

**BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET - CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION**

**AGENDA - ISSUE 4: AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

**Day 6 (Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> PM)**

1. Is policy CP9 justified in seeking an average of 35% affordable housing on developments of 10 dwellings and more?
  - Council to explain how it is has drawn support for this figure from the viability studies.
  - Council to explain why it considers that the residual values likely to be available from the application of the policy will still encourage sites (particularly with alternative commercial use value) to come forward.
  - Discussion.
2. Is the proposed change to CP9 (PC91) justified in indicating *that a higher (45%) proportion may be sought* in some locations?
3. Is policy CP9 justified in seeking an average of 17.5% affordable housing on developments of 5-9 dwellings?
4. Given the range of market values across the district is a single % figure the most appropriate approach?
  - Council to summarise why a single figure is considered most appropriate, particularly given the poor outcomes for sites in the Somer Valley from the site specific viability modelling (CD4/H9 section 5).
  - Discussion.
  - If not, is there evidence to robustly define different %s for different areas?
5. Do the viability considerations introduced by PC91 provide an appropriate means to adjust what is sought in the light of individual site/development circumstances and still comply with the policy?
6. Have the viability studies appropriately taken into account the additional building costs over the life of the Core Strategy of meeting the likely increased requirements from future Building Regulations and of the Council's own policy (CP2) requiring adherence to specific Code Levels, which would be additional to the minimum national standards? (CD4/S12 provides an assessment of such additional costs, see particularly tables 23 and 24).
7. BNES/12 11.8.1-2 explains the Council's approach to affordable rent in the context of the reference to it in PC91. Is the proposed wording consistent with the Council's intended approach? Does the Council's requirement concerning the local affordability of affordable rent mean that where viability is an issue, it would accept a lower proportion of affordable housing in order to get units for social rent? Does this need explanation in the plan?

8. I previously questioned whether the requirement at the end of CP9 for all affordable units to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households is realistic. BNES/12 11.9.2 suggests new wording which would seem to address this matter. Any comments?

*End of affordable housing session*

**Separate issue raised by participant - Older persons housing**

Is the Core Strategy sound in relation to the particular housing needs of the ageing population of the district?

Where potentially relevant, will the Core Strategy facilitate the aims of the Government's new Housing Strategy *Laying the foundations: A Housing Strategy for England* Nov 2011 (eg Ch 6: 33, 34)?

If not, how could it be made sound?

**Simon Emerson  
Inspector  
12 January 2012.**