

ES3.3



Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council

Local Development Plan

**Hearing Session 3: Affordable Housing and Housing
for Gypsies and Travellers**

Wednesday 27 June 2012

Examination 2012

Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council Submission

Examination Statement Reference No:	ES3.3
Submission date:	15th June 2012

SESSION 3 AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND HOUSING FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS

Introduction

This Statement has been prepared by Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council in order to help facilitate appropriate discussion at the Affordable Housing and Housing for Gypsies and Travellers Hearing Session. The Paper provides a response to the questions set by the Planning Inspector (Mr Vincent Maher).

Where the Council does not intend to provide any additional written evidence the Inspector's attention is directed to the relevant part of the Evidence Base, which in the view of the Council addresses the matters raised. The paper will not repeat evidence previously submitted for consideration.

The Council's detailed response to the representations received to the affordable housing and housing for Gypsies and Travellers are contained in the Report of Representations (**SD07b**).

Council Response to Inspector's Questions (questions in bold)

Affordable housing

1. What is the evidence base to justify the Plan's target of "at least" 10% of all developments that exceed the relevant threshold? Is the term "at least" unclear? If so, what are the implications for developers when seeking planning permission?

What is the evidence base to justify the Plan's target of "at least" 10% of all developments that exceed the relevant threshold?

The evidence base to justify the Plan's target of "at least" 10% of all developments that exceed the relevant threshold is set out in detail in the following documents:

- **SD62:** Local Housing Market Assessment
- **SD69:** Study into the Economic Viability of providing Affordable Housing
- **SD42:** Affordable Housing Background Paper
- **SD43:** Updated Affordable Housing Background Paper

In summary, the Local Housing Market Assessment (**SD62**, page 75) identifies the need to provide 86 affordable homes per annum. As a percentage of the proposed average new build of 233, identified in the Plan, this would equate to a need of 37% affordable homes across all s,07Lk"7(iM"0,05%%(nM'U8ak

should allow sites to be considered on an individual scheme by scheme basis where appropriate (**SD69**,

According to the study (**SD69**) development appraisals are in essence relatively straightforward and can be illustrated by the following equation:

$$\begin{array}{r} \textbf{Completed Development Value} \\ \text{Less} \\ \textbf{Development Costs (Land Acquisition + Construction + Fees + Finance)} \\ \text{Equals} \end{array}$$

3. What is the logic for the two thresholds chosen for requiring affordable housing? Why has the Council chosen the area based threshold of 0.28 ha? What does the term “gross site area” mean? Should Policy DM10 state more clearly a mix of tenures sought that is consistent with the findings of the LHMA (SD62)?

Blaenau Gwent's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Planning Obligations (**SD128**) identifies the exceptional circumstances that would enable off-site contributions, these are:

- Where the Council or an RSL consider management of the affordable housing on site cannot be effectively secured, or
- The development site is in an unsuitable location with no or limited local services/facilities nearby, or
- The affordable housing is more effectively secured by bringing vacant stock back into active use, e.g. via the Council's

6.

Rebuttal – HBF (Representor: 24)

The HBF points to the fact that the assessment does not take into account the changing national policy situation. It is only possible to take account of what is known. Future changes need to be monitored so that they can trigger a review of the situation.

Gypsy and travellers' housing

8.