Given the Government's increasing emphasis on community-led housing and CCLT's close joint partnership working with the Council's Affordable Housing Team and its mutually agreed contract to deliver a programme of affordable housing we believe it is appropriate to afford Cornwall Community Land Trust a status in the document which reflects its work, achievements and ambitions.</p>	Noted
		Para 17	<p>Private Intermediate Rent CLTs are able to partner with private developers seeking to offer Private Intermediate Rent. It would be helpful if this option could be clarified within this paragraph.</p> <p>It would also be helpful to provide more direction in the SPD on the type of evidence that should be provided for consideration by a developer when seeking approval from the Council for provision of Private Intermediate Rent.</p>	Noted, consider reference to CLTs within the SPD
		Para 21	<p>Shared ownership. In this paragraph there is a reference to the rental element on the unowned shared being "restricted to 2.5%" This could be more explicit, eg "2.5% of the value of the unowned share."</p>	Agree, consider amending the text as suggested
		Para 30	<p>Discounted Market Sale of 4 bedroom houses Though CCLT accepts that evidence must always be put forward to ensure that these properties will remain affordable in perpetuity, it would not be helpful if the Council adopted a presumption against larger family homes for those families which have need for four or more bedrooms because of family size or special needs.</p> <p>Please can further information be added to this paragraph to clarify the evidence that would need to be provided in order for the Council to consider 4 bedroom homes for discounted sale?</p>	Noted, however these will be judged on a case-by-case basis
		Para 33	<p>There are examples of successful schemes brought forward by CLTs where 100% discounted market sale has been achieved. A local example is the first phase delivered by the St Minver CLT where all 12 properties were bought at 31.3% of open market value and any future resales are restricted to this percentage.</p>	Noted, each site would be considered on its merits

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			CCLT requests that consideration is given to allowing 100% discounted market sale in certain circumstances, for example where the scheme is brought forward by a Community Land Trust and strong evidence is provided to support this approach.	
		Para 35	<p>CLTs are well placed to provide Long Term Stewardship of Shared Equity properties, provided they are registered and licenced under the Consumer Credit Act.</p> <p>The buyer acquires the property outright (including the freehold) with a mortgage from a High Street lender for (say) 70% of open market value. This is a first charge on the freehold interest of the property on a conventional basis. The CLT then grants the buyer an equity loan on the remaining 30% secured by a second legal charge.</p> <p>When the buyer comes to sell the property in the future, the amount required to be repaid to the CLT under their charge is the same percentage of open market value at point of repayment as the equity loan represented when it was first granted. No repayment is due on the second charge until the property is sold by the buyer and in some cases no interest is payable on the loan.</p> <p>CCLT ask that the wording of this paragraph is widened to allow a CLT to provide long term stewardship as an alternative to the Local Authority.</p>	Noted, consider reference to CLTs within the SPD
		Para 41-43	<p>Rent to Buy</p> <p>There are examples emerging of bespoke Rent to Buy arrangements for CLT householders who have been unable to obtain a mortgage. Under these arrangements, the CLT retains the freehold of the houses which is held in perpetuity and prevents Rent to Buy properties leaking out into the Open Market. CLTs commonly have a defined stewardship role, keeping the properties affordable for locals in perpetuity, and this could perhaps be reflected in the wording of paragraphs 41-43, i.e. putting CLTs forward as an alternative to the Council being the long term stewards.</p>	Noted, consider reference to CLTs within the SPD
		Para 48	<p>CCLT strongly endorses and welcomes the Council's proposed extension of Policy 9 to sites adjacent to the main towns and believes that this helps deliver the underlying objective of Policy 9, namely to maximise delivery of affordable homes.</p> <p>There are many examples of CLTs delivering sites with 100% affordable homes and the CCLT would welcome the addition of a further paragraph to indicate to applicants how the Planning Authority may be guided, and in these terms:</p>	Noted, each site would be considered on its merits

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>"In view of the often complex nature of Policy 9 sites and developments, the Local Planning Authority is more likely to be assured that the applicant can deliver a project within the parameters of the Policy if the applicant is a registered provider or Community Land Trust with a proven track record of delivering such projects whilst ensuring that it maximises the proportion of affordable homes on "exception" sites. Alternatively if the applicant can clearly demonstrate that it is working in a formal partnership with an experienced affordable registered housing provider and/or charitable body, the LPA is more likely to acknowledge the integrity and deliverability of the project".</p> <p>This Policy can be further embellished and encouraged by the Council supporting those towns which are preparing Neighbourhood Development Plans and which aim to incorporate a Policy specifically welcoming such an approach.</p>	
		Para 50-53	<p>Cluster Parish Approach</p> <p>We would welcome a clear commitment by the Council that it is prepared to consider and negotiate local variations to the "Local Connection Criteria" within the planning agreement and/or local lettings plan. In some circumstances, because of the configuration of parish boundaries and other geographical reasons, some families with a strong tie to a community can be found as long standing volunteers on a school governing body or similar body even though they may not strictly fulfil the other local connection criteria. A reasonable and objectivised system for accommodating such amendment should be available to local Housing Working Parties, CLTS, etc.</p>	Noted, consideration will be given to a definition of 'local need'
		Leaseholds and ground rents	<p>CCLT notes that the section within the previous Consultation Draft on Leasehold and ground rents has been largely removed.</p> <p>While the issues with leasehold arrangements and the background to the current MCHLG consultation on "Implementing reforms to the leasehold system in England" are understood, it is important to note that leases and ground rents are a useful tool for Community Land Trusts for creating the Asset Lock necessary for ensuring that homes remain affordable in perpetuity.</p> <p>It should also be noted that CLTs and other community organisations are able to gain exemption from leasehold enfranchisement through the Community Right to Build Order as set out in the Localism Act.</p> <p>Furthermore it should be noted that in the MCHLG consultation document, CLTs are set to be exempted from the proposed ban on long leases:</p>	Noted, consider inclusion of information on leasehold and freeholds

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>2.22 There have been however, a small number of examples where an exemption has been called for. In a few cases we are minded to agree with those who have sought an exemption, but for others we are yet to be convinced and would like to see more detailed evidence provided. We want to continue this conversation through this consultation and take views on a set of proposed exemptions as well as seek any further evidence about the case for any additional exemptions.</p> <p>2.23 We think there is a case to consider exemptions for the following types of development: a. Shared ownership properties; b. Community-led housing (Community Land Trusts, cooperatives and cohousing schemes); and c. Inalienable National Trust land and excepted sites on Crown land.</p> <p>Further still, it should be noted that modest Ground Rents and in particular a householder's ability to pay them - are a useful indicator of financial sustainability and can act as an early warning.</p> <p>More information about that National CLT Network's campaign on exemption from the proposed ban is available at</p> <p>http://www.communitylandtrusts.org.uk/article/2018/11/15/leasehold-exemptions-for-community-led-housing-are-in-touching-distance</p> <p>CCLT would request, therefore, that the section on Leasehold and Ground Rent is reinstated and reference made to the anticipated exemption for CLTs.</p>	
		Para 136-147	<p>Self build</p> <p>The policy as stated from paragraph 136 to 147 cause alarm for CCLT in that a new chasm may open up within the planning system which could provide a Trojan horse for applicants whose primary intentions are to accrue greater than affordable housing returns on their land. This policy - in particular the section relating to Community-led self-build exception sites where the ability of "the landowner to make a return on the land" is protected - appears to provide a route for the less scrupulous to side-step normal planning procedures whilst claiming to meet housing need through custom built housing. Indeed this clause would appear to be at odds with the efforts made elsewhere to limit land values on Exception Sites to £10,000 per building plot. It is also noted that in the guidance on the Community Infrastructure Levy, self-build plots are exempt from any payment.</p>	Noted, consider the section on Self-build in the SPD

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>CLLT also note that the Council self-build plots as described would be transferred to the Council rather than to a registered provider or CLT, both of which would be feasible alternatives. Perhaps the Council could either justify or review this.</p> <p>We are not convinced that the arrangements for self/custom build on “exception” sites provides a sufficiently robust methodology to protect the integrity of Policy 9. If the Policy proceeds as proposed, not only will it become the preferred route for many land owners, developers and land agents who seek to maximise their returns, but it will also have the effect of choking off potential Policy 9 sites in other circumstances and restrict the opportunities for local CLTs, registered providers and community-led housing projects which genuinely seek to provide homes to meet local housing need in perpetuity. As currently drafted we feel that this Policy could become very counterproductive.</p>	
		Useful Links	<p>In the above comments we have attempted to highlight the ways in which CLTs can complement the work of Cornwall Council and other partners in maximising the delivery of affordable homes in Cornwall.</p> <p>Should readers of the SPD wish to find out more, then the following could be added to the ‘Useful Links’ page:</p> <p>National Community Land Trust Network – The National CLT Network is the official charity supporting Community Land Trusts in England and Wales.</p> <p>The National CLT Network provides funding, resources, training and advice for CLTs and work with Government, local authorities, lenders and funders to establish the best conditions for CLTs to grow and flourish.</p> <p>http://www.communitylandtrusts.org.uk/</p> <p>Cornwall Community Land Trust – Cornwall CLT Limited delivers affordable homes, mainly for sale and some for rent, tailored to the needs of local communities. In addition it provides the following range of services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical assistance and advice for community groups through the national CLT Fund; • Technical assistance and advice direct to community groups on a consultancy basis; • Development agency services for properly constituted local community groups, and also small housing associations; • Advice and assistance on providing other community assets. 	<p>Agree, add the suggested links to the ‘useful links’ section</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			https://cornwallcct.org/	
25	Lostwithiel Town Council	General	<p>It is inappropriate to put out a document as complex as this without providing an opportunity for a face-to-face conversation with Cornwall Council staff. Lostwithiel Town Council suggests that, in future when responses are required to such a document, a number of engagement events should be set up.</p> <p>From the point of view of a potential purchaser 'Affordability' cannot be defined simply on the basis of purchase price. The affordability of a property depends on levels of pay and unemployment, both of which are significant factors in Cornwall. A house is not affordable at any price to someone on low wages and unable to raise a mortgage.</p> <p>This applies even in the case of shared ownership and rented property, as it is the total outlay relative to income that is important.</p> <p>Lostwithiel Town Council has received examples where the weekly wage of members of the community is too low to render any of the affordable schemes to permit home ownership. The Town Council considers that there should be included in the mix in any development which qualifies for an affordable element, a proportion of houses whose discount relates to individual earnings rather than area average earnings.</p>	Noted
		Para 24	Lostwithiel Town Council would like to see this proviso applying to all sites; not restricted to exception sites and Designated Protected Areas.	Noted, however this is in compliance with the NPPF
		Para 25	<p>Lostwithiel Town Council does not agree with shared ownership being Cornwall Council's preferred solution. It supports the concept of shared ownership, but it does not result in 'affordable' housing remaining affordable in perpetuity. The Draft SPD proposes that gains be 'recycled' into designated affordable schemes elsewhere. So, gains from affordable housing lost in Lostwithiel could be recycled into schemes in, say, Penzance or Saltash - so, how does this help people in Lostwithiel? The plan is not even specific that the designated sites must be in Cornwall. If the intention is to geographically restrict the recycling then the SPD should be clear on this point.</p> <p>Even if recycling is within the same local council area, it means that an area would constantly have to find new sites for development. In the case of Lostwithiel, if we lost affordable housing from within our development boundary, we would have to find land outside the boundary that is large enough in area to accommodate a development capable of delivering the requisite replacement affordable housing. Our Neighbourhood Plan currently identifies land for development allowing 300% above Lostwithiel's minimum requirement. This SPD policy would mean that percentage rising even further. This is a policy for continuing housing growth, even if</p>	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>there is no open market demand: and if there is no demand there would be no development and no replacement affordable housing.</p> <p>The proposal to recycle gains also means a time lag between losing the affordable housing and a new site becoming available, even if development were to be possible because of a sudden unexpected (and quite massive) growth in demand for open market housing.</p>	
		Para 38	<p>Para 38 states “A tapered penalty equivalent to the original level of discount of the purchase price will be payable if the property is sold within the first year of purchase; reducing by 20% of that discount (by value) in each subsequent year until year 6 when the property can be sold with no penalty.”</p> <p>Which? (the Consumer Association) says “Starter homes might not be the best option for those who are looking to move up the property ladder quickly, however, as buyers wouldn't be allowed to sell homes on at full market value until 15 years after they are purchased (updated August 2018)”</p> <p>Lostwithiel Town Council wonders which is the correct figure.</p> <p>There is a concern that these do not add to the stock of in-perpetuity affordable housing. Lostwithiel Town Council thinks they should.</p>	Noted, however this is considered compliant with the NPPF
		Para 44	If the rent is subsidised then why not restrict the value on re-sale?	Noted, this is considered to be compliant with the NPPF
		Para 53	Only if the community supports this in their Neighbourhood Plan; if there is one. The community should remain in control and not have affordable houses designated for purchasers from neighbouring areas imposed on them.	Noted, proposals would need to be considered in the context of any NDP
		Para 54	The affordable housing mix should be as specified in the Neighbourhood Plan if there is one.	Noted
		Para 68	Can it be made more explicit that, should a developer discover unanticipated costs, these costs cannot be used to negotiate a lower proportion of affordable housing.	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 106	It would be useful if the SPD encouraged development of C3 extra-care housing (independent living) which could convert to C2 (institutionalised living) accommodation.	Noted, the SPD aims to support all forms of extra care housing
		Para 139	Exception sites should be used only where land, identified for development in a community's Neighbourhood Plan, is inappropriate.	Noted, proposals would need to be considered in the context of any NDP
		Para 145	If land is identified for development, in a Neighbourhood Plan, it should be a planning requirement that self-build plots are made available on such land and only if there is no uptake could they be part of any Rural Exception development.	Noted, SPD cannot set new policy
		Para 146	Comment as above. Rural Exception sites should not be identified while there is still land identified in a Neighbourhood Plan which could accommodate self-build houses.	Noted, proposals would need to be considered in the context of any NDP
		Para 157	Off-site affordable housing should not be provided outside of land identified for development in a Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted, proposals would need to be considered in the context of any NDP
26	Marine Management Organisation		<p>It is down to the applicant themselves to take the necessary steps to ascertain whether their works will fall below the Mean High Water Springs mark.</p> <p>The Marine Management Organisation (MMO) is a non-departmental public body responsible for the management of England's marine area on behalf of the UK government. The MMO's delivery functions are; marine planning, marine licensing, wildlife licensing and enforcement, marine protected area management, marine emergencies, fisheries management and issuing European grants.</p> <p>Marine Licensing Activities taking place below the mean high water mark may require a marine licence in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act (MCAA) 2009. Such activities include the construction, alteration or improvement of any works, dredging, or a deposit or removal of a substance or object below the mean high water springs mark or in any tidal river to the extent of the tidal influence. You can also apply to the MMO for consent under the Electricity Act 1989 (as amended) for offshore generating stations between 1 and 100 megawatts in England and parts of Wales. The MMO is also the authority responsible for processing and</p>	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>determining harbour orders in England, and for some ports in Wales, and for granting consent under various local Acts and orders regarding harbours. A wildlife licence is also required for activities that that would affect a UK or European protected marine species.</p> <p>Marine Planning As the marine planning authority for England the MMO is responsible for preparing marine plans for English inshore and offshore waters. At its landward extent, a marine plan will apply up to the mean high water springs mark, which includes the tidal extent of any rivers. As marine plan boundaries extend up to the level of the mean high water spring tides mark, there will be an overlap with terrestrial plans which generally extend to the mean low water springs mark. Marine plans will inform and guide decision makers on development in marine and coastal areas. On 2 April 2014 the East Inshore and Offshore marine plans were published, becoming a material consideration for public authorities with decision making functions. The East Inshore and East Offshore Marine Plans cover the coast and seas from Flamborough Head to Felixstowe. For further information on how to apply the East Inshore and Offshore Plans please visit our Marine Information System. The MMO is currently in the process of developing marine plans for the South Inshore and Offshore Plan Areas and has a requirement to develop plans for the remaining 7 marine plan areas by 2021.</p> <p>Planning documents for areas with a coastal influence may wish to make reference to the MMO's licensing requirements and any relevant marine plans to ensure that necessary regulations are adhered to. For marine and coastal areas where a marine plan is not currently in place, we advise local authorities to refer to the Marine Policy Statement for guidance on any planning activity that includes a section of coastline or tidal river. All public authorities taking authorisation or enforcement decisions that affect or might affect the UK marine area must do so in accordance with the Marine and Coastal Access Act and the UK Marine Policy Statement unless relevant considerations indicate otherwise. Local authorities may also wish to refer to our online guidance and the Planning Advisory Service soundness self-assessment checklist.</p> <p>Minerals and waste plans and local aggregate assessments</p> <p>If you are consulting on a mineral/waste plan or local aggregate assessment, the MMO recommend reference to marine aggregates is included and reference to be made to the documents below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Marine Policy Statement (MPS), section 3.5 which highlights the importance of marine aggregates and its supply to England's (and the UK) construction industry. • The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which sets out policies for national (England) construction minerals supply. 	

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Managed Aggregate Supply System (MASS) which includes specific references to the role of marine aggregates in the wider portfolio of supply. • The National and regional guidelines for aggregates provision in England 2005-2020 predict likely aggregate demand over this period including marine supply. <p>The NPPF informed MASS guidance requires local mineral planning authorities to prepare Local Aggregate Assessments, these assessments have to consider the opportunities and constraints of all mineral supplies into their planning regions – including marine. This means that even land-locked counties, may have to consider the role that marine sourced supplies (delivered by rail or river) play – particularly where land based resources are becoming increasingly constrained.</p> <p>If you require further guidance on the Marine Licencing process please follow the link https://www.gov.uk/topic/planning-development/marine-licences</p>	
27	Ms H Dent	General	<p>Rented social or council housing should be a large part of any housing plan, to house the many who can only budget weekly and who cannot afford to purchase a house or flat on their current income.</p> <p>I can think of no better plan than to follow the design of Moray Crescent in Edinburgh and the Crescent, famous in Bath.</p> <p>The Crescents should have traffic access from the back, while in the front, the 4 crescents should look out to and have access to, a park garden which all residents can enjoy and children can play.</p> <p>By building flats in the shape of crescents , 3 to 6 stories high , the individuals foot print is lowered , compared to that of separate housing, thus allowing more green space to use and look out on, (for the many, not just for the few.)</p> <p>Similarly elderly residential care homes, sheltered housing, hospitals and hospices use such a design and could benefit, while aesthetic principles are followed.</p> <p>If we are going to build homes, then let us do it with artistic design, so people take a pride in their homes. Obviously there will still be a call for individual homes with their own garden, but let us start with housing the many with good social council housing and fix that need first.</p> <p>To offset the wishes of land owners, prospectors, builders, to build only for the rich, a moratorium should be set by the Council for a period, for no other than. Council social housing to be built.</p>	Noted, the SPD aims to provide guidance on the provision of affordable housing and implementation of LP policies

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>Just as in self building trusts, where the prospective dweller works on the building, these schemes could also have involved labour on the work for crescents.</p> <p>We should aim for designs of homes that encourage people that reduce foot print of building and increase park space for the many and are well insulated and warm.</p> <p>The park land inner space could have geothermal heating incorporated just by laying structures some feet below the ground surface, so the cr essential residents can benefit from the transferred underground warmth.</p> <p>For greater security, instead of crescents, the flats could be built, as a circle.</p>	
28	Natural England	General	<p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Our remit includes protected sites and landscapes, biodiversity, geodiversity, soils, protected species, landscape character, green infrastructure and access to and enjoyment of nature.</p> <p>While we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic this Supplementary Planning Document covers is unlikely to have major impacts on the natural environment. We therefore do not wish to provide specific comments, but advise you to consider the following issues:</p> <p>Biodiversity enhancement</p> <p>This SPD could consider incorporating features which are beneficial to wildlife within development, in line with paragraph 118 of the National Planning Policy Framework. You may wish to consider providing guidance on, for example, the level of bat roost or bird box provision within the built structure, or other measures to enhance biodiversity in the urban environment. An example of good practice includes the Exeter Residential Design Guide SPD, which advises (amongst other matters) a ratio of one nest/roost box per residential unit.</p> <p>Landscape enhancement</p> <p>The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green infrastructure provision and access to and contact with nature. Landscape characterisation and townscape assessments, and associated sensitivity and capacity assessments provide tools for planners and developers to consider how new development might makes a positive contribution to the character and functions of the landscape through sensitive siting and good design and avoid unacceptable impacts.</p>	Noted, however this is not the remit of the SPD. Other guidance documents provide information on biodiversity, GI and design.

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>Protected species Natural England has produced Standing Advice to help local planning authorities assess the impact of particular developments on protected or priority species.</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment/Habitats Regulations Assessment A SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment only in exceptional circumstances as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance here. While SPDs are unlikely to give rise to likely significant effects on European Sites, they should be considered as a plan under the Habitats Regulations in the same way as any other plan or project. If your SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulation Assessment, you are required to consult us at certain stages as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance. Should the plan be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then, please consult Natural England again.</p>	
29	Commercial Estates Group	Para 7	Paragraph 7 of the SPD recognises the policy requirements set out in Policy 10 (Managing Viability) of the Local Plan, noting positively that the provision of affordable housing is not absolute and must be considered in the context of the viability of individual schemes. This flexibility is supported.	Noted
		Para 67	<p>Paragraph 67 is clear that affordable housing targets in the Local Plan (Policy 8) are based on viability. Consequently, the Council will only expect a viability assessment to be submitted for a site in unusual circumstances. CEG supports the inclusion of wording that allows viability assessments to be prepared. Notwithstanding, we would also like to add that the Local Plan covers the period 2010-2030, therefore the need for viability assessments may become more common depending on the state of the economy.</p> <p>As a result, CEG considers it important to adopt a flexible approach to viability and affordable housing; the economic circumstances that are so important to viability may change over the years and the SPD needs to allow for changes in circumstances. Accordingly, whilst the text refers to “unusual circumstances”, it may be worth amending to state that the assessments will need to take into account unusual circumstances of a particular site and/or changes in the underlying economic situation.</p>	Noted, wording is considered flexible
30	Mr J Biscoe	Para 3	Providing affordable housing via permissions granted for market housing is a dodge which, basically, doesn’t work. There are now a range of mechanisms whereby developers regularly avoid such obligations with the result that the number of people unable to afford accommodation (rented or purchased) is not falling as it should.	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 4	It is a poor policy which requires supplementary documents to explain what it means and how it should be delivered ?	Noted
		Para 5	There are now substantial questions surrounding the number of houses which are needed in Cornwall this whole business needs to be reviewed.	Noted, LP is considered up to date
		Para 6	What is demand? Is need or desire or is it, as it should be, effective demand, that is demand which someone has the resources to implement? I have severe doubts particularly vis a vis affordable housing required because incomes in Cornwall still lag at less than 70% of national average despite all the efforts at economic development.	Noted, LP is considered up to date
		Para 7	Managing viability. One of the mechanisms whereby obligations to provide affordable housing are regularly obviated. Surely if the circumstances change between agreeing a permission and it being implemented then the risk taking developer should bear the risk not the unfortunates who can only afford affordable housing because their incomes are insufficient to service borrowing for market housing? Why is there such a gap between market housing and affordable housing prices in Cornwall I wonder?? Is the 20% profit allowed in such calculations not excessive especially when borrowing rates are so low?	Noted, LP is considered up to date
		Para 9	Where is the provision for new council houses?	Noted, however, this is not the remit of the SPD
		Para 11	These provisions rarely stick for more than two iterations before becoming generally available	Noted
		Para 13	'at a genuinely affordable price' does that mean that others are offered at affordable prices which are not genuine?	Noted
		Para 14	New council housing is now a possibility as HMG has lifted the cap on Council borrowing for this purpose. Get busy please!	Noted
		Para 45	Planning obligations.where possible..... A large unspecified loophole which should be removed surely.	Noted
		Para 47	What is this rounding up money used for? I would like to think that rounding from different sites would be combined until a whole unit is achieved and a further affordable house is built. Why do I doubt that this happens?	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 50	Oh ho! At last CC has recognised that there is life outside towns and now, as a last minute SPD thinks it might be an idea to enable building some houses in villages. The urban bias of the CC local plan is glaring to be polite. Will this remedy that?	Noted
		Para 51	This means that CC is against greenfield land then?	Noted, however land may not be available
		Para 52	Local connection is a joke. Look at Homechoice register, a charade if ever there was one. The cascade approach mentioned here is really allowing speculative building in villages.	Noted, aims to address local need
		Para 53	Cluster approach. How do you consult among parishes to get this agreed? Not easy. Then wonder about allocating the dwellings between the parishes unto the third, fourth and subsequent iterations?	Noted
		Para 56	Better to avoid one bed units, better two bed so that if needs be a friend relative or carer can stay overnight to provide care thereby keeping people out of institutions!	Noted, however in some instances a 1 bed dwelling will serve a need
		Para 57	Note Need rather than demand, cf above effective demand	Noted
		Para 61	What will be the impact on the sacred viability of this?	Noted
		Para 63-66	And the squealing from developers about viability was not deafening, really?	Noted
		Para 69	Will the publicly available information include the % profit on different types of dwelling?	Noted, this would be in accordance with NPPF
		Para 70	So CC recognises that viability will affect affordable housing percentages and accepts that.	Noted
		Para 73	Very droll.	Noted
		Para 78	Can these contributions be used by the Council to build Council houses?	Noted, however this is not the remit of the SPD
		Para 82	Oh dear, an exception based on subjective information.	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 83	Oh dear, the contributions will end up in the general bucket. Use it for building council houses?	Noted
		Para 85	How often is this likely to actually happen? Viability calculations?	Noted
		Para 90	Why are exception sites only rural? Why not urban exception sites as well? More urban bias, gobbling up rural land for urbanisation.	Noted
		Para 94	Good to see that Outline planning has come back into service. No more Pre Apps please.	Noted, however the Council encourages the use of the pre-application service
		Para 96	Surely the system should be that no new exception sites will be considered until all existing such permissions have been delivered. Much easier.	Noted
		Para 98	Oh dear, urban creep dressed up a bit differently.	Noted, however this reflects Government policy
		Para 99	How is such demand demonstrated? Does it have to be demonstrated to exist in perpetuity? Could be interesting to achieve?	Noted
		Para 102	The best way to achieve this is if people reside in their own homes, see my comments above at para 56 about two bedroom OPB's	Noted
		Para 105	But now we are working on predicted demand. How was this prediction arrived at? How many chicken gizzards were examined?	Noted, work by the Council's extra care team has identified a need
		Para 107	Do you mean dispersed or distributed growth? Either way this statement is much at odds with the vast majority of the policy contents of the Local Plan which favour concentration of development in urban areas. How much of the population resides in rural areas? How much support do they get? The square root of not very much it seems.	Noted, however the adopted local plan sets a dispersed spatial strategy

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 110	Amaze me what are HAPPI principles? "Housing our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation"	Noted, make reference to HAPPI principles
		Para 113	Another potential reducer for affordable housing then? Or four to be precise.	Noted
		Para 115	That is a breakthrough. Shops, restaurants, gyms etc. Market housing seems to not need these from casual observation?	Noted
		Para 118	See comments above about 1 bet units and carers.	Noted
		Para 120	Surely these services should be available to all dwellings? That way people don't get to need special care as much or as soon.	Noted
		Para 123	Only one guest room? See above.	Noted
		Para 127	'Housing without care' Bit of a Freudian slip that?	Noted
		Para 132	What would be the costs and benefits of making all new homes wheelchair friendly? At least have the corridors and doorways wide enough so that they are easy to adapt later if needs be?	Noted, building regulations set out requirements
		Para 157	But not use it to build council houses?	Noted
		Para 162	That is provocative?	Noted
		General	<p>Conclusion; The thrust of this SPD seems to be one of introducing more exceptions and extraordinary circumstances which have the effect of making an already fragmented Plan and its associated policies even more fragmented. No doubt planning agents will be rubbing their hands at the prospect of more clients wanting guidance through this new maze. Will the result be that housing which is built will more closely match the needs of the people resident in Cornwall? Council has not clicked on to the fact that HMG will lift the cap on borrowing to build council houses.</p> <p>Three new ideas arise from this document.</p> <p>Make sure that every dwelling has a bedroom and a space for relatives/carers to stay.</p>	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>Make building regulations such that all new dwellings are wheelchair friendly so doors wide enough and no steps at entrances to start with. Stairs wide enough to accommodate a stair lift. This will enable more people to stay in their own homes longer and save money into the bargain.</p> <p>Use any money arising from S106 for partial dwellings to build council houses.</p> <p>These of course in addition to the long held ideals of making all new dwellings attached to the mains gas system as it is the cheapest source of energy and enforcing this will spread the grid at the cost of developers across more of the Duchy than the current pathetic 45% of dwellings.</p> <p>Add the requirement that all new dwellings are equipped with sink side waste disposal machines and more putrescible waste will go to sewage and less to landfill. One day of course SWW will be obliged to process all sewage by Anaerobic Digestion with all its benefits..</p>	
31	Pearce Fine Homes	Para 6	<p>Policy 9</p> <p>Pearce Fine Homes have developed a number of exception sites under Policy 9 and are therefore in an excellent position to advise on the implementation of this policy. In practice they have found that with 50% affordable housing, the site becomes extremely unattractive to open market purchasers. This happens where a management company is in place and open market purchasers think that they are subsidising the site's amenities for the affordable housing. This is particularly the case as the Registered Providers are only willing to pay a fixed price for these contributions which falls well short of what is required. Accordingly, the viability of these schemes going forward is questioned.</p>	Noted, the SPD provides guidance on the policies in the LP. It cannot set new policy
		Para 7-12	<p>Affordable Housing Definition</p> <p>The NPPF 2 published in July 2018 sets out the definition of Affordable Housing in Annex 2 Glossary. It is defined as: -</p> <p>“housing for sale or rent, for those whose needs are not met by the market (including housing that provides a subsidised route to home ownership and/or is for essential local workers); and which complies with one or more of the following definitions: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Affording housing for rent b) Starter homes c) Discounted market sales housing d) Other affordable routes to home ownership” 	Agree, the SPD seeks to address the affordable housing requirements

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			It is important to ensure that the SPD covers all of these definitions for affordable housing and that provision is made for all types of affordable housing. It is unclear that the SPD does that at present.	
		Para 31	Developers are equally concerned about the future affordability of homes at the stage they are built and valued. This paragraph does not appear to recognise that important fact. A development's viability would be hit if the Council are able to switch from discounted sale to another product of its own discretion. Such an approach is extremely unhelpful and will only mean that less affordable housing is provided.	Noted, however the Council feel this is appropriate to ensure affordable housing provision
		Para 37-38	Starter Homes It is unclear why starter homes are exempt from a Policy 9 exception scheme. It seems that they are a good way of assisting development for local people particularly in rural areas.	Although defined as affordable, these are not affordable in perpetuity and do not fit the policy requirements
		Para 47	Rounding Up the Affordable Housing Provision It is recognised that Policy 8 requires between 25% - 50% affordable housing to be provided on a site depending on the Value Zone the site is located. However, where a site is situated on the edge of a settlement and clearly the houses are being provided for that settlement, then the rate to be applied should be that which applies to the settlement, even though the site may be located in the higher value zone. Furthermore, we do not believe that it is correct to round up affordable housing from a point below 5 percentage. This will not assist the delivery of affordable housing particularly on sites where the viability is marginal	Noted, the SPD cannot set new policy
		Para 50-53	Cluster Parish Approach It is accepted that the need for affordable housing in rural areas should be for the benefit of the local households. It is also accepted that where these local households do not come forward for affordable housing then a wider search should be undertaken e.g. Parish wide etc. However, there should also be recognition that in some circumstances, the affordable houses will not be occupied and accordingly consideration should be given to changing the tenure of these properties to say open market.	Noted
		Para 60-62	Design & Distribution of Affordable Housing It is a well established principle of the design of affordable housing should be 'tenure blind' and indistinguishable from open market properties. With regards clusters of affordable housing, the advice is overly prescriptive and we believe that there will be circumstances where clusters greater than 6-8 dwellings will be appropriate. Furthermore, larger clusters which will be tenure blind have greater efficiency in terms of	Noted, SPD provides guidance and states 'typically' recognising there

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			management for the Registered Providers. The cluster of affordable housing and its position in relation to open market dwellings is extremely important particularly with regards the overall viability of schemes. This is an important consideration which must be taken into consideration.	may be circumstance where this is not appropriate. Consider amending the text
		Para 63-66	Phasing Concern is expressed at the suggested phasing triggers. This should be treated on a site by site basis. The desired timing of the delivery of affordable housing at the start of a particularly larger site only works to strain cashflow particularly where other up front infrastructure and financial contributions are required. The requirements set out in paragraph 66 can potentially stall a site and accordingly they should be deleted.	Noted, SPD provides guidance and phasing is an important issue.
		Para 67-72	Viability Assessment The Cornwall Local Plan predated the publication of the NPPF in July 2018. It is therefore wrong to suggest that no viability assessments would be accompanied with any applications. Clearly, once the Local Plan review has followed the advice in the NPPF then that represents a change in circumstances but it would be incorrect to adopt such an approach now. Indeed, rather than accept the delivery of affordable housing it would be the opposite effect. The reference to £10k per plot is unrealistic especially on smaller sites. The land owner simply does not get the return required to allow the dals to be completed. This figure should be updated rather than leaving it to the developers to subsidise the issue It must be recognised that a certain amount of land banking takes place in order to assist developer's ability to continually deliver sites and retain the employment of its staff.	Noted, however the LP is considered up to date
		Para 79	A fixed enabling activity fee seems extremely high and should be re-examined.	Noted, the Council considers the enabling fee fair and has set out the methodology in the SPD
		Para 81	The issue of overall site viability must be considered. As presently drafted the developer is expected to have to pay offsite contributions and enabling fees up front. This will affect a site's viability and hamper the delivery of affordable housing.	Noted, however the Council feels that the payment

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
				points are appropriate for an off-site contribution.
		Para 84, 85 & 86	In its present form it is likely that only Registered Providers will bring forward these sites. The 50% land division for open market and affordable plots affects the value of these sites.	Noted, however this is the adopted policy approach
		Para 108	We do not believe the extra care homes should be subject to affordable housing. The dwellings are meeting a specific need in the housing sector and accordingly should be exempt from providing affordable housing.	Noted
32	RentPlus UK		<p>General Comments</p> <p>The Council's housing team has met previously with Rentplus to discuss the practical delivery of rent to buy in Cornwall, while the planning team was also sent representations from Tetlow King Planning on Rentplus in 2015 and 2016. Since then rent to buy has been recognised by the Government as an innovative tenure able to meet the needs of those hard-working households squeezed by the inability to save for a mortgage deposit which is the main barrier to homeownership. This is achieved through a combination of a secure affordable rented period (whichever is the lower of 80% of open market rent, including any service charge, or Local Housing Allowance), giving time to save, and a 10% gifted deposit to enable tenants to buy their own home in 5, 10, 15 or 20 years.</p> <p>We understand the context for bringing forward the draft SPD and the need to ensure that affordable housing delivered across Cornwall meets Cornish housing needs. The Council's Local Plan target is to build 52,500 homes across the period 2010-2030 and, whilst there is no formal affordable housing target, does indicate need for 30,910 affordable homes, with an annual target of 1,546 homes. Delivery however has not kept pace with these targets, with 20,494 homes being delivered across 2010-2018, of which 6,505 were affordable – 32% of overall delivery. As the Council's affordable housing policies seek 40% delivery, and around 12,400 affordable homes should have been provided over the same period, there is a clear shortfall against policy expectations and a significant unmet need for more affordable housing across the county.</p> <p>Affordability is constraining access to home ownership, keeping many potential home owners locked in private rented accommodation or in other affordable tenures without support towards ownership. Access to a deposit remains one of the most challenging blockers to accessing home ownership which intermediate affordable housing does not resolve; the Council should take a proactive approach to welcoming the delivery of the wider range of affordable tenures as now set out in the revised Framework to encourage a more diverse housing stock and to improve the ability of all developers to deliver an appropriate and higher quantum of affordable</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>The SPD recognises the contribution Rent to Buy can</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>housing. As such Cornwall Council cannot afford to be closed off to new delivery platforms bringing new investment into the sector, particularly as the Government support delivery of a wide range of affordable housing by all types of housing providers.</p> <p>Rentplus is the country's leading delivery platform as a private sector provider of Affordable Rent to Buy homes. However, the SPD in its current form offers significant barriers to the inclusion of privately financed Affordable Rent to Buy models in Cornwall which offer the opportunity of further diversifying local housing stock, new opportunities for local people to access housing that meets their needs, and in enabling local Registered Providers to meet needs without additional capital outlay.</p> <p>Rentplus can enable the Local Authority to attract significant additional institutional private finance to fund the delivery of a complementary affordable housing product. As the Council will now be aware, Rent to Buy is now identified as an affordable housing tenure within national policy as defined within Annex 2 of the NPPF (2018). The Rentplus model provides affordable housing that combines an affordable intermediate rent for a period of 5, 10, 15 or 20 years, and a 10% gifted deposit at the point of sale. This gives people on lower and average incomes a genuine and realistic pathway to affordable home ownership.</p> <p>It is important to recognise that this differs from 'traditional' shared ownership affordable housing by the omission, at first point of entering a Rentplus Rent to Buy home, of a deposit which remains the key barrier to accessing those other tenures. Rentplus also works for people who are working to correct bad credit profiles or have county court judgements (CCJs) which are a further barrier to renting and applying for a mortgage. As a positive credit record can be built up whilst renting households are in a much better position to obtain a mortgage at the point they look to buy; as those households are unlikely to qualify for traditional affordable accommodation and unable to access shared ownership housing Rent to Buy offers a genuinely new opportunity to save for home ownership.</p> <p>By supporting the development of privately financed Affordable Rent to Buy within the SPD, the Council will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase its Affordable Housing provision across the county without additional public sector subsidy by improving the viability, thus reducing the need for additional subsidy or renegotiation of the provision of affordable housing on a site. • Offer a much-needed additional tenure to meet the needs of a section of the community which are unable to be met by the current housing market or the current provision of Affordable Housing in Cornwall, and they may be stuck in private rented or occupying valuable social rented accommodation when they could be better accommodated in other tenures, freeing those homes for other households with priority needs. 	make to the provision of affordable housing.

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>Affordable Housing Products</p> <p>At paragraph 9 the SPD refers to the adopted Policy 8 broad tenure split requirement for 70% rented affordable housing tenures and 30% intermediate affordable housing for rent or sale. Whilst this is adopted policy, this must also be read in the context of the revised national policy which has already noted contains a new definition of affordable housing. Until such time as the Council reviews and revises its Local Plan policies to reflect those many changes within the NPPF it is important for the Council's planning guidance to interpret the adopted policy in the context of the national policy which is a material consideration in determining planning applications.</p> <p>It will be important as part of the Council's review of its policies to consider whether a new assessment of housing need in a new SHMA will be the most appropriate mechanism to assess the needs for the more diverse affordable housing tenures now recognised in the NPPF. Attached to this letter is a report produced by Lichfields setting out a proposed methodology on how to calculate need for Affordable Rent to Buy as part of a general assessment of need which may be helpful in considering the assessment and practical implications for delivering affordable housing.</p> <p>For the purpose of this proposed supplementary guidance to the Local Plan we note that the Planning Practice Guidance states that SPD should be prepared <i>"only where necessary"</i> and should <i>"build upon and provide more detailed guidance on the policies in the Local Plan. They should not add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development."</i> (Paragraph 028 Reference ID: 12-028-20140306).</p> <p>As the Council has yet to review its Local Plan it would be useful for this proposed supplementary guidance to set out how the Council intends to implement the Government's new definition of affordable housing, enabling delivery of a wider range of affordable tenures to greater assist in meeting needs and make the step change in delivery that is so clearly needed across the county. This may in the short term be achieved by encouraging development that is for rent (and/or) sale to be permitted under the existing tenure split until such time as the evidence base is reviewed and a more tailored policy set out.</p> <p>The distinction made at paragraphs 9 to 44 between affordable rented housing and intermediate housing for rent or sale prevents Affordable Rent to Buy models being utilised as a third option to enhance viability and increase affordable housing delivery. The SPD should include the flexibility to include additional tenures as affordable housing; by way of an example a scheme that is not viable with the rigid application of the Council's tenure split of 70% affordable rent and 30% shared ownership may result in reduced provision of affordable housing. However, by including Affordable Rent to Buy in to the mix with 1/3 affordable rent, 1/3 affordable</p>	Noted, the LP is considered up to date

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>rent to buy and 1/3 shared ownership, viability is increased, and the ability to deliver a maximised level of affordable housing at 40% is preserved.</p> <p><i>In Perpetuity</i> Throughout the SPD there are multiple references to affordable housing being retained <i>in perpetuity</i>. This is a critical problem with the document which fails to reflect adopted policy from either the Local Plan and the NPPF, both 2012 and 2018. The requirement to restrict occupation of affordable housing <i>in perpetuity</i> is referenced just once in the Local Plan, within the supporting text at paragraph 2.58 and explicitly in reference to rural exception sites only. This quite rightly followed the approach set out in the NPPF which only requires such a restriction on rural exception sites.</p> <p>There are a number of problems with setting out a requirement in this planning guidance for all affordable housing to be retained <i>in perpetuity</i>. The first is that, as set out in the NPPF and confirmed in the PPG, supplementary guidance cannot set policy and therefore should be consistent with the Local Plan and not introduce further requirements. The second is that this restriction is not only inappropriate but, in our experience in working with providers of affordable housing, including Housing Associations, causes problems for providers and purchasers of affordable housing in obtaining mortgages for properties restricted in this way. This limits the ability to deliver; for this guidance to be capable of being adopted it should remove all references to retaining affordable housing <i>in perpetuity</i> except in relation to those affordable houses provided on rural exception sites.</p> <p>The policy set out in the NPPF follows on from case law and precedents set out in a number of planning appeal decisions. One such appeal, relating to Old Albanians Sports Ground, St Albans (reference APP/B1930/A/01/1073344), at which Tetlow King Planning acted for the appellant the local authority had objected to the proposal on the grounds that the affordable housing would not be secured <i>in perpetuity</i>.</p> <p>The Council had three objections to the scheme submitted by the appellants on three grounds –prioritisation, permanence and enforceability; the appellants sought to restrict the homes to key workers, which the Council objected would not meet the needs of those in greatest (priority) need. This the Inspector noted would assist those on low and middle incomes who are unable to purchase homes or rent on the open market locally, meeting the needs of local workers in housing need and assisting in reducing the ‘polarisation’ of the market which delivery of only affordable housing for those in priority needs and open market housing can exacerbate.</p> <p>In respect of permanence the Council objected that the dwellings could be ‘lost’ as affordable units at the end of 20 years (the period of the housing association’s loan in that case). The Inspector noted the appellant’s</p>	<p>Noted, the SPD cannot set new policy but gives guidance on how to deliver LP policies.</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>arguments that the concept of 'in perpetuity' is "difficult to attain even when a social landlord is involved. When an RSL uses Social Housing Grant to provide dwellings for rent, every tenant has the right to purchase by virtue of the Housing Act 1996. Every 'shared owner' has the right to 'staircase' to 100% ownership."</p> <p>The Inspector further commented that tenants' rights limit the weight that a local plan policy making units permanently affordable can be attributed and that 20 years is a "sufficiently long period of time for the provision of affordable housing", and a "long period in development plan terms". The 'windfall' from the sale of the dwellings could also be used to deliver affordable housing elsewhere, meeting further households in need. In concluding on this matter, it is important to note that the Inspector commented that permanence "is not a realistic objective for affordable housing even where an RSL is involved" and delivery of affordable housing for a period as 'substantial' as 20 years would offer benefits to that area.</p> <p>Finally, in relation to enforceability the Council had expressed concern that the units may be offered for sale after a shorter period than 20 years and that this would be difficult to prevent using enforcement measures. The Inspector once more commented that this "overlooks the fact that the units would be owned by an RSL with its duties and obligations." This would secure the homes for people in need, and if 'lost' through purchase would be the same as a tenant exercising their right to buy as those tenants would "be no longer in need", with the housing provider able to recycle those funds for alternative affordable housing provision.</p> <p>Paragraph 11 should remove reference to affordable housing being expected to be secured <i>in perpetuity</i>, but also remove reference to providers of affordable housing being approved by the Council on a scheme-by-scheme basis. There is no requirement for such approval in planning policy, and unnecessarily restricts the ability to deliver and manage affordable housing in Cornwall.</p> <p>Paragraph 13 includes reference to social rented housing being "helpful to those that are looking to save a deposit to buy their first home". There is no real benefit to this statement being included in relation to this tenure as this applies to many forms of affordable housing, including social rent, affordable rent and affordable rent to buy. As it provides no planning guidance it should be removed.</p> <p>Definitions The definitions set out at paragraphs 11 to 44 unnecessarily replicates those definitions set out at Annex 2 of the NPPF. As the guidance in this section does not add any further local detail these paragraphs should be removed, and reference made only to the national definition to ensure long term consistency.</p> <p>Rent to Buy</p>	<p>Noted, it is recognised that not all affordable housing can be provided in perpetuity. Wording in SPD will be considered to ensure this is reflected, where appropriate</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>Further to our comments in relation to removing all references throughout the SPD to securing all affordable housing <i>in perpetuity</i> we note that the reference to this at paragraph 43 conflicts with the text at paragraph 41 which recognises that rent to buy conflicts with the requirement to be provided as such. This also conflicts with the guidance on shared ownership at paragraphs 20 to 25 as these allow, as per national policy, for staircasing to full ownership with appropriate recycling of subsidy to delivery of affordable housing on other schemes.</p> <p>Rent to Buy by its definition completes the pathway to homeownership and therefore cannot be secured by planning obligation <i>in perpetuity</i>, just as shared ownership occupiers can quite rightly be allowed to staircase to full ownership. Failure to permit 100% staircasing is also well understood to unnecessarily fetter Housing Associations' ability to fund, deliver and manage shared ownership properties as this causes difficulties at all stages including upon resale. Sales rights to the Council can be secured on Rent to Buy homes but the tenant must have the primary opportunity to purchase. Paragraph 43 should, if retained within this guidance, instead read:</p> <p><i>"Where Rent to buy products are agreed and supported, these should be managed for the rental period by a Registered Provider. They will also be secured by an appropriate planning obligation to ensure appropriate allocation."</i></p> <p>Similarly, paragraph 41 should remove the restriction on delivery of rent to buy homes on Policy 9 sites to shared ownership only as this fails to reflect the above points in relation to permanence of affordable housing, suitability of restricting shared ownership to less than 100% ownership and the need to deliver significantly more affordable housing across Cornwall to meet the full diversity of housing need.</p> <p>The reference to 'Policy 8 sites' at paragraph 42 would seem to be an error which should refer to 'Policy 9 sites' as paragraph 41 has already established in principle support of Rent to Buy housing. Nevertheless, reference to supporting Rent to Buy delivery where this is 'delivered' by a Registered Provider creates a fundamental barrier to the delivery of such innovative privately funded models which are supported by Government. However, privately funded Rentplus Rent to Buy homes are leased and managed by Registered Providers to deliver the management during the rented period and as such this language should be changed to show support for products that are "managed" by Registered Providers.</p> <p>Paragraph 42 also includes a requirement for <i>the</i> 'subsidy' element to be returned to the Council to reinvest in other affordable housing accommodation, or where there is a guarantee that sales proceeds are used to fund further affordable housing in Cornwall. The NPPF states under the definition of Rent to Buy at Annex 2:</p>	<p>Noted, however CC requires this to ensure compliance</p> <p>Agree, delete sentence</p> <p>Noted, wording will be reviewed to</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p><i>d) ... [Only] Where public grant funding is provided, there should be provisions for the homes to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households, or for any receipts to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision, or refunded to Government or the relevant authority specified in the funding agreement.</i></p> <p>Affordable Rent to Buy as delivered by providers such as Rentplus uses private finance, bringing in new money and new investment in affordable housing; the housing White Paper (<i>Fixing our Broken Housing Market</i>, 2017) set out the Government's support for institutional investment, stating that "<i>Rent to Buy ... will enable thousands of households to access home ownership through a product that fits their circumstances.</i>" To properly reflect the definition set out in the NPPF if paragraph 42 is retained in the guidance this should be reworded, including such wording as to exclude privately funded affordable housing from this provision in order to attract private investment in affordable housing into Cornwall.</p> <p>Paragraph 44 introduces one model of Rent to Buy based on Cornwall Living Rent. It is inappropriate to specify a single model of Rent to Buy when the NPPF deliberately keeps the definitions broad to allow all providers to meet needs, and while paragraph 41 states clearly that there are several models, and further innovation may yet be delivered in Cornwall. As with our earlier comments, this paragraph should be removed or expanded to include all available models of Rent to Buy, for example an Affordable Rent to Buy model that combines a subsidised rental period with a subsidised sale of at least 10% of open market value gifted deposit at the time of purchase. The SPD should not seek to limit delivery by reference to a single Affordable Rent to Buy product, such as Cornwall Living Rent.</p> <p>Affordable housing-led schemes and main towns A Country Land and Business Association (CLA) policy briefing was published in November, titled <i>Sustainable Villages – Making Rural Communities Fit for the Future</i>. This briefing highlighted Cornwall as the local authority area with the 'most unsustainable villages', with 213 villages deemed 'unsustainable' in the Local Plan hierarchy, whilst noting that this figure may mask a much higher figure if villages are not listed at all.</p> <p>The briefing echoes the Taylor Review's findings in stating that assumptions about villages without services being unsuitable for development "<i>effectively fossilises these villages instead of seeking to address the reasons behind why services are lost, creating a cycle of decline.</i>" The briefing does highlight Cornwall as a success story in delivering a large number of rural exception sites but also notes that tools such as this are not being used to their full potential.</p> <p>The revised NPPF includes a new policy seeking to deliver affordable housing-led schemes outside urban areas to complement the existing success of rural exception sites. Entry-level exception sites are aimed at delivering affordable housing for rent and sale and as such should be encouraged here, as well as at paragraphs 97 to 100</p>	<p>ensure compliance with policy</p> <p>Agree, amend to policy 9</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>provided that this is not set out as policy and complements the existing policy on 'rounding off' settlements, as this will enable additional delivery across Cornwall.</p> <p>Cluster Parish Approach We support the Council's approach to allowing for a cascade approach to clustering parishes for determining households in need with local connections. This not only helps those households in need now, but secures more homes and helps to sustain those villages for the longer term.</p> <p>Mix, Size and Accessibility Standards Paragraph 59 essentially sets policy by requiring specific house types and sizes. This is inappropriate and should instead be worded as the guidance at paragraph 57 is, with proposals expected to consider the provision set out in that section. This is equally important for ensuring that the guidance remains relevant and effective over the longer term, enabling development that meets the specific needs of an area and reflecting specific site circumstances, to come forward without unnecessary planning barriers. 6</p> <p>Entry Level Exception Sites As with our comments above, guidance in this SPD should not seek to introduce policy or replicate policy from the NPPF but complement the existing Local Plan approach to allowing development on the edge of settlements. The bullet points at paragraph 98 should not explicitly refer to Starter Homes as this is not specifically referenced in the NPPF as the main tenure for delivery on such sites. The reference to entry-level exception sites not being permitted within the AONB should be removed, as this is already specified in the NPPF at paragraph 71b), footnote 34.</p> <p>Glossary We support the definition of affordable housing within the Glossary as consistent with that provided in the NPPF Annex 2 Glossary.</p>	<p>Noted, amend to ensure section on Living Rent is clear</p> <p>Noted</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
				<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, consider amending wording to read 'typically the following are considered appropriate....'</p> <p>Agree, delete reference to AONB</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment																														
				Noted																														
			<div><div>Summary of Proposed Amendments</div><div>For ease of reference we provide here a summary of our proposed changes to the SPD that are necessary in our view to ensure it may be readily implemented by applicants and the Council alike:</div><table><tr><td>Paragraph</td><td>Proposed Amendment</td><td>Comment</td></tr><tr><td>9 – tenure split</td><td>Tenure split to be interpreted with reference to new affordable housing tenures that are for rent and/or sale.</td><td>To ensure effective application of local policy in context of NPPF material consideration.</td></tr><tr><td>9 – 44</td><td colspan="2">Refer to new NPPF definition of affordable housing and guidance on interpretation of Policies 8 and 9 in context of this.</td></tr><tr><td>11</td><td>Remove reference to all affordable housing being secured <i>in perpetuity</i>.</td><td>For consistency with national policy, guidance and case law.</td></tr><tr><td>13</td><td>Remove reference to social rented housing being helpful to those looking to save for a deposit.</td><td>Unnecessary and misleading given this is only noted in reference to social rented housing and no other forms of affordable housing.</td></tr><tr><td>11 – 14</td><td>Remove definitions.</td><td>Duplication of national policy.</td></tr><tr><td>41 and 43</td><td>As above, remove references securing rent to buy housing <i>in perpetuity</i>.</td><td>Consistency with national policy, guidance and case law, and between paragraphs (including 20-25) which acknowledge that rent to buy includes conversion to full or part ownership.</td></tr><tr><td>41</td><td>Remove restriction to shared ownership rent to buy on Policy 9 sites.</td><td>Consistency with national policy and flexibility to deliver greater affordable housing numbers.</td></tr><tr><td>42</td><td>Correct reference to Policy 8 sites.</td><td>Appears to be a reference to Policy 9 sites.</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">Reword to remove reference to ‘the’ subsidy.</td><td>Consistency with national policy.</td></tr></table></div>	Paragraph	Proposed Amendment	Comment	9 – tenure split	Tenure split to be interpreted with reference to new affordable housing tenures that are for rent and/or sale.	To ensure effective application of local policy in context of NPPF material consideration.	9 – 44	Refer to new NPPF definition of affordable housing and guidance on interpretation of Policies 8 and 9 in context of this.		11	Remove reference to all affordable housing being secured <i>in perpetuity</i> .	For consistency with national policy, guidance and case law.	13	Remove reference to social rented housing being helpful to those looking to save for a deposit.	Unnecessary and misleading given this is only noted in reference to social rented housing and no other forms of affordable housing.	11 – 14	Remove definitions.	Duplication of national policy.	41 and 43	As above, remove references securing rent to buy housing <i>in perpetuity</i> .	Consistency with national policy, guidance and case law, and between paragraphs (including 20-25) which acknowledge that rent to buy includes conversion to full or part ownership.	41	Remove restriction to shared ownership rent to buy on Policy 9 sites.	Consistency with national policy and flexibility to deliver greater affordable housing numbers.	42	Correct reference to Policy 8 sites.	Appears to be a reference to Policy 9 sites.	Reword to remove reference to ‘the’ subsidy.		Consistency with national policy.	
Paragraph	Proposed Amendment	Comment																																
9 – tenure split	Tenure split to be interpreted with reference to new affordable housing tenures that are for rent and/or sale.	To ensure effective application of local policy in context of NPPF material consideration.																																
9 – 44	Refer to new NPPF definition of affordable housing and guidance on interpretation of Policies 8 and 9 in context of this.																																	
11	Remove reference to all affordable housing being secured <i>in perpetuity</i> .	For consistency with national policy, guidance and case law.																																
13	Remove reference to social rented housing being helpful to those looking to save for a deposit.	Unnecessary and misleading given this is only noted in reference to social rented housing and no other forms of affordable housing.																																
11 – 14	Remove definitions.	Duplication of national policy.																																
41 and 43	As above, remove references securing rent to buy housing <i>in perpetuity</i> .	Consistency with national policy, guidance and case law, and between paragraphs (including 20-25) which acknowledge that rent to buy includes conversion to full or part ownership.																																
41	Remove restriction to shared ownership rent to buy on Policy 9 sites.	Consistency with national policy and flexibility to deliver greater affordable housing numbers.																																
42	Correct reference to Policy 8 sites.	Appears to be a reference to Policy 9 sites.																																
Reword to remove reference to ‘the’ subsidy.		Consistency with national policy.																																

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment			CC Officer Comment	
			43	Where rent to buy products are agreed and supported in accordance with the above, these should be provided through an approved managed for the rental period by a Registered Provider. They will also be secured by an appropriate planning obligation to ensure they constitute affordable housing in perpetuity, and provide nomination and sales rights to the Council appropriate allocation.	Ensures consistency with national policy and flexibility with regards to delivery, allocation and subsequent management.		
			44	Remove reference to Cornwall Living Rent to the exclusion of any other models, or amend to refer to wider range of rent to buy models.	Consistency with national policy and Government support for a wide range of providers of affordable housing.		
33	Retirement Consortium	Para 10	This paragraph contradicts 24 on shared ownership. Affordable properties cannot be maintained as such in perpetuity. Affordable rent will be subject to Right to Acquire requirements and Shared Ownership will have staircasing to 100% full ownership. In these Cases the ‘developer subsidy’ should be quantified and recycled to provide full or part provision of affordable housing elsewhere. This mechanism is set out in paragraph 24.			Noted, consider text to ensure compliance with policy and guidance	
		Para 11, 18	Similarly, rented affordable homes will be subject to Right to Acquire and properties may not be secured “in perpetuity”. The ‘developer subsidy’ should be quantified and recycled to provide full or part provision of affordable housing elsewhere. This mechanism is set out in paragraph 24.			Noted, consider text to ensure compliance with policy and guidance	
		Para 24	While we have no objection to the principle of recycling subsidy it is not clear how the developer subsidy is calculated especially where staircasing amounts to less than 100%.			Noted	
		Para 30	The council acknowledges here that there a particular management issues associated with discount market sale flats. This is of particular concern to my clients as they are providing retirement apartments where management of any affordable housing on site would present significant barriers to delivery of retirement housing due to the need to provide stable management arrangements.			Noted	
		Para 31	We are concerned that changing the type of affordable housing may adversely affect the viability of a scheme and affect how much affordable housing can be delivered. The S106 may need to allow some flexibility in the			Noted, the guidance provides flexibility	

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			calculation of the amount of affordable housing that may be provide in order to avoid potentially time consuming discussions.	
		Para 34-36	It might be helpful to consider a model lease for shared equity and shared ownership and to make this available.	Noted, consider suggestion
		Para 36	ADD for clarity: "the respective percentages of equity that the owner and the council originally agreed will remain the same on resale in order to maintain affordability for future owners and an equitable return for the owner."	
		Para 46	<p>Draft SPD refers to the VBC guidance note (September 2016) and these comments relate to that document (which should be formally part of the consultation process.</p> <p>We support the method for calculating the VBC in the Guidance Note. However, we are confused by the second bullet point on page 2 of the Guidance Note which states:</p> <p>"To qualify as 'vacant', applicants will need to show that the building has not been in continuous use within the preceding year from the day the planning application is validated" (my emphasis). This is very confusing. It is not at all clear what continuous use might mean in practical terms. Is one week not in "continuous" use satisfactory or does it have to be longer. Taken to it's extreme this could mean that one day's vacancy during the preceding year satisfies this criterion which I am sure is not the intention of the Council.</p> <p>There is no reason to accept the CIL definition of vacancy as applying as there are different objectives that apply for the purposes of Vacant building credit. Therefore, the only criterion that should apply should be that the buildings are vacant at the time of the validation of the planning application and that the vacancy has not occurred for the sole purposes of redevelopment.</p> <p>By way of an example, a police station that is vacated for operational purposes may be vacated immediately prior to a planning application. The police station would still have been made vacant whether the site were to be redeveloped or not. To artificially impose a time period that the buildings are to remain vacant imposes unnecessary delays to the planning process.</p>	Noted, CC will consider reviewing the VBC guide
		Para 54-59	This section does not apply to the development of retirement housing. This confirms that the provision of affordable housing on sites where retirement housing is being provided should always be by way of an off site commuted formula. This position has been accepted recently on retirement schemes in, inter alia, Newquay, Penzance and Truro. This is especially the case as the Council can generally support no more than 15% of the affordable mix as flats.	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 68	<p>While we would generally agree with the expectations set out here we would want the following points clarified: Economic Viability Assessments should use inputs based on generic and industry accepted standards wherever possible;</p> <p>As far as the land value is concerned it is not clear what the vague terms “realistic” and “sound” mean in practice. I think that the council should be referring here to a benchmark land value which should be based upon the principles set out in planning practice being Existing Use Value plus a landowner’s premium or a realistic alternative use value that satisfies the council’s planning objectives. This should then negate the need to itemise the issues in the second set of bullet points in this paragraph.</p> <p>While we accept the NPPF is expecting viability assessments to be made publically available there may be circumstances where some issues surrounding an assessment are commercially sensitive. This may be particularly the case where land ownership details and values may form the basis of an existing use value. This could disincentives land owners from bringing sites forward. This paragraph should acknowledge, therefore, that there may be instances where certain elements of a viability assessment may be sensitive.</p>	<p>Noted, however CC considers this an appropriate approach</p> <p>Noted, however the NPPF requires viability assessments to be made available</p>
		Para 70	<p>While we acknowledge that review mechanisms may be relevant these should be restricted to seeking to review a viability assessment where development has not reached a certain stage. Clearly, it is in everyone’s interest to ensure that schemes are developed as diligently as possible following the receipt of a planning permission. However there are certain circumstances where development is not able to proceed especially where economic conditions become unfavourable and it is not possible to meet the full affordable housing requirements and to maintain a viable development.</p> <p>Therefore, we support the possibility of post implementation reviews that are undertaken on the same basis using the same parameters and assumptions as the original viability assessment. This should not only apply to cases of “improvement(s) in market conditions” but also where economic conditions have become unfavourable.</p> <p>Requirements for “different” review mechanisms only serve to create financial uncertainty for retirement housing developers and their funders thereby making the delivery of retirement and Extra Care housing even more difficult in locations such as Cornwall</p>	Noted
		Para 71-73	It is unacceptable to impose conditions on a developer based upon the outcome of a viability assessment. Viability assessments should be scrutinised on behalf of the council by a suitably experienced and/or qualified	Noted, however this provides

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>individual or organisation. It is not for the Council to decide whether they will or not proceed based upon the result of that assessment. The decision a developer takes to proceed can be based upon a number of different factors and the threshold to proceed may be based on different criteria than return as a proportion of gross development value (Internal Rate of Return, Return on Capital Employed, Turnover etc.).</p> <p>It must also be remembered that viability assessments will use generic inputs and assessments and test the ability of a scheme to come forward for development based on industry accepted norms and generic inputs. It would be unfair and perverse to penalise a developer for being more efficient than average. Planning permissions run with the land and are not confined to an individual which is why generic, industry accepted assumptions are used. These paragraphs should, therefore, be omitted.</p>	guidance on NPPF requirement for 'deliverable sites'
		Off-site contribution tariff	We support Cornwall's acceptance that in certain circumstances an off site contribution is acceptable. The bullet points are acceptable but my clients would wish the SPD to acknowledge that it is not possible to provide affordable housing within single core apartment developments for retirement housing to be developed with any form of affordable housing within the block.	Noted
		Para 74-80	<p>The SPD is correct in saying that an off-site contribution should be of a "broadly equivalent value to the cost of providing on site affordable housing". The rest of this section then proceeds to propose a 'tariff' that DOES NOT represent a broadly equivalent value for specific schemes. I have significant issues with the method and even the principles proposed and the following comments need to be understood and taken into account.</p> <p>1. The principle The Council propose that the commuted sum should be based on the "difference between the open market value of a dwelling and the price that a Registered Provider would pay for the dwelling if it was provided on site. This is NOT the cost to the developer. Values cannot be taken in isolation to the costs of provision including the full cash flow and other costs. Therefore the proposal in paragraph 74 grossly overestimates the true cost of affordable housing to a developer. This is why a residual and value appraisal is undertaken to establish the on-site contribution and should also be used to calculate the off-site contribution.</p> <p>2. The Tariff Using a simplified tariff may give the impression of equity, fairness and transparency. In actuality, it produces a catch all figure that does not represent the cost of affordable housing on individual sites. Each scheme should be assessed individually and even where a commuted sum is involved the values should be assessed against specific costs assessments for each site.</p>	Noted, however this is considered to be an appropriate method as set out in the SPD

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>I am particularly worried by the assertion in paragraph 77 which suggests using general values per dwelling. This is clearly inequitable and while it may favour some developments, it is likely to be unfair on developers of smaller, higher density, sites.</p> <p>3. The solution</p> <p>Commuted sums should be calculated on the basis of the equivalence principle which the Council appear to support. The developer subsidy for off site provision should equate to the subsidy that would have been provided had the affordable housing been delivered on site. The calculation of the developer subsidy should reflect scheme development costs and values and equate to the difference in the residual value of a scheme unencumbered with affordable housing and one with affordable housing, taking account of realistic expectations of land value.</p> <p>This is a principle used in a number of other local authority areas. Wokingham, for example, use the following within their SPD on affordable housing (extract):</p> <p><i>We have pointed out that the developer subsidy relates to the implications for the land use of a particular site. The developer subsidy is established by looking at the difference in residual land value between the development without an encumbrance (in this case the encumbrance is the imposition of affordable housing) and the residual land value with the encumbrance. The simple formula for developer subsidy is thus:</i></p> <p>DEVELOPER SUBSIDY FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING</p> <p>=</p> <p>RESIDUAL VALUE OF DEVELOPMENT UNENCUMBERED BY AFFORDABLE HOUSING</p> <p>LESS</p> <p>RESIDUAL VALUE OF DEVELOPMENT ENCUMBERED BY AFFORDABLE HOUSING</p> <p>Wokingham then suggest using a matrix where site specific values and costs can be input. This produces a contribution that reflects the subsidy that would have been provided and establishes the maximum developer subsidy for the specific schemes that come forward. This also negates the need for the Council to keep their cost matrix (paragraph 79) up to date. The LHA rates can be used to establish affordable housing values although the encumbered schemes should use a policy compliant mix of affordable rent and intermediate affordable housing.</p>	
		Para 101	<p>We are pleased to note that there is an acknowledgement of the need for older persons dwellings. Our clients provide a range of specialist older persons accommodation and the challenges to develop this mean that it is very difficult to make many sites “work” financially. It is important therefore, that planning authorities are</p>	<p>Noted, the SPD does not set new policy but provides</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			flexible in their approach to securing infrastructure and affordable housing. Where affordable housing is a requirement this should be through an off-site contribution in order to ensure viability of schemes coming forward. This is acknowledged in paragraph 108. In the light of this it is surprising and disappointing the council do not set a more realistic affordable housing target seeing as none of the schemes that have recently come forward for retirement housing in the region have met the full requirement for affordable housing because of viability reasons.	guidance on policies in the LP
		Appendix 2	We understand the need to fund council activities in the light of challenging financial times. Two issues must be borne in mind: 1. If the enabling fees are to be charged it must be remembered that this will have to be taken into account in the viability assessment as an additional cost; 2. Developers must expect performance targets to be met. In other words, the assessment of viability and affordable housing statements must be undertaken diligently and timely so that developments are not unduly delayed.	Noted
		Para 108 & 130	Paragraph 130 sets out a position that Extra Care Housing falls within Use Class C3 and paragraph 108 asserts that the provision of extra care housing is subject to affordable housing requirements presumably on the basis of the view that it falls within Use Class C3. This approach is too simplistic and entirely erroneous It is well established that Extra Care Housing can fall within both Class C2 and Class C3 dependent on the care facilities and accommodation that it provides. Good points of reference in this regard are the RTPi Good Practice Note No8 and the Housing Lin note Extra Care Housing What is it in 2015, both of which provide guidance on how individual schemes should be assessed in this regard. There is useful appeal precedent in this regard too. A recent example being Appeal Decision 3177340 dated 22nd January 2018. Extra Care Units in Sidmouth. This also highlights a common misunderstanding that self-contained dwellings (as themselves required by Paragraph 116 of the SPD must fall within Class C3. Through the very existence of guidance in this regard, patently that is not the case Indeed many of the requirements set out at Paragraphs 109 and 114 , through the application of appeal precedent/guidance and good practice guidance point to such developments as falling within Use Class C2 The assertions at paragraph 108 and 130 must therefore be amended to provide flexibility for individual assessment of proposals in this regard Reference at Para 109 to providing smart technologies and a mix of tenures in accordance with the Community Based Support and Housing Commissioning Framework should be deleted as this is a local framework and may prevent other forms of beneficial extra care housing from coming forward.	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
34	Saltash NDP Steering Group	Para 6	How will demand be identified?	Noted, demand is monitored and evidenced
		Para 7	How will viability be determined?	Noted, NPPF requirement for viability assessments to be publically available
		Para 10	What does “secured in perpetuity” mean in law and how will compliance be enforced in the event of legal challenge	Noted, CC will consider the wording in the SPD to ensure compliance
		Para 14	What certain sites, how are they defined and identified	Noted, sites are considered on a case-by-case basis
		Para 15	How will rents be legally fixed in perpetuity?	Noted, CC will consider the wording in the SPD to ensure compliance
		Para 19	What standard will be identified and enforced to ensure all credible opportunities have been exhausted?	Noted
		Para 23	In the phrase “exists for purchasers can purchase additional” “can” should read “to”.	Agree, amend as suggested
		Para 24	What does “secured in perpetuity” mean in law and how will compliance be enforced against legal challenge.	Noted, CC will consider the wording in the SPD to ensure compliance
		Para 26	How will continued local people ownership” be maintained against legal challenge?	Noted, this is a policy requirement
		Para 30	There is apparently significant demand for single occupant property in Saltash. This is assumed to include flats as the most efficient way of meeting that demand	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 38	This paragraph, as written, appears to allow developers to build dwellings in exception sites which occupiers can then sell on as normal dwellings with only minimal financial penalty bypassing any long term planning control of local areas near existing towns and villages.	Noted, this is Government policy
		Para 52	There should be a mechanism to define “cluster demand” before planning permission is given, including consideration of existing permissions in the area where construction has not yet started to prevent construction above the actual local demand bypassing any existing control of local areas near existing towns and villages.	Noted
		Para 54	As well as considering the existing spread of houses the current local demand should also be considered. In some areas the current local demand profile reflects that previous construction does not reflect current demand	Noted
		Para 57	In some areas the number of open market flats available reflects profitability rather than local need. Is there (or should there be) a planning mechanism allowing the build options to be identified and “put on hold until required” at the initial planning stage?	Noted, however this mechanism is not in place
		Para 64	This phrase should identify that the “all” reflects the phrasing in the paragraphs below	Agree, consider amending the text
		Para 84	Existing built up areas	Agree, consider amending the text
		Para 96	This provision is welcomed (see 52 above)	Noted
		Para 99	How will rents be “fixed in perpetuity”?	Noted, CC will consider the wording in the SPD to ensure compliance
		Para 103	This policy seems a good idea but recent evidence suggests that as local hospitals are closing and bed blocking becomes a major issue together with problems with “at home support” beds need to be provided somewhere by someone. Paragraphs below seem to reflect this.	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
35		Para 110	HAPPI should be identified here as its first appearance (it is later).	Agree, add reference to HAPPI principles
		Para 120	Other areas (Attleborough in Norfolk as an example) have developments which have bungalows, houses, serviced flats, old people's home and a supermarket closely grouped together	Noted
		Para 145	How will "affordable" houses be secured in perpetuity? How will main residence rules be defined and maintained?	Noted, CC will consider the wording in the SPD to ensure compliance
	St Ives Town Council	Para 11	<u>Rented homes owned or managed as affordable housing</u> Rented homes owned or managed as affordable housing is are expected to be secured as affordable housing in perpetuity.....	Noted, amend as suggested
		Para 16	<u>Intermediate rented housing</u> ability to be more flexible with intermediate rent, such that it may be agreed anywhere above social rent levels, and but within the maximum 80% of Open Market Rental Value.....	Noted, amend as suggested
		Para 23	In many cases, the option exists for purchasers can purchase to buy additional equity in the property when they can afford to.....	Noted, amend to read 'to...'
		Para 25	Shared ownership homes difficulties associated with securing a mortgage on a shared ownership lease for a leasehold flat	Noted, amend
		Para 30	encourage discounted market sale value homes discount market sale value flats	Noted
		Para 33	The Council will support provision of an element of discounted market sale value housing.....	Noted
		Para 45	<u>Planning Obligation Thresholds</u> Planning obligations are used to ensure that affordable housing is provided and (where possible) retained in perpetuity. This is a potential loophole. For what reasons would it be accepted that it is not possible?	Noted, not all affordable housing products can be secured in perpetuity

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 47	<p><u>Rounding up the affordable housing provision</u></p> <p>a 'fraction' of a unit, this should be provided as a proportional off-site contribution. For example, a scheme that should provide 8.7 affordable homes will provide 8 homes on-site, with 70% of the per unit off-site affordable housing tariff. Perhaps this should read - 'with the remaining 0.7 of a unit providing an offsite contribution of 70%.</p>	Agree, amend as suggested
		Para 55-57	<p>The Council encourages developers can help maximise the_ value of affordable homes...</p> <p>to help meet the Local Plan requirement to meet the needs of an ageing or less-mobile population.</p> <p>On sites of 10 or more affordable homes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One and a half bedroom homes which have an additional modest room for use as an office or ancillary accommodation 	Agree, amend as suggested
		Para 65	<p>On smaller schemes, typically no more than 50% of the open market housing is to be occupied or transferred prior to the equivalent proportion of the affordable homes are being ready for occupation.</p> <p>Viability Assessments</p>	Agree, amend as suggested
		Para 67-68	<p>The revised NPPF is clear that where proposals for development accord with all the relevant policies in an up-to-date development (like the Cornwall Local Plan), no viability assessment</p> <p>The following guidance sets out our expectations for Economic Viability Assessments: On all sites: The the following costs should be taken into account (deducted) when defining land value:</p>	Agree, amend as suggested
		Para 75	<p>There are three different tariffs for the three different Local Housing Allowance (LHA) areas in Cornwall: Kernow West: £102,000 North Cornwall and Devon Borders: £102,000 Plymouth: £92,000</p> <p>This information is repeated in paragraph 80 but with different wording - 'The amount of off-site contribution payable per dwelling, in each of the three Local Housing Allowance areas is:'</p>	Noted, ensure consistent wording

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Para 86	Policy 9 is clear that market housing must not represent more than 50% of the homes or 50% of the land take To comply with Policy 9 no more than 50% of the homes proposed should be market housing and the land take associated with the market housing should not exceed 50% of the land, after land devoted to infrastructure and services are excluded from the equation.	Noted
		Para 99	Proposals for Build to Rent may be supported where the proposed scheme will deliver homes at affordable rent (including any service charges) in perpetuity.....	Noted
		Para 103	The Council's Community Based Support and Housing Commissioning Framework This means that care homes may be becoming become become a less prevalent but more intensive and specialised offer.....	Noted, amend as suggested
		Para 126	<u>Housing without care</u> Well-designed housing intended for occupation by older people is encouraged. This can be suitable housing in the right areas that meets the needs of older or disabled people and is designated via a local lettings plan to older people.... <i>Is it relevant / feasible to include a reference to 'over 55's' retirement apartments ? (This designation is possibly used by developers as a means of achieving planning permission for developments which might otherwise be refused). Residents of such accommodation may require visits from carers as they become less independent. The apartments would therefore need to be accessible and adaptable, to enable residents to remain in their home for longer.</i>	Agree, consider adding reference to over 55
		Para 131	Should this be in the case, the scheme will be referred on to the Affordable Housing Team for its comments on the application.....	Noted, amend as suggested
		Para 143	The Council considers that self-build can be an affordable housing product increase the supply of self-build plots in the market at less than market value for people who meet the established local connection criteria to purchase	Noted, consider suggestion
		Para 144	<u>Provision of self-build as part of the affordable housing requirement</u> Proposals for affordable self-build homes as part of the affordable housing..... <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each affordable home will be subject to the same affordability, eligibility and local connection criteria as would a developer-built affordable home (this will usually be controlled via a S106 legal obligation setting out any provisions controlling the future occupancy and affordability of the dwellings), and it will either : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> remain affordable in perpetuity 	Noted, consider suggestion

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>o or any receipts will be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision or refunded back to the Council;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council is satisfied with a reasonable degree of certainty that the scheme is deliverable and viable and that there is a clear delivery mechanism in place; • There is clear evidence of housing need. It must be demonstrated that there are sufficient local people in housing need <p>'The Council is satisfied....' needs to be moved to a separate bullet point as shown above.</p>	
		Para 146-147	<p>Community-led self-build exception sites</p> <p>Cornwall Council wishes to support the provision of small scale community-led self-build Any monies raised through the sale of the plots would be recycled into other affordable self-build schemes.</p> <p>Any such sites would be well related to the physical form of the settlement and appropriate in scale, character and appearance and would need to meet all of the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small scale self-build schemes, supported by the community, of up to 6 plots (minimum of 2); • In smaller villages and hamlets smaller sites of only 2 or 3 homes would only usually be appropriate • The allocated Cornwall Council plots must be serviced, readily accessible and transferred to the Council within [an agreed period of time or before work commences on any of the market plots] of outline permission being granted transfer will not be contingent on the sale of any market plots; <p>The sentence in red needs to be rephrased, for example:</p> <p>.... transferred to the Council within an agreed period after outline permission has been granted or before work commences on any of the market plots ; transfer will not be contingent</p>	Noted, amend as suggested
36	Mrs L Kasman	Part 2 on Housing	<p>I think it would be a good idea to buy up properties to house people as recently suggested. But with new ones all properties should be fitted with solar panels as there is too much building going on ruining Cornwall and mostly not for locals and too expensive, also wrong sites i.e. Hayle's North Quay where developer wants to build hundreds of homes it already has sewerage problem. Also land known to be subject to flooding being built on and sewerage can't cope. There are too many flats half empty. This is going on all over Cornwall. Cheaper homes need to be built on less conventional lines like some places in Europe. Developers should be made to build infrastructure before anything else so they can't get out of it later. The care I had when I came out of hospital re Council Cares was wonderful last March, all lovely ladies. Also 2015 when Sid had major</p>	Noted, policies in the adopted LP address renewable energy, flooding, transport etc.

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			surgery all lovely ladies no well done with that. But the people on end of phone at Cornwall Council don't know anything regards this document etc.	
37	Mr D J Pollard	68 Economic Viability Assessments Rural Exceptions Sites	The formula of £10,000 per plot or no more than 10 times the agricultural value at the time might not work for the plan period on a rising agricultural land price. The plan runs until 2030, it easily possibly longer plans are always protracted. Build cost, infrastructure, materials, professional fees are all variables in housing. The Council will still charge CIL at the same rate. Tax implications and requirements are the same. You cannot put land for certain buildings criteria into a fixed formula to control land values when all other costs are variable, what is the formula based on? Why isn't it calculated on average affordable land price if all affordable Supplies could reduce coming forward being no advantage to any parties in the plan timeframe.	Noted, the SPD provides flexible guidance stating 'typically...'
		74 Off-site contribution tariff	I disagree with off-site contribution tariffs especially in band building zones. This may not have been its original aims. But it will allow a get out clause. Terms such as broadly equivalent cost to the developer are used. The higher band valuations of bands 1 and 2 will offload to windfall sites in bands 4 and 5. The county picking up similar house numbers to hit targets and CIL. This will cause infrastructure, social and political issues long term. It totally defeats the aim of this document and more importantly the Local Plan. The Local Plan aims to distribute, stabilize and supply all types of housing to all areas and provide services.	Noted, however this is considered an appropriate approach
38	Mr E W Simpson – Chairman of Residents Group		I find the draft housing supplementary planning document of Cornwall Council to be the most destructive policy this Council has ever produced. I would urge all Cornwall Council Members to call a 'halt' before the damage done becomes irreversible. The 'so-called' housing need has not been properly established – your figures are expressions of interest and not genuine need. The Council has failed to 'join the dots' 52,000 new houses = about 130,000 people. Employment – where are the jobs to support this? Health – Our health service cannot cope now! How will it cope by 2030! Education – Where are all the additional school places? Transport – Our public transport is already very poor – where is the new infrastructure? Wildlife – You have little respect or regard for our wildlife in the policy. Communities – We like our villages – stop destroying them!	Noted, the LP policies adopted in 2016 sets out the level of new homes required and other policies guide development
39	Luxulyan Parish Council	Paragraph 8	8. Delete "(where relevant)". Neighbourhood Development Plans that have been approved at referendum after due process that includes oversight by Cornwall Council are always relevant and become planning policy.	Noted, not all areas have a NDP

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Paragraph 50-53	<p>50 – 53. The “Cluster Parish Approach” is anti – democratic, giving too much power to the local planning authority and its case officers. It gives in to pressure from developers. A developer would site housing need in neighbourhood parishes as evidence for a development of increased size. The only person to decide whether this is appropriate would be the case officer.</p> <p>The phrase in Para 53 “will typically require community support” is very weak and inadequate.</p> <p>If the Cluster Parish Approach were to be considered, Para 53 must read: “This is known as the cluster approach. The primary parish and especially the neighbouring parishes whose housing need is being considered shall be consulted and must support the development for it to be considered.”</p>	Noted
		Paragraph 60	Inspections for affordable homes should be more frequent during the building stage so that quality is ensured.	Noted, however this is not considered to be an issue for the SPD
		Paragraph Concerns, changes and reasons/ evidence	<p>The development in Luxulyan, C2/08/01791 (Proposed residential development of 13 Affordable and 6 speculative houses at Beswetherick Field) is a case in point. Poor quality construction materials were used and the project was abandoned by the developer. It is incomplete and there is no street lighting. The street has not been accepted by Highways. Purchasers and renters of affordable homes must be protected from sub-standard work and abandoned projects.</p> <p>APP/D0840/w/16/3145679 and APP/D0840/S/16/3143592 show what a disaster this affordable housing project was</p>	Noted
		Paragraph 67	67. Reference should also be made here to local Neighbourhood Development Plans. A Neighbourhood Development Plan attains the same legal status as the Local Plan once it has been approved at a referendum. The Government thinks that the local community should have a greater say in shaping the way their local area, the parish develops. This idea forms a key part of the Localism Act (2011).	Noted, however NPPF specifically relates to LP viability
		Paragraph 96	<p>96. A shorter timescale for development, especially of affordable housing, should be imposed across the board.</p> <p>Regarding affordable housing, a project completion date should also be imposed. The approved housing which has not yet started should be taken into consideration for all subsequent planning applications.</p>	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		General Considerations	Cornwall Council must resist the temptation to redefine “local” as county-wide. There is pressure from developers and financial pressure within the Local Planning Authority that tries to stifle the voice of parishioners and parish councils because it makes decision-making more complicated, time-consuming and costly. When it comes to development, “local” consultation does not mean the case officer. This is not democracy and is not in keeping with the Localism Act. Local consultation means listening to and giving weight to local parish opinion, especially that of the elected parish and town councils, particularly giving weight to the democratically constructed, reviewed and ratified Neighbourhood Development Plans.	Noted
40	Livewest		<p>In Perpetuity</p> <p>We note that the SPD makes reference to affordable homes for sale being provided in perpetuity. This can cause a number of issues for purchasers when attempting to secure mortgages at competitive loan rates, and is likely to create barriers to affordable home ownership in Cornwall. This policy is not imposed by the Local Plan, and a Supplementary Planning Document should not seek to introduce new requirements to existing policy.</p> <p>In Designated Protected Areas we have previously discussed with the council that Shared Owners need to be able to staircase to 100% in Designated Protected Areas without the obligation on the freeholder to repurchase. There are provisions agreed with Homes England that allows this to take place where grant funding is provided to a scheme.</p> <p>We would suggest that paragraph 24 is reworded so that the text after ‘elsewhere’ is deleted and replaced with: ‘Where there is a requirement for such homes to be restricted as affordable homes in perpetuity, for example on exception sites, the lease can either restrict the maximum share to be owned to 80% or allow the Registered Provider the ability to sell up to 100% but with provisions to re-purchase the property’.</p> <p><u>Residential Care</u></p> <p>We are looking to remodel our existing housing stock for elderly people, and in almost all cases it will not be appropriate to change the provision to Extra Care. The text in paragraphs 130 and 131 implies that C3 Extra Care is likely to be required instead. We suggest that the SPD should allow for provision of traditional C2 Residential Care facilities as well as C3 to ensure a broad range of accommodation for older people.</p> <p>A representation will also be submitted by Tetlow King who have reviewed the document on behalf of the Planning Consortium for South West Registered Providers of which Livewest is a member.</p>	<p>Noted, consideration will be given to the wording in the SPD to ensure compliance</p> <p>Noted, consider merging para 130 and 131 to provide clarity</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
41	St Newlyn East Parish Council		<p>St. Newlyn East Parish Council welcomes the statements made in the Foreword but is concerned that what is regarded as affordable by housing providers is not actually affordable to a large proportion of families in Cornwall who are in housing need.</p> <p>In the comments below, we mention only those areas where we have concerns as to the effect of the proposals.</p> <p>Revised NPPF: Building the right number of homes in the right places would be a welcome change. Doubling the number of dwellings in settlements with no or few amenities should not be acceptable. Greater attention should be paid to the views of Parish Councils and where the number of proposed dwellings exceeds local need, there should be more consultation with Parish Councils and better and clearer information as to why developments are acceptable when local residents have strong opinions to the contrary.</p> <p>Local Plan - Strategic Policies : In regard to managing viability, closer attention needs to be given to establishing viability prior to granting planning permission and it should be made clear to developers that claims that a scheme is no longer viable due to the affordable quota will only be accepted in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Affordable Rented Housing: This is a misnomer as while not all properties may require as much as 80% of market rent, many families still cannot afford the so-called "affordable" rents. Those who can only just afford the rent then have no opportunity to save for a deposit in order to buy; they are condemned to live permanently in rental properties. The same argument is valid for intermediate rented housing. Apart from this, the proposals for this type of housing and its continued use as affordable are sensible.</p> <p>Shared Ownership and Discounted : Can we be certain that the actions and provisions set out under these headings will be monitored and checked and, if so, who will do this? Stating that market sale one bedroom flats are unlikely to be supported would remove the possibility of single people and childless couples getting a foot on the housing ladder by this means. More than encouragement is needed to persuade applicants to seek pre-application advice for all types of development.</p> <p>Starter Homes : Yet again, the minimum of 20% below open market value is still not sufficient for many families in Cornwall.</p> <p>Cluster Parish Approach : We trust that in situations where a development is technically in one parish but is actually more closely related to a settlement in a neighbouring parish, that there will be joint consultation with</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agree, the Council seeks to encourage pre-application discussions</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>the two parishes and a fair method found of distributing the parish precept charged to these properties so that residents using the amenities provided by one parish are not paying their share of the precept to another parish where they do not use any of its amenities.</p> <p>Affordable Housing Design : We would suggest that the Council should require developers to consult with the Affordable Housing Team rather than merely encourage.</p> <p>Phasing : The definition of smaller and larger schemes should not be applied to all schemes whether urban or rural. In a small settlement, a scheme below 25 units may well be considered a large scheme. Would it not be better to have this definition as a percentage of existing dwellings for smaller settlements outside towns?</p> <p>Off-site Contributions : If developers were required to have a pre-application discussion, surely they would then be informed as to what was acceptable for their proposed site. This should reduce the need for off-site contribution.</p> <p>Extra Care Housing : Again, we would suggest that consulting the Adult Commissioning and Transportation and the Affordable Housing Teams should be a requirement, not a recommendation.</p> <p>In conclusion, our view is that no supplementary planning proposals are sustainable unless improvements to infrastructure are made at the same time as carrying out development. There is a need to provide for additional demands for education, transport links, sewage disposal, water and electricity supplies, health services and social services.</p>	<p>Noted, however this is Government policy</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agree, consider text to ensure that any development is proportionate</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, consultation arrangement are set out in the adopted SCI</p>
42	St Dennis Parish Council	50.	<p>Affordable Housing and what is considered affordable is out of the reach to most residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capped limits for areas like St Dennis - Shared ownership and pitfalls - Capped limits for rental properties - The cluster approach, how could it be ensured that this scheme would not be used for people from, outside the area with higher priority housing requirements - Would like to see rental housing capped for local residents, - Rent matching Local wages, not national 	<p>Agree, the SPD aims to encourage a range of affordable housing products</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of suitable properties for elderly/disabled - A guarantee that the cluster approach remains for local residents - 	
43	St Mewan Parish Council	Forward	We agree with the principle contained here but would suggest that local Neighbourhood Development Plans should also be referenced as a key part of the Planning process.	Noted, NDPs are referenced in the SPD
		Cornwall Local Plan – Strategic Policies 6 8	<p>Conflicts with the adopted Cornwall Local Plan Document Policy No 9</p> <p>Reads “Whilst these policies specifically relate to housing, the Local Plan must be read as a whole, including any Development Plan Document and Neighbourhood Plan (where relevant)”. Adopted Neighbourhood Development plans are always relevant and must be consulted wherever planning applications are being considered. Improved linkage for pre-application and planning applications to adopted NDPs is required to ensure that relevant local NDPs are referenced by officers (this is currently not the case).</p>	<p>Para 6 sets out the LP policies</p> <p>Noted, made NDPs are part of the policy framework in planning decisions</p>
		Cluster Parish Approach 52/53	<p>St Mewan Parish Council strongly objects to this approach. Through the development of NDPs (adopted), local residents want affordable housing for local people. This proposal allows for a much wider distribution of affordable housing, to other parishes and even other Counties which is totally unacceptable. Any development should relate to the identified need in the specific parish/village to avoid sporadic and unnecessary development into the rural areas of predominately countryside.</p> <p>The Cluster Parish Approach has been proven NOT to be enforceable and refer in the case of: England and Wales High Court of Decisions Planning Court BETWEEN Old Hunstanton Parish Council (Claimant) v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, Hastoe Housing Association Ltd, Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council (Defendants).</p>	Noted, the SPD identifies that new homes are made available for households with a local connection
		Viability Assessments	Reference should also be made here to local Neighbourhood Development Plans. A neighbourhood plan attains the same legal status as the Local Plan once it has been approved at a referendum. The Government thinks that the local community should have a greater say in shaping the way their local area, the parish develops. This idea forms a key part of the Localism Act (2011).	Noted, to avoid repetition NDPs are referred to in para 8 as part of the policy framework
		Planning Applications 91	<p>Pre-applications: - Parish and Town Councils should be considered as a consultee in pre-application advice and there needs to be a fundamental principle in allowing parish and town councils, as a corporate body to be consulted in confidential pre-applications to ensure openness, transparency and local democracy.</p> <p>A need for Affordable housing in the village/parish must be proven and the Neighbourhood Development Plan, including CISI reports must be taken into consideration when advice is given as it can create difficulties when the Planning Officer does not refer to the adopted Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Noted, however this is not the remit of the SPD

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		Glossary Housing Needs Survey	The draft document conflicts with the practice currently carried out by the Affordable Housing Team in Cornwall Council. Presently, housing need surveys are only carried out online and can include respondents from anywhere. We welcome the draft proposal of a standard paper form delivered to all registered addresses within the parish as this is vital to determine the real local need.	Noted, consideration will be given to ensure accurate information is provided in SPD
		General Feedback	Local residents are not engaged in this process and as such the Parish Councils form a vital feedback mechanism. Local residents want to see investments in infrastructure before major developments – roads, hospitals, schools, doctors, dentists, care homes etc etc.	Noted, other policies in the adopted LP address transport, infrastructure etc.
44	Stephens Scown LLP	89/Glossary	<p>In light of recent concerns and the direction of travel with some Neighbourhood Development Plans the SPD is a good opportunity to add some guidance to what the Council considers amounts to 'local need'. Some suggested text is put forward below:-</p> <p>"Local Need" is a matter of planning judgment for the decision maker; it is not limited to the needs of the settlement in which the development is to take place, nor the parish in which that settlement is located, but can extend to the needs of other rural settlements and communities nearby".</p>	Noted, consider a definition of local need in the glossary
45	Enterprise Charlamand Ltd		<p>1. There is little point in responding to the Draft in the manner requested, insofar as its format is symptomatic of the "box-ticking" and "template-completion" methodology which passes for "planning" in these enlightened (?) days.</p> <p>1.1 There is more than a whiff of "Alice-in-Wonderland" in the compilation of the Draft and one suspects it was put together at the "Tea Party" with Humpty Dumpty as the collator!</p> <p>1.2 Consequently, it is difficult to appreciate that the Draft is a framework for planning but rather more as a text to 'prop-up' a flawed method of the provision of "affordable" (or 'social') housing. Appendices 1,2 and 3 demonstrate that the Draft will be a blueprint for the employment of "planners".</p> <p>1.3 to earn credence as a planning framework, the Draft should – instead – be looking at other ways whereby 'social-housing' can be provided; such as the one outlined in Annex 1. This is what "planning" and "planners" is/are all about – but, seemingly, absent in the Cornwall office. As demonstrated, "planning" has been demoted to proving an untenable modus operandi.</p>	<p>Noted, policies in the LP are extant</p> <p>SPD aims to provide guidance on the implementation of LP policies in relation to housing.</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>1.4 Additionally, it is disturbing to learn that whatever kind of policy (sic) emerges from the consultation, it will form part of the Local Plan until 2030! A most unwise proposition as the whole contemporary concept of “affordable-housing” – and its ‘products’ is, already, unfit-for-purpose and not to be held for the next 12 years! Common-sense dictates that the concept will be doomed to oblivion within the next 4 years.</p> <p>2. Before commenting at length on the policy document, it is important to identify a single, incontestable FACT (i) and its corollary (ii) that – (i) as far as the overall provision of housing-units is concerned, there is far more NEED for ‘social housing’ than ‘private housing’ and (ii) given this incontrovertible fact, any solution to a social-housing problem which must rely upon private endeavour, can only be regarded as an aberration of common-sense!</p> <p>2.1 Concomitantly then – in view of present circumstances – the notion of an “affordable-housing-led” policy is nonsense and should be abandoned forthwith!</p> <p>2.2 In practical terms, a successful solution to the UK’s housing problems should be for the entire housing programme to be based upon “affordability” with a ‘percentage element’ contained therein for “unaffordable housing” – either for rent or ownership! This proposal is based upon the present general assumption that both ‘private’ and ‘social’ housing is undertaken by the ‘volume-house-building-industry;</p> <p>Otherwise known as the “brinks-and-motorbrigade”!</p> <p>2.3 However, this suggestion is already ‘dead-in-the-water’ for 2 reasons (i) it would upset the likes of the 5 directors of Persimmon Ltd, who have recently plundered the company to the tune of £350m for salaries, fees, perks etc and (ii) For the suggestion to be carried forward into practise would require enormous financial commitment from both Government and local authority sources- neither of whom have pockets that deep! Especially Cornwall Council!</p> <p>3. The term “affordable housing” was coined by Mayor Ken Livingstone in 2004 and was intended as a “bash-the-capitalist-housebuilders’ observation. His notion that 50% of any housing project should be ‘affordable’ was based upon a study, which he had commissioned, that 50% was achievable with vastly increased public subsidy!</p> <p>3.1 Since then, our “planners” at national and local levels have striven to give “affordable housing” a degree of respectability by introducing a ‘Pandora’s box’ full of gimmicks – known as “products” – to persuade themselves that “affordability” is, indeed, the way to housing salvation!</p>	

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>3.2 Unhappily, Livingstone's '50% has never been achieved; and never will be in context of the UK's present financial problems! Set to worsen after 'Brexit'!</p> <p>3.3 To give some credibility to the foregoing criticism it is worth quoting a few random comments taken from recent surveys across the country –</p> <p>(i) 70% of Council's rely substantially on the planning system to meet their local affordable housing needs BUT only 2% of the Councils can report that their local affordable-housing needs are met!</p> <p>(ii) Only one-fifth of all Councils agree that the NPPF definition of "affordable-housing will meet their need for affordable-housing.</p> <p>(iii) The planning system is not delivering the level of affordable-housing we need</p> <p>(iv) There has been a drastic decline in the numbers of affordable-housing being secured through the planning system.</p> <p>(v) The planning system is not delivering sufficient amounts of genuinely affordable-housing.</p> <p>(vi) We are experiencing a considerable loss of 'affordable-housing contributions'.</p> <p>3.4 If a system is operating in a satisfactory manner, why is there all this doubt and dissatisfaction? Perhaps they stem from 2 rather telling statements-</p> <p>(i) "There is no duty upon LPA's in relation to meeting housing need" (Government source) and</p> <p>(ii) "Importantly, the provision of affordable-houses is not absolute and must be considered on the viability of individual schemes" (Cornwall Council). Hardly ringing endorsements for a successful affordable-housing policy!</p> <p>4. Why then, is Cornwall Council promulgating a distinctly flawed policy with regard to the provision of affordable-housing? Why it is clinging to an unachievable goal of 50%? Why is there no more positive a commitment to the provision of enabling finance?</p> <p>4.1 One cannot escape the conclusions that (i) the Draft Document is nothing more than a "smoke and mirrors" exercise; perhaps (ii) to provide employment for a team of officers into the future? Appendices 1,2 and 3 would appear to suggest so!</p> <p>5. In context that public and private housing systems were amalgamated in order to acquire "affordable-housing" on the cheap and that a flawed planning system was recruited to carry the acquisition programme into effect – appears to spell disaster!</p> <p>5.2 There are less cumbersome and more effective ways of providing "affordable" housing and one is outlined in the paper at Annex 1,</p>	

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>5.3 Perhaps the Council should explore this alternative? Preferably without the involvement of the Service's 'Business Improvement Specialist'!</p> <p>Annex 1 A PROPOSAL FOR A NATIONAL, NON-PROFIT-MAKING, HOUSING AUTHORITY FOR THE PURPOSE OF CREATING A WIDE RANGE OF HOUSING UNITS – FOR RENTAL PURPOSE ONLY: Conditions relative to a modus operandi.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Structured upon co-operative lines, in the style of the Swiss/French 'Habitations a Loyer Modere' and operated as a National Charitable Trust with satellite Trusts on a County basis. 2. To be independent of Government and Local Authority control (except for the purpose of adhering to Statutory regulation) and Private control. 3. To be independent of all party-political influences and pressures. 4. To have a management structure drawn from tenants and occupiers at County level and for the purpose of delegation of representation to the National Board. 5. The Chairmen of County and National Boards to be directly responsible to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government – for reporting purposes only, 6. Existing Housing Associations etc, to be permitted to join with the new Trusts but only upon agreeing to abandon their existing management arrangements including their idiosyncratic remuneration, fees and bonus schemes. 7. For each County Trust to possess powers to "hire and fire" external expertise for the purposes of creating and managing individual housing projects, subject to the approval of the National Board. 8. (i) Principally financed from a National Housing Lottery, but also to attract financial support – or 'support-in-kind' from public or private sources by the issue of long-term bonds paying a 'dividend'. (ii) Operated upon the lines of the Premium Bond Savings Scheme, the "prizes" on offer could be 'free tenancies' of varying lengths; i.e., 6,12,24, 36 and 48 months. A 'sure –fire' way to attract investment! 9. To be free of any VAT imposition or, alternatively, at a low rate of, say, 5%. 10. To be free of any association with the Stock Exchange or extraneous financial institution except for the Bank of England to underwrite the new Authority's trading activities. <p>That the leader of this movement was the London County Council; closely followed by Glasgow, Liverpool and other large urban councils.</p> <p>26. All of these early social housing projects were soundly conceived and soundly constructed and, for their day, of high spatial standards. It is to their credit that many of these housing developments are in great demand, especially those located in city-centres. Known by their generic term "Council housing" these developments were the 'back-bone' of reasonably priced housing accommodation for 60 years from 1900.</p>	

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>27. The disintegration of 'social housing' commenced in the late 1960's with the advent of the "tower block". Erroneously copied from their Continental cousins, this form of development was poorly constructed and quickly became very expensive to manage and maintain; without, ever, achieving the enhanced spatial standards for which they were erected in the first place!</p> <p>28. At this time also, financial cut-backs were beginning to take effect and in an attempt to attract more capital into the social housing market, the "Housing Association" was invented. A short-lived experiment in the provision of reasonably priced accommodation as they, too, became subject to financial strangulation and to fall prey to the insidious machinations of Prime Minister Thatcher and her misplaced reliance upon a "right (sic) to buy" scheme whereby "renters" could become "buyers" for the purpose of securing "a foot upon the housing ladder"!</p> <p>29. When the shortcomings of Thatcher's scheme were- very quickly-realised our "planners"(sic) had to find some other way to provide a solution to resolve an over-worsening shortage of social housing! Witness then, if you please, the entry of "affordable housing" to the field of social housing conflict!</p> <p>30. Originating in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, this expression of intent was a veritable 'Pandora's box' of ridiculous and unworkable proposals ostensibly to resolve a social housing problem. By the time of the 2018 Review of NPPF 2012, the 'box' had opened to reveal a plethora of wondrous proposals; namely</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Private Intermediate renting (ii) Intermediate rented housing (iii) Shared ownership (iv) discounted ownership (v) shared equity (vi) starter homes (vii) rent to buy (viii) buy to rent etc all of which, in one way or another, are profit led! <p>31. The culminating idiocy of these floundering attempts to resolve a national disgrace, was to rely upon the UK's planning(sic) system to "deliver the goods"</p> <p>A classic example of "the blind leading the blind"; or, in modern parlance, a "broken system designated to repair another broken system".</p> <p>Is there a solution and what is its nature?</p> <p>32. The Raynsford Report on Planning 2020 makes an eloquent plea for the UK to "go back to our roots" to redefine its broken planning system! Very much the same approach must be followed to resolve its broken social housing system!</p>	

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>33. The philanthropist-led housing movements of the 18th and 19th centuries always sat happily alongside the private housing sector. Both sectors providing for a distinct market according to an individual's needs and requirements. The individual having the choice of being able to start-off in either or to transfer from one to another! Complete flexibility!</p> <p>34. Disaster came about when our partisan-politicians and misguided administrators decided to combined the two "markets" and to attempt to make the private sector responsible for the social sector to provide social housing "on the cheap" and to employ a dysfunctional planning system to achieve their misguided goals and objectives.</p> <p>35. The concept for the provision of rented accommodation, briefly outlined in paragraphs 1 to 17 – and the 'Footnote – is easily achievable. A framework of sorts already exists, but to make it amenable to the success of rented housing provision, its practitioners must give up their bloated salaries, bonuses and all manner of "perks" and inducements! A democratically organised and operated system for the provision of rented accommodation in the UK is sorely needed. WHEN DO WE START?</p>	
46	Bude Stratton Town Council		Bude-Stratton Town Council are fully supportive of the draft Housing planning document.	Noted
47	St Buryan Parish Council		St Buryan Parish Council has no comment to make on this document because it largely relates to towns and not rural parishes.	Noted
48	Camborne Town Council		Camborne Town Council has no comments to submit on the draft Housing Supplementary Planning document	Noted
49	Camelford Town Council		Camelford Town Council resolved to reply with No Comment	Noted
50	St Erth Parish Council		<p>At its meeting on 6 November, St Erth Parish Council passed the following resolution: "RESOLVED ' that Cornwall Council be informed that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rural exception sites ' that despite Cornwall Council maintaining that the starting point is that all housing on rural exception sites should be affordable, in practice, it almost always just meets the 50% minimum target. The Parish Council requests that this minimum figure is raised so that rural exception sites actually achieve their intended purpose and deliver more affordable housing; 2. Cluster parish approach ' whilst this may, exceptionally, be useful, bearing in mind the recent Crantock case, the Parish Council requests that much clearer and more rigorous criteria (including local opinion) is included in the SPD so that this approach is used only where it is truly appropriate and is acceptable to the community where the houses will be built; and 3. Updating of the Cornwall Local Plan (CLP) ' any updates to the CLP must not undermine Neighbourhood Plan 	Noted, the SPD cannot set new policy but provides guidance on the implementation of policies in the adopted LP

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			policies nor must Neighbourhood Plans be disadvantaged simply because a revised CLP becomes a more 'recent' plan.	
51	St Ewe Parish Council		<p>General Considerations. Cornwall Council must resist the temptation to redefine 'local' as county-wide. There is pressure from developers and financial pressure within the Local Planning Authority that tries to stifle the voice of parishioners and parish councils because it makes decision-making more complicated, time-consuming and costly. When it comes to development, 'local' consultation does not mean the case officer. This is not democracy and is not in keeping with the Localism Act. Local consultation means listening to and giving weight to local parish opinion, especially that of the elected parish & town councils, particularly giving weight to the democratically constructed, reviewed and ratified Neighbourhood Development Plans.</p> <p>Paragraph 8. Delete '(where relevant)'. Neighbourhood Development Plans that have been approved at referendum after due process that includes oversight by Cornwall Council are always relevant and become planning policy.</p> <p>Paragraphs 50 - 53. The 'Cluster Parish Approach' is anti-democratic, giving too much power to the local planning authority and its case officers. It gives in to pressure from developers. A developer would site housing need in neighbouring parishes as evidence for a development of increased size. The only person to decide whether this is appropriate would be the case officer.</p> <p>The phrase in Para 53 'will typically require community support' is very weak and inadequate.</p> <p>If the Cluster Parish Approach were to be considered, Para 53 must read: 'This is known as the cluster approach. The primary parish and especially the neighbouring parishes whose housing need is being considered shall be consulted and must support the development for it to be considered.'</p> <p>Paragraph 60. Inspections for affordable homes should be more frequent during the building stage so that quality is ensured. Inspections for affordable homes should be more frequent during the building stage so that quality is ensured.</p> <p>Paragraph 67. Reference should also be made here to local Neighbourhood Development Plans. A Neighbourhood Development Plan attains the same legal status as the Local Plan once it has been approved at a referendum.</p>	<p>Noted, however this is not the remit of the SPD. Consultation requirements are set out in the adopted SCI</p> <p>NDPS form part of the policy framework used in planning decisions.</p> <p>Planning decisions are made in the context of the adopted policies</p> <p>Noted, however this is not the remit of the SPD</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>The Government thinks that the local community should have a greater say in shaping the way their local area, the parish develops. This idea forms a key part of the Localism Act (2011).</p> <p>Paragraph 96. A shorter timescale for development, especially of affordable housing, should be imposed across the board. Regarding affordable housing, a project completion date should also be imposed. The approved housing which has not yet started should be taken into consideration for all subsequent planning applications.</p>	Noted
52	Gwinear Gwithian Parish Council		<p>Para 22. can P&TC see the 'sense check' for applications?</p> <p>16-26. Intermediate sale/Discounted housing although these are common place, generally it appears to be more a case of who can secure a mortgage quickest rather than local connection and this tends to lead to more going to those without a local connection than rented properties do. What can CC do to increase the level of those occupying these types of properties having a local connection as in our Parish 25% are generally occupied by someone without a local connection. (data from affordable housing providers)</p> <p>31. Where a development has switched in the past this has come back to the PC as a planning application, if CC can change affordable product through the S106 after the properties are built at its discretion we assume without local consultation with P&TC, could this lead to developers switching much needed rented properties to reduced price sale without PC knowing which would not meet local need. One way to tackle this would be to ensure CC write into the S106 that PC will be consulted on any changes.</p> <p>35. CC needs to show what they are selling off, where, by what profit and where that profit is being invested (to include finances as shown on item 78 & 83 also), maybe once a year if they do this already, signpost where to find this to P&TC.</p> <p>53. Whilst we agree that in some parishes that have small villages or hamlets it may be worthwhile looking to cluster with others, it is evident in the correspondence coming from the North Cornwall Cluster Group that developers are using this as a way to secure large scale developments in larger villages using the homechoice targets. This coupled with developer's ability to be allowed to bank land exacerbates this issue for parishes such as Crantock.</p> <p>85-89. agree but CC needs to ensure this is happening</p> <p>90-96. agree but CC needs to ensure 100% a/h starting point is being honoured as in most cases applications are starting at 50% how are CC going to stop this practice?</p> <p>94 as good as this sounds again this is not generally the case, speak to the planning officers and they will tell</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>SPD cannot set new policy but provides guidance on the implementation of policies in the adopted LP</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>you that the application process means that by the time they receive these applications they have already lost vital time as they only have 1 month to ask for further information on an application quite often an outline application is submitted with the minimum detail required and officers cannot always get further information and have to make a decision based on limited information.</p> <p>96 - GGPC has concerns regarding the ability for developers to count Homechoice numbers time and time again and bank land in the meantime. The draft housing SPD which states The Council may seek to impose a planning condition to require that a development begins within a timescale shorter than the relevant default period, to prevent speculative applications and land-banking. This is particularly the case where a number of rural exception site permissions exist in a settlement but are not being delivered (page 24 para 96). This would help the situation and I hope that P&TC across Cornwall will urge CC to use this power and ensure once their time limit is up CC does not continue to count those sites, educating P&TC and Planning Officers on this proposal is vital. GGPC believes that we all have a responsibility to understand why developers are land banking and P&TC and CC could work together to press the government on ideas such as Council Tax on un-built developments over a certain size to try and reduce this.</p> <p>98 This is a good policy but how will CC ensure the homes stay at entry level in perpetuity? Would this just become a way of land banking and waiting for the rules to change or could developers use point 31 of the SPD to change the status of it?</p> <p>106-113 We have seen a lot of older properties being advertised at low purchase prices depending on age recently, is this a practice that CC undertakes? Also older people do prefer to be grouped near to each other, if t</p>	
53	Lanlivery Parish Council		More weight must be given to Neighbourhood Plans and the locations of exceptions sites.	Noted, NDPs once made form part of the policy framework and are used in planning decisions
54	St Neot Parish Council		The Parish Council supports this supplementary planning document.	Noted
55	Paul Parish Council		No comment	Noted
56	St Pinnock Parish Council		The Parish Council note the contents of this document and the Councils approach to building affordable housing. There is little point in addressing an affordable housing need if the Council does not improve the local	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			infrastructure, including extra provision of doctors surgeries, dentists, hospitals, schools, public transport and the utilities associated with these and other matters.	
57	Probus Parish Council		<p>Para 68 - Paragraph 67 deals with Policy 8 affordable housing provision but is followed in 68 regarding Economic Viability Assessments with a reference to Rural Exception Sites (Policy 9). Policy 9 sites start with presumption of 100% affordable housing so are beyond the policy 8 requirements. Surely any deviation from 100% on Policy 9 sites should be accompanied by an Economic Viability Assessment as to why only between 50% (the minimum requirement) and 100% can be achieved.</p> <p>Para 84- Rural Exception Sites stipulated as 'small sites used for Affordable Housing' 'the primary role of providing affordable housing to meet local needs.' This paragraph needs more emphasis on the Affordable housing as it is evident that landowners/developers are using Policy 9 to build on rural land with as much market housing as possible (almost always 50% or more) to boost land values and extraordinary profits This is not the objective of this paragraph or Policy 9.</p> <p>Para 86 the reference to land devoted to infrastructure and services requires more definition to make this paragraph as onerous as it seems to intend.</p> <p>Para 89 What does ".carefully justify their proposals to the Council and community'." actually entail for Policy 9 sites?</p> <p>Para 97 and 98 Entry Level Exception Sites. These paragraphs make NDPs, Strategic Housing Land and any village planning almost irrelevant as it means that all land adjacent to the settlement is open for development of housing (albeit Affordable Housing only). Surely greater control of planning of any village growth must be maintained. The second bullet point in Para 98 links site size with housing numbers. These should be separate conditions and 5% of total housing in the settlement is in the case of some settlements far too great a percentage in number and leads to potential 'ghettos' of Affordable Homes instead of them being integrated within the community.</p>	<p>Noted, consider including clarification as to when viability assessment will be necessary</p> <p>The LP & SPD clearly set out that Policy 9 sites are small sites for affordable housing in accordance with Government definition.</p> <p>Noted, SPD reflects Government policy</p>
58	Sancreed Parish Council		No Comment	Noted
59	Sennen Parish Council		No Comment	Noted
60	Stithians Parish Council		Stithians Parish Council considered this matter at the meeting held on 20th November 2018 when it was resolved to make no comment.	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
61	St Winnow Parish Council		No Comment	Noted
62	Devon & Cornwall Police Architectural Liaison Officer	Specialist Housing	<p>Unfortunately those with specialist needs are often more likely to be victims of crime and also to be specifically targeted so I feel it should be stated that all specialist housing must ensure their designs provide a 'safe' place to live for all their occupants and fully consider all aspects of crime and disorder in so doing.</p> <p>Measures which must be considered will include safe and secure access, appropriate lighting, passive surveillance opportunities of the immediate area both by the occupant and of the occupant's front door by neighbours, appropriate boundaries and landscaping and safe and convenient parking etc</p> <p>Crucially the fear of crime amongst persons with specialist requirements such as the elderly can be disproportionately high so this must be fully considered.</p>	Noted, consider including text to highlight safe places to live
63	St Buryan Parish Council		No Comment	Noted
64	St German Parish Council		<p>In the Draft Housing Supplementary Planning Document, page 24 (of 43), section 96 the Councillors of St Germans Parish Council would like to see the word 'seek' replaced with the word 'will'.</p> <p>So the clause would read as follows:</p> <p>"The Council will seek to impose a planning condition to require that a development begins within a timescale shorter than the relevant default period, to prevent speculative applications and land - banking. This is particularly the case where a number of rural exception site permissions exist in a settlement but are not being delivered."</p>	Noted, however SPD text is considered flexible as currently drafted
65	Mr G M Jones		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building 52,500 new homes by 2030 implied an expected population increase of area 24% on the 2011 census of 536,000 people. This is not sustainable unless infrastructure improvements are made in parallel. - The Plan, as drafted, does not adequately demonstrate "Housing need". - Cornwall is attractive due to its coastline, large open green spaces, loose knit housing, quaint harbours and relatively clean air. This must not be negatively impacted for profit and an inadequately justified need. - The Plan is silent on the lack of employment opportunities for the significantly increased population expected. - The Plan must include parallel plans for additional capacity in health, education, transport, water, sewerage, pollution and social services for adults and children. <p>Please ensure these points are properly considered, debated and solutions put in place before proceeding to adoption.</p>	Noted, SPD provides guidance on adopted LP policies and cannot set new policy

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
66	Hewas Water Farm Action Group		<p>Our group, which represents almost all residents of Hewas Water, is concerned about the proposal to use a "Cluster Parish Approach" to housing need assessments.</p> <p>As we see it, it would mean that houses can be built in certain locations based on a housing need expressed in a number of surrounding towns/villages. This goes against the ethos of the Rural Exception Site policy, which is based on "local" need. This would also give carte blanche to developments cascading out from one urban or suburban location into the surrounding rural parishes and open countryside.</p> <p>It also goes against a High Court ruling on a planning application rejection in Hunstanton, in Norfolk, where Justice Lang ruled: "The Rural Exception Site policy permits development on green field sites in rural areas as an exception to the general rule which prevents such development in order to protect the countryside. The purpose of the policy is to provide affordable housing to meet the needs of small rural communities. The policy does not permit the affordable housing needs of local towns to be met by developing green field sites in small rural communities."</p> <p>We also believe that further abuses and exploitation of loose planning constraints would follow and would have a damaging effect by encouraging more uncontrolled growth of unwanted new homes in Cornwall, which is ruining the beauty of this unique landscape and heritage.</p> <p>For the reasons stated, we urge the Council to remove the Cluster Parish Approach from the draft Housing SPD.</p>	Noted, cluster parish approach aims to address housing need within Parishes
67	Mrs A Scott		<p>I am a resident of a small hamlet called Hewaswater, its name in Cornish is Havis meaning Summer dwelling. It set in a rural area with beautiful hedgerows surrounded by farm land. People choose to live here for the rural beauty.</p> <p>Under the new Government's National Planning Framework to cope with the 'demand' for housing is to allow developers free reign to build under the guise of 'affordable housing'. I do understand that there is a genuine need, but the planning department needs to take a more structured approach assessing the need, with insufficient infrastructure, the pressure it will be putting on schools, G.P surgeries (Probus and its peripheral surgeries have 9,000 patients alone). Our local Primary hospital, The Royal Cornwall has been on black alert frequently this winter putting pressure on nursing homes, block booked beds with inappropriate admissions. Long waiting times in A&E. I speak from personal experience as a Registered Nurse.</p> <p>In regards, to the proposed build on Hewaswater Farm, the developers state that they now want to build 'affordable housing' (this after being turned down previously proposing to build 30 houses). The developer M&D, prior the preplanning application hired an individual to go around the hamlet one Sunday afternoon</p>	Noted, policies in the adopted LP and any made NDPs will be used in decision making process.

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>using heavy-handed tactics stating that if the planning did not go ahead that they would sell to another developer who would build more houses. M&D has now employed Situ8, a company that will obtain financial gain if this development proceeds. St Mewan Parish Council has agreed that Situ8 could devise the questionnaire to send to parishioners, finding out local opinion which in my opinion could be seen as bias and a conflict of interest. Why could the Parish Council not use the Councils' questionnaire to avoid any conflict of interest? Situ8's Angela Warwick's partner is going to be undertaking the natural habitat survey, yet again another conflict of interests. Hewaswater is situated in a clay basin. The subsoil has very poor drainage. We have been flooded on numerous occasions and have had to build flood defenses in an attempt to alleviate the problem (we have photographic evidence to prove this). More building with dive ways adding to drainage difficulties will just add to the problem of those existing residents lower than the proposed developments.</p> <p>There has been speculation that the new development in Pine Lodge is to be sold to Suffolk Council to rehome those displaced families (this information is from an employee of Cornwall Council). At a local meeting on the 26th June 2018, Cornwall Councillor Cherilyn Mackrory was asked was it true that Cornwall Councils obtained £50,000 for rehoming families from out of county. Cherilyn stated that she had heard of this and had been trying to find out details.</p> <p>The whole purpose of this National Planning Framework to cope with the 'housing need' was to allow locals within their Parishes to devise a local plan to cater to local need sensitively, taking into account peoples view. In the St Mewan Parish the proposal falls outside the proposed development plan, also note it is on green land. Government legislation recommends brown land.</p> <p>More recently, there have been dwellings built in Hewaswater if there was such a demand should these have not been earmarked for affordable housing? There has been another application put in this month for Hewaswater infill another eight houses, possibly more applications to follow now the Government has relaxed their ruling. Polgooth has its own development issues along with St Austell a further 900 houses to be built. St Austell has already reached its housing target for 2030! We have over 3,000 empty houses in Cornwall. Towns will merge with villages</p> <p>Speeding is an issue in Hewaswater and Lord Robin Treverson helped locals with ways to attempt to reduce speeding and stop locals using it as a 'rat run'. This will only get worse with the proposed development and the access that has been suggested. The entrance will be near the brow of a hill sun hazards obscuring vision is already an issue.</p>	

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>Being an area of natural beauty, it has many hedgerows and the proposed site are fields with many forms of wildlife. Foxes, badgers, rabbits, bats Pipistrels (which are rare), possible dormice, slow worms the natural fauna encourages bees which are an endangered species, buzzards, and owls. We are squeezing out our natural wildlife which locals and visitors alike enjoy.</p> <p>To conclude, we are all custodians of this wonderful historical Cornwall of King Arthur, Wesley, St Michaels Mount, Daphne Du Maurier fame, The Lost Gardens of Heligan, Poldark country, beaches, plus numerous other naturally beautiful sites. What are we replacing it with? It can never be replaced. Those in Cornwall who care, need to polish their bezants, stand firm and say no to the ruination of our hamlet Hewaswater and just as important Cornwall itself.</p>	
68	Imerys Minerals Ltd		<p>Imerys recognises the document provides clarity on many current planning practices under the National Planning Policy Framework and Cornwall Local Plan policies.</p> <p>However, there are a number of points included within the document which may discourage landowners and developers bringing forward sites for development and ultimately be detrimental to a supply of land.</p> <p>Below are Imerys' comments on the following sections of the document:</p> <p>Self-Build Housing as part of the affordable housing requirement. Imerys support the paragraphs 144 and 145. Self-build affordable housing may help to unlock small sites in rural communities with the associated benefits of providing unique, quality, and affordable housing to support employment and growth in rural areas and help to create sustainable communities.</p> <p>Cluster Parish Approach Imerys support the cluster parish approach. Paragraphs 50-53 demonstrates a pragmatic approach to rural development and recognises that development on larger scales is more appropriate in some locations than others, particularly where many rural hamlets and small villages have a housing need but lack land suitable for development. It also recognises that communities extend beyond parish boundaries and are not always constrained to the boundaries defined on a parish map or within a neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Viability Assessment Imerys understand the need for viability assessments and broadly supports the expectations set under paragraph 68 for information required within an Economic Viability Assessment.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>However, Paragraph 68 appears to expressly set the price for an affordable housing plot at £10,000, whilst Imerys agrees that perhaps the maximum price for an affordable plot could be set at 10 times the agricultural value.</p> <p>Given the proposed life of the Cornwall Local Plan this would effectively discount the value of sites/plots for landowners over time and dis-incentivise landowners from making sites available and ultimately reduce the supply of land for affordable homes.</p> <p>Imerys questions whether it is the role of the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to determine the value of sites at all; this should be left for the market to decide.</p> <p>Planning Applications Imerys objects strongly to the principle that outline applications will not be supported for proposed affordable housing developments. Paragraphs 90 - 94 do not reflect that landowners often do not want to be obligated to agree to options or work with developers prior to the planning principle of a site being established. The cost of a detailed planning submission without the guarantee of planning being granted may be too greater risk for some landowner applicants to take. The LPA should ensure that the information required to fully assessing and effectively agree a sites mix, type of tenure and quantum of affordable units is to be provided through the use of robust S106 agreements and conditions contained within decision notices.</p> <p>Imerys suggests that the principles outlined by the second and third points of paragraph 94 are practicable for outline applications. Applicants are likely to accept that the quantum and mix of affordable housing could not be agreed with the LPA on the determination of an outline application and would be willing to work back from 100% affordable until a viable scheme can be delivered.</p> <p>Imerys also question the Council's approach of potentially refusing to support an application on the basis that the application was outline. Outline planning applications are provided for in the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, an applicant has a right in law to submit such an application. The LPA's suggestion that it may to refuse to support an application of this type which is otherwise sound and is supported by national and local planning policies appears to go beyond the scope of a Supplementary Planning Document per the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, rather it appears that the policy is a statement regarding the development of land and development management policy and as such should instead be contained within a DPD, which is subject to examination.</p>	<p>Noted, however the text is flexible stating 'typically...' to allow case-by-case evidence</p> <p>Noted, CC encourages a full planning application but recognises that in some cases this is not feasible</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>Imerys believes that paragraph 95 would adequately achieve the LPA's aims without reference to outline planning applications not being supported.</p> <p>Imerys also suggests that paragraph 96 would also undermine the ability of landowners to market sites effectively and would reduce the land supply. Marketing, conveyancing and the surveys and reports often required for reserved matters often extend to beyond two years following grant of planning decisions.</p>	
69	Mrs J Osborne		<p>I fully support the fact that we should have enough social housing for needs of OUR COMMUNITY, but fail to understand how development of the level detailed is justifiable. We appear to have become the go to county for other councils who are suffering from the wider housing shortage. We are losing our identity along with our towns and villages. This level of development is unsustainable within the constraints of our current infrastructure/services, not to mention the damage to our precious environment. Please look around, it's not possible to travel comfortably around the county anymore, especially in the height of the tourist season, which is so important for our economy. Our county towns are becoming urban sprawls and hubs of antisocial behaviour, would you want to walk around st Austell at night?? Please listen to your communities, your taxpayers and think again about what we really NEED!</p>	<p>Noted, however the SPD cannot set new policy but provides guidance on the implementation of LP policies</p>
70	Mr D Yates		<p>Par 6 Policy 6 - How will demand be identified?</p> <p>Par 7 Policy 10 - How will viability be determined?</p> <p>Para 10 - What does "secured in perpetuity" mean in law and how will compliance be enforced in the event of legal challenge</p> <p>Para 14 - What certain sites, how are they defined and identified</p> <p>Para 15 - How will rents be legally fixed in perpetuity?</p> <p>Para 19 - What standard will be identified and enforced to ensure all credible opportunities have been exhausted?</p> <p>Para 23 - In the phrase "exists for purchasers can purchase additional" "can" should read "to".</p> <p>Para 24 - What does "secured in perpetuity" mean in law and how will compliance be enforced against legal challenge.</p>	<p>Noted, demand is monitored and evidenced</p> <p>Noted, NPPF requirement for viability assessments to be publically available</p> <p>Noted, CC will consider the wording in the SPD to ensure compliance</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>Para 26 - How will continued local people ownership" be maintained against legal challenge?</p> <p>Para 30 - There is apparently significant demand for single occupant property in Saltash. This is assumed to include flats as the most efficient way of meeting that demand</p> <p>Para 38 - This paragraph, as written, appears to allow developers to build dwellings in exception sites which occupiers can then sell on as normal dwellings with only minimal financial penalty bypassing any long term planning control of local areas near existing towns and villages.</p> <p>Para 52 - There should be a mechanism to define "cluster demand" before planning permission is given, including consideration of existing permissions in the area where construction has not has not yet started to prevent construction above the actual local demand bypassing any existing control of local areas near existing towns and villages.</p> <p>Para 54 - As well as considering the existing spread of houses the current local demand should also be considered. In some areas the current local demand profile reflects that previous construction does not reflect current demand</p> <p>Para 57 - In some areas the number of open market flats available reflects profitability rather than local need.</p> <p>Para 57 - Is there (or should there be) a planning mechanism allowing the build options to be identified and "put on hold until required" at the initial planning stage?</p> <p>Para 64 - This phrase should identify that the "all" reflects the phrasing in the paragraphs below</p> <p>Para 84 - Existing built up areas</p> <p>Para 96 - This provision is welcomed (see 52 above)</p> <p>Para 99 - How will rents be "fixed in perpetuity"?</p> <p>Para 103 - This policy seems a good idea but recent evidence suggests that as local hospitals are closing and bed blocking becomes a major issue together with problems with "at home support" beds need to provided somewhere by someone. Paragraphs below seem to reflect this.</p>	<p>Noted, sites are considered on a case-by-case basis</p> <p>Noted, CC will consider the wording in the SPD to ensure compliance</p> <p>Noted Agree, amend as suggested</p> <p>Noted, CC will consider the wording in the SPD to ensure compliance</p> <p>Noted, this is a policy requirement</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, this is Government policy</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, however this mechanism is not in place</p>

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>Para 110 - HAPPI should be identified here as its first appearance (it is later).</p> <p>Para 120 - Other areas (Attleborough in Norfolk as an example) have developments which have bungalows, houses, serviced flats, old people's home and a supermarket closely grouped together</p> <p>Para 145 - How will "affordable" houses be secured in perpetuity?</p> <p>Para 145 - How will main residence rules be defined and maintained?</p>	<p>Agree, consider amending the text</p> <p>Agree, consider amending the text</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, CC will consider the wording in the SPD to ensure compliance</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agree, add reference to HAPPI principles</p> <p>Noted</p>
71	Mr M Wilson		<p>There is no need for a housing development on this site. It is green field and outside the local development plan for the area. There are new built houses still on the market in this hamlet of Hewaswater. We do not have any amenities, it is a clay based soil which is going to cause further flooding issues.</p> <p>Affordable housing is not cost effective for young families in this area for transportation, shops schools G.Ps.</p> <p>Council tax in a rural area is costly.</p> <p>There are further planning developments for the area and we strongly against the developments.</p>	Noted, the aim of the SPD is to provide guidance on the implementation of policies in the LP
72	Mr R Noy	No. 6 and 7	Part 7 Policy 9 Who is paying? County or Parish Council should borrow money from the market at a fix amount for 25 or 30 years.	Noted, however these are adopted LP policies
		No. 11 page 7	Affordable housing in Perpetuity is only about 80 years in Planning Law, not for ever and day.	Noted

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
		No. 12 page 7	Social Rented housing, Council dreaming again, more times than not. End up paid by the people who pay out of hard wage every month.	Noted
		No. 68 page 18	Land Values should not substitute other cost of the plot price because the land owners pay capital gain tax and many other costs, planning, legal, professional fees. Too much of this draft is left wing politics.	Noted
73	Save Heamoor from Excess Development	10 and 45	<p>There is an apparent contradiction between paragraphs 10 and 45.</p> <p>Paragraph 10: <i>"Homes provided as affordable should be secured as such in perpetuity... via a suitable planning obligation."</i></p> <p>Paragraph 45: <i>"Planning obligations are used to ensure that affordable housing is provided and (where possible) retained in perpetuity."</i></p> <p>It's unclear whether the retention of affordable homes as such in perpetuity is an obligation (as implied by paragraph 10) or whether this only applies "where possible" (as per paragraph 45). If the "where possible" wording prevails, it is not specified who determines whether or not provision in perpetuity is possible, and how this is determined.</p> <p>If the Council is serious about providing affordable housing that will benefit current and future generations of local people, we would suggest deleting <i>"(where possible)"</i> from paragraph 45.</p>	Noted, CC will consider the wording in the SPD to ensure compliance
		46	We welcome the Vacant Building Credit as an incentive to bring empty properties back into use, which aligns with one of the key objectives in the emerging Penzance Neighbourhood Plan.	Noted
		48 & 49	<p>We support the principle of small-scale affordable housing-led developments in villages like Heamoor that lie on the edge of areas designated as "main towns" under LPSP policy 3. However this creates issues for communities like ours that are also being allocated hundreds of new dwellings under the Cornwall Site Allocations DPD (subject to the outcome of the ongoing examination process).</p> <p>The CSADPD proposes 640 new dwellings on open countryside around our village, which would (based on the 30% quota) provide 192 affordable homes – way in excess of the 44 households on the Homechoice Register who stated Heamoor as their first choice (based on December 2017 figures). Cornwall Community Land Trust have informed us that by driving up land values, these proposals are precluding affordable housing-led developments of the kind that would best meet local need.</p> <p>This issue is not so much a problem with paragraphs 48 and 49, but with the underlying delineation of the "main town" of "Penzance, Newlyn, Heamoor, Gulval and Long Rock" in LPSP Policy 3.</p>	Noted, however the LP is adopted and provides a policy framework for planning decisions

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			<p>The boundaries of the “main town” area are drawn in such a way that Heamoor and Gulval – two villages separate from Penzance, each with a strong community identity – currently fall within the “main town” area and hence are potentially required to accept large numbers of new homes wholly disproportionate to local need within that community: in the case of Heamoor, increasing the population by over 50%.</p> <p>This is in contrast with villages in other parts of Cornwall that have similar spatial relationships with a main town but which fall just outside the “main town” area for CSADPD purposes (such as Mabe Burnthouse and Budock Water relative to Falmouth/Penryn).</p> <p>The result of these apparently arbitrary decisions on “main town” boundaries is to create massive development pressure on certain communities that because of their character, size and location would be much more suited to affordable housing-led developments under the rural exception sites policy. Such developments would enjoy community support, unlike the large-scale market-led proposals in the CSADPD which have attracted widespread opposition from local residents (as evidenced in the massive consultation response to the CSADPD).</p> <p>Recent discussions in the Penzance Neighbourhood Plan Community Link Group have highlighted the potential problems arising from focusing affordable provision on large sites in a single location rather than using a dispersal model. Residents with a connection to (say) Gwavas on the fringes of Newlyn who secured affordable housing in Heamoor would potentially be cut off from family ties in their original community: for example, providing carer support to elderly relatives remaining in Gwavas would present logistical difficulties given the poor public transport links between the “fringe” communities on the periphery of Penzance.</p> <p>We would therefore advocate a shift in focus from large-scale market-led developments on the edge of the main town area towards affordable housing-led “pocket developments” in the peripheral communities, with greater attempts to find and deliver market-led sites in town centre locations, which would enjoy better transport links and avoid disproportionate development in rural and semi-rural communities.</p> <p>We also believe that the split within the West Penwith CNA between the “main town” area and the “residual” area is an artificial construct that fails to take account of the symbiotic relationship between Penzance and the dispersed towns and villages of West Penwith.</p> <p>It is striking that the latest housing delivery figures show the West Penwith residual area running ahead of target while the Penzance “main town” area is behind target. This reflects a lack of deliverable sites within the geographically constrained “main town” area, but also support for developments within the dispersed towns</p>	

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
			and villages, where affordable provision in particular can help local people stay in the community where they grew up. Although such changes may be beyond the scope of this SPD, we would urge the Council to treat the entire West Penwith CNA as a unified whole in determining housing targets and delivery, so as to ensure that provision is better matched to the needs of individual communities.	
		50-53	The “cluster” parish approach should be amended to take account of the specific case where a larger parish (in our case, the Penzance civil parish) includes a number of separate, distinctive communities with their own character and identity (and their own specific housing needs). In such cases, we would argue that affordable housing in each of the communities should be allocated in priority to families with a connection to the host community, before cascading out to the rest of the civil parish and (ultimately) beyond the civil parish. The SPD should include definitions of local need and local connection that relate to the relevant settlement or parish. In parishes that include more than one settlement, including those focused on main towns, “local need” and “local connection” should relate to the relevant settlement or community rather than to the parish. In such parishes Housing Needs Surveys, and other evidence of local need, should also be related to the relevant settlement not the parish as a whole. We would also welcome clarification on how households with a “local connection” would be identified, and how they would be informed of the opportunity to apply for affordable housing in a proposed development within their community.	Noted, consideration will be given to the inclusion of a definition for local need
		63	Drafting error: text should read “ <i>occupation or transfer of dwellings</i> ”, not “ <i>occupation of transfer of dwellings</i> ”.	Agree, amend as suggested
		67	Drafting error: insert the word “ <i>document</i> ” after “ <i>up-to-date development</i> ” on line 2.	Agree, amend as suggested
74	Fowey Town Council		More weight must be given to Neighbourhood Plans and the locations of exceptions sites.	Noted, once made NDPs form part of the policy framework used in decision making process

ID	Consultee Name/ Organisation	Page number Paragraph number	Consultee Comment	CC Officer Comment
75	South West Water		I refer to the above and would advise that South West Water has no comment.	Noted
76	St Austell Town Council	1	Add "quality" after quantity	Agree, amend
		14	New social rented housing is strongly supported.	Noted
		21	Explain what the 2.5% relates to	Agree, amend
		22	Delete "not" before "be affordable"	Agree, amend
		44	Cornwall Living rent needs to be defined or explained here.	Noted, consider text
		75/80	These paragraphs are identical.	Noted, consider text
		General	Members felt that "sustainable" needs to be defined and that affordable should relate to running costs (eg energy maintenance etc) as well as the capital cost. It was felt that climate change and energy use should be considered Members also felt that the document should link or to other documents that the Council is developing.	Noted
77	Vickery Holman	Para 68	The typical plot value of £10,000 or 10x agricultural value is slightly low. From our data base the average purchase price of exception sites is closer to £13,000 per plot. I think the LPA needs to be <u>a little</u> flexible on this price if what has been a really successful policy is to continue to supply houses. The idea of publishing the viability assessments and undertaking post application reviews is supported.	Noted, SPD is considered flexible stating 'typically...'
		Para 146	I propose an alternative to the Council intervention which sells plots direct to custom-builders in return for making an appropriate off-site AH contribution or on-site provision.	Noted, para 139 allows for innovative solutions



**CORNWALL
COUNCIL**
one and all • onen hag oll

If you would like this information
in another format please contact:

**Cornwall Council, County Hall
Treyew Road, Truro TR1 3AY**

Email: comments@cornwall.gov.uk

Telephone: **0300 1234 100**

www.cornwall.gov.uk



www.cornwall.gov.uk