

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
General					
General	GOSE	AHSPD6/1	Comment: It is important that any adopted policies and guidance do not have the effect of stifling the market's response to new housing as the SPD puts added demands on developers, therefore careful monitoring should be carried out.	The SPD does not put any added demands upon developers as it only gives more detail on adopted Local Plan policies.	No change
General	GOSE	AHSPD6/2	Comment: The SPD is likely to require additional time for pre-app discussion and the Council is urged to make adequate resources available to implement the final SPD.	The City Council is hoping to recruit a new post to dedicate further resources to the implementation of the SPD.	No change
General	GOSE	AHSPD6/3	Comment: Consider how the City Council's own requirements can be better harmonised with national and regional initiatives e.g. Housing Market Assessment.	The City Council is currently in discussions with the neighbouring districts on undertaking a Housing Market Assessment.	No change
General	Christ Church College	AHSPD2/1	Objection: Christ Church College has a significant number of important land interests in the West End of Oxford and is keen to be involved with the planning process and in particular delivering market and affordable housing in Oxford. The introduction of new market and affordable housing in the West End is very important. To ensure the residential potential of the West End is secured, a flexible approach to residential provision should be encouraged, including the consideration of strategic land use "packages" for sites in the same ownership in and around the West End. This could meet Council's mixed use objectives and secure the maximum provision of market and affordable housing in the City. The quantum and split of affordable housing needs to be considered in light of the Council's strategic objectives and the viability of the individual sites.	<p>The consideration of a number of different sites under the same ownership is possible only where the planning permissions would be tied to each other. It is not considered necessary to specify in the SPD particular locations in Oxford where this might be appropriate.</p> <p>The West End Area Action Plan will consider if there is a need of area specific policies relating to affordable housing.</p>	No change
General	Knight Frank LLP	AHSPD9/1	Objection: We have reservations that the level of detail and the interpretation of the affordable housing policies extend well beyond the role of a SPD and that it provides a new policy direction.	The delivery of affordable housing is complex and the information within the SPD clarifies many of the issues surrounding the affordable housing requirements. The Policy works within the framework of the existing Local Plan policies.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
General	Knight Frank LLP	AHSPD9/2	<p>Comment: The challenges facing development in Oxford is appreciated. Oxford City Council has clearly adopted a step change with regard to the provision of affordable housing. There is concern that this could have major implications for developers considering Oxford as an investment opportunity. PPS3 advocates the concept of sub-regional housing markets. We encourage Oxford City Council to consider its housing options in a wider sub-regional context, beyond the authorities boundaries.</p>	<p>The Local Plan policies were a step change in policy but these policies have been examined in public and are now adopted. The City Council is aware of the need to consider sub-regional housing markets and is working with it's neighbours on this issue. However there is still a huge housing need within Oxford's boundaries. The present system does not allow for Oxford to plan for affordable housing across boundaries.</p>	No change
General	Knight Frank LLP	AHSPD9/3	<p>Objection: The need for 1700 to 1800 affordable homes per annum is incorrect and should be revised. The City Council is urged to reassess their housing needs requirements and would recommend that a sub-regional market assessment be undertaken to ensure an accurate assessment of housing need.</p>	<p>The Housing Requirements Study concluded that 1,700-1,800 affordable dwellings per year would be needed to meet housing need in Oxford. This is factual information derived in April 2004 and need not be updated at this stage. These figures indicate need, they do not indicate what the City Council intends to realistically make provision for. Oxford could not physically provide that level of affordable housing in Oxford due to the shortage of land, let alone the equivalent level of market housing too. The 137 affordable dwellings per year was derived from evidence on the likely size of site coming forward and by then applying the 10 dwellings threshold and 50% provision to these sites. This resulted in an estimated number of affordable dwellings coming forward per year. The fact that the affordable housing annual figure comes out less than 50% of our annual overall target of 433 indicates that a large proportion of sites coming forward will have a capacity of less than 10 dwellings.</p>	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
General	Knight Frank LLP	AHSPD9/4	Objection: Extremely concerned about the implications of the commercial development contribution requirement for mixed used schemes. Effectively, developers will be expected to pay twice for affordable housing in developments that have a commercial space on the lower floors (with the exception of retail uses) which is unreasonable if a contribution has already been provided for in the residential element of the scheme. Surely this approach discourages mixed use developments and therefore goes against Government objectives of sustainable communities.	In terms of the provision of affordable housing, both the commercial element and the residential element should be considered independently because developing one of these land uses does not mitigate against the need for affordable housing generated by the other. This is because the contribution from the residential element would be required regardless of whether the commercial development took place or not.	No change
General	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/1	Objection: Does not believe the SPD is needed, and in any case, this is the wrong time to draw one up as Core Strategy should be adopted first. In any event feels it is too prescriptive and needs to develop better monitoring tools.	The SPD relates to Policies in the Local Plan and is not tied to the production of the Core Strategy.	No change
General	Oxford Pastorate Housing Association	AHSPD14/1	Comment: Urge the City as planning authority to frame appropriate policies and insert them in the draft Affordable Housing SPD so that the stock of housing providers such as Oxford Pastorate Housing Association is protected.	The Affordable Housing SPD does not have a presumption in favour of losing stock such as that of Oxford Pastorate Housing Association. However, housing that is not self-contained does not count towards meeting the need of those on the housing register. The St Aldates regeneration zone is allocated for future redevelopment, this policy was adopted in the Local Plan in November 2005 and is not due for review.	No change
General	SEEDA	AHSPD19/1	Support	Noted	No change
General	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/1	Objection: Implementation of the SPD will severely restrict the supply of affordable housing from private sector developments.	The SPD does not put any added demands upon developers as it only gives more detail on adopted Local Plan policies.	No change
Introduction					

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 3	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/2	Objection: Pre-application advice should be coupled with a commitment to respond to requests for a response within a reasonable timetable. Suggest that this paragraph be amended to state " <i>pre-application advice will always be provided in writing or through a meeting within 2 weeks of a written request being made</i> ". We understand that this is the Council's internal performance management target.	This is the target that the City Council aims to meet and we do our best to meet that target. However, due to the huge number of correspondence we receive, it is not always possible to do so.	No change
Paragraph 6	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/1	Objection: In order to ensure accuracy and consistency with the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 the word "generally" should be added. Amend paragraph 6 as follows: " <i>The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 was adopted on 21 October 2005 and states that <u>generally</u> at least 50% of all new housing...</i> "	This paragraph could be more accurate to be inline with paragraph 7.18 of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016.	Amend paragraph 6 as follows: " <i>The Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 was adopted on 21 October 2005 <u>and has an expectation that</u> and states that at least 50% of all new housing...</i> "
Affordable housing need in Oxford					
Paragraphs 9-10	Jack Straws Lane Association	AHSPD4/1	Objection: We remain convinced that it would be in the interests of the local and national economy to change the policy regarding eligibility and the evaluation of priority regarding affordable housing, so that greater weighting is given to the needs of those in low-paid employment.	The allocation of households to affordable housing is based on need and the particular circumstances of the household. The SPG ensures that any affordable housing will be affordable to those households. The City Council's Allocations Team would be able to offer advice on the points system used to allocated housing.	No change
Paragraph 11	The Home Group	AHSPD20/1	Objection: There is a substantial imbalance between need and supply. Supply needs to be based on tenure mix unit type and quality, and not just unit dwelling type numbers to ensure the dwelling type need is met.	The Urban Potential Study sets out the housing capacity of Oxford until 2016. Due to the physical constraints in and around Oxford and the shortage of land available for development, it is not physically possible to accommodate much more housing than 433 per year. By applying the strategic mix, the units sizes that best meet need will be delivered. The cascade approach has been altered to allow for circumstances where if the proportion of affordable housing is reduced, the number of family sized dwellings will increase.	Amend paragraph 36: " <i>second, <u>progressively amend the mix of dwellings so that overall the proportion of affordable housing is reduced but the size of dwellings are increased to better meet housing need</u> reduce the affordable housing requirement . "</i>

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 13	Lee Mikhelson	AHSPD10/1	Comment and Support: Key worker housing is very closely allied to affordable housing as those who need affordable housing will inevitably need key workers e.g. teachers, nurses etc. Impressed with the attempts to prevent dilution of the affordable housing policy and to control the cash in lieu avoidance of obligation. Obviously the incorporation of the Natural Resource Impact Analysis SPD will make affordable housing an even better investment for all concerned.	Noted	No change
Paragraph 13	Town Furze Allotments	AHSPD21/1	Objection: Local Authority planners should be excluded from key worker housing. Environmental Health officers should be substituted – to fight the rising rat population.	The Government's Key Worker Living Programme has classed Local Authority planners as key workers in London since 2004 and in the South East since April 2006.	No change
Paragraph 14	Town Furze Allotments	AHSPD21/2	Wants more facilities such as libraries to prevent crime. Wants the Council to encourage the elderly to leave their homes so that they can be assigned to key workers.	These are not issues for the this SPD	No change
Paragraph 13	Town Furze Allotments	AHSPD21/3	Objection: The City Council should put more effort into encouraging the elderly to re-locate to smaller units to release more family housing. This would be needed when the 'key workers' want to start families.	The SPD is not the appropriate place to deal with issues of whether or not the elderly should be encouraged to move to smaller dwellings. In terms of affordable housing for the elderly, the allocation of affordable dwellings to particular households is determined by the housing allocations team. In terms of market housing, aside from delivering smaller units which is the current trend in Oxford, Planning cannot do much else to encourage elderly people to move house.	No change
Paragraph 13	Town Furze Allotments	AHSPD21/4	Objection: House building is completed at a rapid rate in Oxford without a commensurate increase in leisure and recreational facilities, especially in Headington. Two schools have closed and Bury Knowle library is threatened. This is a recipe for crime and discontent.	The issue of recreational facilities is not an issue for this SPD. The forthcoming SPD on Planning Obligations will cover this issue and there are also policies in the Local Plan. Education and libraries are under the control of the County Council and it is therefore the City Council cannot keep schools and libraries open.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraphs 13-15	University College	AHSPD22/1	Objection: The SPD should be amended to include key worker housing within the definition of affordable housing. Paragraphs 14 and 15 should be deleted and paragraph 13 amended to demonstrate that the Council does accept key worker housing as an element of affordable housing provision subject to a detailed assessment of housing need on a case by case basis.	The Local Plan inspector considered intermediate housing not to be an option in Oxford as it is not affordable. The housing needs of many key workers would be met by general affordable housing anyway as due to their personal circumstances and low income levels they would be eligible. If a scheme provides 50% affordable housing that meets our definition we would accept key worker housing in addition to the affordable housing.	No change
Paragraphs 13-15	Oxford Radcliffe NHS Trust	AHSPD15/1	Objection: It is not clear from the document whether affordable housing would be required where, for instance, a key worker housing development was proposed by a health trust. This is explicit in Policy HS.16, and it is suggested that such information should be included in the SPD.	If a health trust wants to develop housing on its own land for its employees, then this would be dealt with under Policy HS.16 and would not be required to provide affordable housing provided the criteria in the Policy are met. This SPD does not deal with Policy HS.16 in details and is therefore anymore detail would be inappropriate for this SPD.	No change
Paragraphs 13-14	Oxfordshire County Council	AHSPD18/1	Objection: Could you please clarify the definition of "key worker housing". Paragraph 13 states that " <i>Key worker housing applies to households that cannot afford a home they need and who work in particular public sector occupations that have recruitment difficulties</i> ". In Paragraph 14, some key workers are seen as not technically in housing need and not qualifying for affordable housing. Later in Paragraph 14, it says that you will not accept key worker housing as a substitute for general affordable housing. If key worker housing is allocated to people who meet the social and economic entry requirements for general affordable housing, key worker housing would therefore qualify as affordable housing. It would help to have this definition clarified. The document could state that 'key workers' are defined by the Government for the purposes of the Key Worker Living Scheme operating in the South East, Eastern and London Regions.	This is the point trying to be made. The sentence " <i>Affordable housing may benefit key workers where, apart from their key worker status, they qualify for affordable housing</i> " is considered to adequately make this point. It would be helpful to include reference to the Government's Key Worker Living Programme.	Insert sentence at end of paragraph 13: " <i>as set out in the Government's Key Worker Living Scheme operating in the South East, Eastern and London regions.</i> "

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 14	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/3	<p>Objection: Policy H4 of the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 states that affordable housing includes key worker housing. The SPD should be amended to make it clear that key worker housing does contribute to the 50% provision and additional flexibility build in elsewhere in the document to allow its provision.</p>	<p>Key worker housing for households that do not qualify for general affordable housing does not contribute to the 50% affordable housing requirement. The Local Plan Inspector concluded that "<i>some key workers would in any event qualify for affordable housing</i>" and that "<i>a number of sites have been specifically allocated, in the Plan, for key worker housing in the form of staff accommodation. In addition, the Government's Key Worker Living programme operates in Oxford. Further, there is nothing to stop employers from building key worker housing.</i>"</p>	No change
Paragraphs 14, 15	The Home Group	AHSPD20/2	<p>Objection: There is concern that excluding Key workers housing from the affordable definition could limit access to more specific funding streams such as Housing Corporation Key Worker funding. It is understood that this specific needs type is not a priority, however the clause should be reworded to give some discretionary flexibility to prevent possible exclusion from these funding sources.</p>	<p>Key worker housing for households that do not qualify for general affordable housing does not contribute to the 50% affordable housing requirement. The Local Plan Inspector concluded that "<i>some key workers would in any event qualify for affordable housing</i>" and that "<i>a number of sites have been specifically allocated, in the Plan, for key worker housing in the form of staff accommodation. In addition, the Government's Key Worker Living programme operates in Oxford. Further, there is nothing to stop employers from building key worker housing.</i>"</p>	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 16	Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts	AHSPD17/1	Objection: The interpretation of the Housing Requirements Study is incorrect. There are many households in housing need whose circumstances would allow them to pay more than social rented costs but less than market costs. A mechanism should be found for households in housing need that better uses available subsidy to achieve more whilst not oversubsidising households	The City Council's houses households on the housing register in order of priority (those in greatest need). The HRS concluded that new-build low-cost market housing would not meet any housing need and that discount market rents would only meet need if they were significantly below market levels. These mechanisms could not therefore meet those in greatest housing need. Due to the high house prices in Oxford there are likely to be many households that can afford more than social rented but less than market costs but these household are not always in the greatest housing need.	No change
Forms of affordable housing					
Paragraph 18	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/2	Objection: The proposed text is inappropriately prescriptive and will prevent schemes coming forward. Amend paragraph 18 as follows: " <i>Shared ownership housing refers to housing which is partly sold to the occupiers and partly rented to them by a RSL. It is tailored towards a specific income group that is currently targeted to address specific local housing needs. Because of the high cost of housing in Oxford and taking into account the particular circumstances of each proposal, shared ownership housing should offer buyers an initial share of no more than 25% of the open market value of the dwelling. The rental charges on the unsold equity (share) should be no more than 2% of this share. Oxford's Housing Requirements Study found that overall there is an 18% need for shared ownership affordable housing.</i> "	There are areas of Oxford that are more expensive than others, e.g. North Oxford is more expensive than Rose Hill. However, compared to incomes in general, the cost of housing is extreme high across the whole of Oxford. It is therefore necessary to prescribe the level at which shared ownership dwellings will be sold, otherwise dwellings will not be affordable the the majority of those in housing need. There are no circumstances envisaged where by it would not be necessary ensure the affordability of shared ownership dwellings.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 18	The Home Group	AHSPD20/3	Objection: Maximum Share of 25% agreed that it would state a minimum of 25% equity share, so there is flexibility to sell larger shares subject to the affordability assessment understandable but could be too low on some schemes, there needs to be more flexibility. 2% rent levels are very low and may give insufficient return to RSLs on their retained equity; it is proposed that this is changed to a maximum of 2.75% in line with current Housing Corporation requirements as long as this is within the affordability criteria.	Amend to refer to affordability test.	Amend 3rd sentence of paragraph 18 to read: " <i>Because of the high cost of housing in Oxford, shared ownership housing should offer buyers a <u>maximum initial share of</u> an initial share of no more than 25% of the open market value of the dwelling.</i> " Add new paragraphs: " <i><u>Higher proportions can be offered provided the cost would be less than 30% of the net household income as set out in the Local Plan. RSLs will be expected to demonstrate that the shared ownership dwellings would meet this requirement. The rental charges on the unsold equity (share) should be no more than 2.75% of this share</u></i> "
Paragraph 18	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/4	Objection: Object to capping the initial proportion of shared ownership at 25% which is not justified.	Amend to refer to affordability test.	See amendment in response to AHSPD20/3
Paragraphs 18-19	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/2	Objection: Do not support the use of a blanket 18% shared ownership need based on the Housing Requirements Study as this Study is only a snapshot and need will change over time.	The Housing Requirements Study uses the information gathered to assess need over the next 10 years. The study concluded that to best meet housing need, tenure of affordable housing should be 18% shared ownership and 82% social rented. Due to the high level of need, combined with the assessment of supply, any shortage at April 2004 has a knock on effect for years to come.	No change
Paragraphs 18-19	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/3	Objection: The prescription of the amount of equity stake to be sold for a shared ownership unit is wrong. It suggests an exclusive policy that would prevent access to such housing by households who could afford a higher stake but still not afford market housing.	The point of affordable housing is that it is available to those in greatest need and on the housing register and not those at an intermediate level.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraphs 18-19	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/4	Objection: We do not accept that the part share, part rent model represents good value for money. The rent paid on a shared ownership property could support a substantially larger mortgage. The Council should be encouraging more affordable types of housing such as shared equity housing, which is strongly supported by the government.	The extra rent could not support a substantially larger mortgage. By simply looking at a households outgoings, it might appear that if a household can afford £250 extra towards rent, and that they could put that money towards purchasing a greater proportion of the property. But the reality is that the level of mortgage that they could be offered is calculated by a multiple of the amount the household income. The average house price in Oxford would cost the average household more than 8 times their income. The typical mortgage lending rate is 3.5 times income, some lenders lend to 4 times income, any more is usually considered too risky for the mortgage lender and unadvisable to the mortgagee. Clearly the average household would struggle to get a mortgage for even 50% of the average house. A household in housing need would have significantly more difficulty. The shared equity scheme is available in Oxford under the Government's Key Worker Living programme but households who can afford this option purchase properties on the open market and are not affected by the affordable housing that	No change
Paragraph 19	The Home Group	AHSPD20/4	Objection: 75% cap on staircasing cannot be agreed to and is unacceptable except in rural areas. The Housing Corporation do not agree with restriction and capping could prevent the RSLs accessing funding.	It is agreed that the City Council should not limit staircasing to 75% as this may mean that funding would be unavailable from the Housing Corporation.	Amend paragraph 19 to read: " <i>Shared ownership affordable housing should be available, in perpetuity, to those in housing need therefore the City Council will prevent 'staircasing' (gradually buying a greater share) beyond 75% of the equity share of the property. This will ensure that the share of the property that had been purchased will eventually be sold back to the Registered Social Landlord and so the home can be re-occupied by another household in housing need at an affordable price.</i> "

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 19	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/5	Objection: Object to reference to no more than 75% of the equity of a property being purchased by the occupier.	It is agreed that the City Council should not limit staircasing to 75% as this may mean that funding would be unavailable from the Housing Corporation.	See amendment in response to comment AHSPD20/4
Paragraph 19	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/3	Objection: The proposed text is inappropriately prescriptive and will prevent schemes coming forward. Amend paragraph 19 as follows: " <i><u>Taking into account the particular circumstances of each site</u>, shared ownership affordable housing should be available, in perpetuity, to those in housing need, therefore the City Council will prevent 'staircasing' (gradually buying a greater share) beyond 75% of the equity share of the property. This will ensure that the share of the property that had been purchased will eventually be sold back to the Registered Social Landlord and so the home can be re-occupied by another household in housing need at an affordable price.</i> "	There are no circumstances whereby shared ownership dwellings should not be available in perpetuity. However, it is agreed that the City Council should not limit staircasing to 75% as this may mean that funding would be unavailable from the Housing Corporation.	See amendment in response to comment AHSPD20/4
Paragraph 19	Oxfordshire County Council	AHSPD18/2	Objection: We have been made aware that Housing Corporations may no longer be funding shared ownership homes if it is not possible for the purchases to staircase up to full ownership, therefore, it may be necessary to revisit paragraph 19. Table 2 identifies the strategic mix sought for affordable housing dwellings on city centre and out of centre sites, but has made no provision for family sized (3 and 4 bed) shared ownership properties in the outer Oxford areas. How do couples in a shared ownership 2 bedroom flat upgrade to a shared ownership family home when they have children?	It is agreed that the City Council should not limit staircasing to 75% as this may mean that funding would be unavailable from the Housing Corporation. The Housing Requirements Study identified only a negligible need for 3 and 4 bed affordable dwellings. This size shared ownership dwelling is also not affordable to the majority of those in housing need.	See amendment in response to comment AHSPD20/4.
Paragraph 20-21	The Home Group	AHSPD20/5	Objection: RSLs agree that this should be removed from the affordable definition.	Whilst subsidised housing is not a form of affordable housing in Oxford, it is nevertheless useful to make this clear in the SPD for the avoidance of doubt.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 20-21	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/6	Objection: This is not justified. Paragraph should be deleted. Draft Government Guidance is only an indication of future Government policy. To rely on draft PPS3 is unsound.	Previously, the Local Plan Inspector had already concluded this with respect to low-cost market housing in Oxford due to high house prices.	Amend paragraph 21 to read: " <i>The Local Plan Inspector's Report and Draft Planning Policy Statement 3 (2006) does not consider low-cost market housing to be affordable housing.</i> "
Paragraph 22	Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts	AHSPD17/2	Comment: How well does the City Council understand Community Land Trusts? We want to work alongside RSLs and developers with what is effectively a financial mechanism that could be used to deliver more affordable housing.	It is not appropriate for the SPD to go into any more detail on Community Land Trusts. Paragraph 22 adequately outlines their role and, provided that the dwellings are affordable to those on the housing register, then there may be opportunities for RSLs and developers to work with Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts. It would be better directed towards the Housing Development Team who co-ordinate and review partnership working on housing issues.	No change
Affordable Housing Policies					
Policy HS.4	Fairview Homes	AHSPD5/1	Objection: Object to the proposal to require affordable housing in residential development of at least 10 dwellings or on sites of 0.25ha or more.	This was debated at the Local Plan Inquiry. This is now an adopted Local Plan policy. The opportunity to object to this policy was during the review of the Local Plan.	No change
Paragraph 24	The Home Group	AHSPD20/6	Objection: There is concern that a threshold of 10 units may affect the viability of some sites for private developers and prevent development. Again there is a concern about numbers over unit types and tenure mix.	The issue of threshold was debated at the Local Plan Inquiry. This is now an adopted Local Plan policy. By applying the strategic mix, the units sizes that best meet need will be delivered. The cascade approach has been altered to allow for circumstances where if the proportion of affordable housing is reduced, the number of family sized dwellings will increase.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD20/9

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 25	Christ Church College	AHSPD2/2	Objection: Reference to “on site” in the penultimate line of this paragraph should be deleted. This is inconsistent with the advice provided in paragraph 39 which recognises in certain circumstances that it may be more appropriate, or there may be good planning reasons, why affordable housing should be provided off-site or financial contributions made in lieu of the provision of affordable housing. Suggest reference to “on site” in the penultimate line should be deleted.	Agree that there is an inconsistency with paragraph 39.	Delete "on site" from paragraph 25
Paragraph 26	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/4	Objection: The paragraph is more rigid than Policy HS.4 which allows an appropriate degree of flexibility. The text in the draft SPD therefore lacks an appropriate policy basis and will in fact act to limit the amount of affordable housing coming forward. Amend paragraph 26 as follows (deletions struck through): “ <i>Applicants for outline applications for residential development on sites with a gross area of 0.25ha or greater will automatically be expected to enter into a legal agreement to provide affordable housing on site in line with Policy HS.5. The standard clauses that should generally be included in the legal agreement are set out in Appendix 6.</i> ”	The presence of a legal agreement will not limit the amount of affordable housing coming forward. The use of a planning obligation is a standard and accepted method by which affordable housing is delivered.	No change
Paragraph 26	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/7	Objection: This is at odds with Government Guidance. Applicant's cannot automatically be required to enter into a legal agreement. Circular 5/2005 makes it clear that a legal agreement is to be negotiated - unless it is a unilateral undertaking.	The text says "automatically expected". Affordable housing will be delivered via a S106 agreement which will include the elements in Appendix 6.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 27	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/5	Objection: Specifying that the gross number of proposed dwellings will be taken into account rather than the net increase when considering whether development meets the threshold for providing affordable housing goes beyond the adopted local plan policy. The proposal therefore lacks an appropriate policy basis. The proposal will in fact have the effect of preventing the renewal of ageing housing stock as it will not be economically viable to undertake the redevelopment to provide new units in accordance with modern requirements.Delete paragraph 27.	The proposal does not lack an appropriate policy basis. The use of the gross number of dwellings is referred to in paragraph 7.2.3 of the Local Plan. The Local Plan Inspector supported this view in his report (paragraph 7.5.2).	No change
Paragraph 27	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/8	Objection: This paragraph is wholly unreasonable as it provides a major disincentive for residential intensification - we suspect this is the actual reason for this change in policy, which is not in any way justified. Delete paragraph.	There is no presumption against residential intensification in Oxford. Local Plan policies exist to make the most of land including the sub-division of dwellings and efficient use of land. The use of the gross number of dwellings is referred to in paragraph 7.2.3 of the Local Plan. The Local Plan Inspector supported this view in his report (paragraph 7.5.2).	
Paragraph 27	University College	AHSPD22/2	Objection: It is inappropriate to base an affordable housing contribution on the basis of the gross increase in housing on a given site.	The use of the gross number of dwellings is referred to in paragraph 7.2.3 of the Local Plan. The Local Plan Inspector supported this view in his report (paragraph 7.5.2).	No change
Paragraph 27	Christ Church College	AHSPD2/3	Objection: The threshold for providing affordable housing should be should be the net increase not the gross number of buildings. The Draft SPD currently considers that the threshold for providing affordable housing should be based on the gross number of proposed dwellings and not the net increase. This could stifle development and act as a disincentive for developers to re-develop existing residential sites/uses for higher densities and thus have a negative impact on the provision of affordable housing in Oxford. Suggest the threshold for providing affordable housing should be based on the net increase of units.	The use of the gross number of dwellings is referred to in paragraph 7.2.3 of the Local Plan. The Local Plan Inspector supported this view in his report (paragraph 7.5.2).	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 27	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/5	Objection: It may not always be practical to base calculations of the affordable housing provision on gross provision rather than net provision. In order to maximise land use, sites with low density developments, that could be developed at a higher density, should be considered against existing use value. The existing properties on site should be considered in establishing a reasonable quantum of affordable housing because a significant premium over the existing houses' market value is usually paid in order to encourage occupants with no other reason to move that they should do so. Therefore the principle of gross provision may not always be appropriate.	The use of the gross number of dwellings is referred to in paragraph 7.2.3 of the Local Plan. The Local Plan Inspector supported this view in his report (paragraph 7.5.2).	No change
Paragraph 27	Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts	AHSPD17/3	Objection: Site assembly of sites involving existing residential use is the most "expensive". Whilst application of this policy will make sense on some sites, where a small number of effectively redundant houses are demolished to make way for much higher densities, its application in cases that might be characterized as "urban renewal" where many homes are replaced on a new for old basis plus a few more created by increasing the resulting density would be completely unviable. Rose Hill Orlit redevelopment is an example.	If a development is considered unviable, developers have the opportunity to provide financial information as evidence. Therefore there is scope for flexibility should non-viability be an issue.	No change
Paragraph 24-27	Fairview Homes	AHSPD5/2	Objection: Object to the requirement that 50% of new housing should be affordable. Any specific requirement for affordable housing should be indicative and should be open to negotiation.	This was debated at the Local Plan Inquiry. This is now an adopted Local Plan policy. The opportunity to object to this policy was during the review of the Local Plan.	No change
Paragraph 31	The Home Group	AHSPD20/7	Objection: Concern about economic viability of some sites and unit numbers taking priority over need and type of housing required, ie, larger family homes. OCC's Strategic Housing Conference in June 2005 urged the City to think in terms of habitable rooms rather than dwellings.	By applying the strategic mix, the units sizes that best meet need will be delivered. The cascade approach has been altered to allow for circumstances where if the proportion of affordable housing is reduced, the number of family sized dwellings will increase.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD20/9

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 31 onwards	Oxfordshire County Council	AHSPD18/3	Objection: The section on the Proportion of Affordable Housing indicates that a greater financial contribution will be sought for cash in lieu, for off-site provision, so that the outcome is a 50/50 provision of market and affordable housing. If this is the case, the requirement appears to be inequitable in that the developer of the housing site has to provide double the cost of on-site affordable housing via a cash payment. The OLP policy does not flag up this additional cost and therefore it would be useful for the SPD to clarify this. Some sites will have less than 50% affordable housing because of site circumstances, this could be acknowledged in this document.	Overall, the developer will provide funding for 50% affordable housing so it is equitable to providing affordable housing on site.	No change
Paragraph 33	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/9	Objection: Unlikely that any member of the consortia will be willing to supply detailed financial information in order to demonstrate non-viability of schemes. We also doubt the ability of the Council to interpret the necessary figures. One of the RSL partners indicated that the format was easy to manipulate. In practice land supply will dry up resulting in failure to provide affordable housing. Delete paragraph and accompanying Appendix 3.	We will use an independent consultant to analyse financial information. The Council also has staff who are expert in development finances.	No change
Paragraph 33	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/6	Objection: The proposed requirement to allow potentially sensitive financial information to be open to public scrutiny is an unrealistic and unacceptable burden upon the market which will simply act to prevent development proposals coming forward, thus reducing the amount of affordable housing coming forward and in fact undermining the Council's objectives. Amend paragraph 33 as follow (deletions struck through): " <i>Applicants who cite non-viability as the reason for not complying with Policy HS.5 must support their case with financial evidence, which they should submit with the planning application. The evidence will be open to public scrutiny, and where necessary will be audited by external experts.</i> "	In his report relating to the provision of affordable housing, the Local Plan Inspector stated that " <i>If an applicant considers that, in the circumstances of a particular case, there should be some lesser provision, the onus should be on that applicant to supply the necessary information to justify publicly some alternative position</i> ".	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 33	Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts	AHSPD17/4	Comment: This paragraph may provide the flexibility I mentioned in my comment to para 27	Noted	No change
Paragraph 33 and Appendix 3	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/6	Objection: Do not believe that developer profit is a material planning consideration and therefore Appendix 3 should be removed. No justification that a 15% profit margin is a reasonable expectation of every developer, whatever the associated risks to the development. Planning Officers and Members are inexperienced and very likely unqualified to assess the appropriate profits for a particular development.	If profit is not a material consideration, then the City Council could insist on much higher levels of affordable housing provision without having regard to viability. The level of profit is what makes a development viable or not and viability is clearly set out in PPS3 as a material consideration.	No change
Paragraph 33-36	The Home Group	AHSPD20/8	Objection: There is concern that developers will try to use viability on a regular basis to reduce the affordable contribution. What method would be used to illustrate the viability? Overall concern that Land Values will be decrease as effects will be passed onto land owners by the developers, this is not an issue for RSL's but may have an implication on the market, and release of land.	It is not considered that the viability of developments will have a long term effect on development coming forward. There will inevitable be a temporary slump in sites coming forward since the adoption of the Local Plan, which is to be expected, however in the long term development will continue. It has been acknowledged in Government guidance that land values will be reduced. Therefore this is to be expected and accepted.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 35	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/7	<p>Objection: The draft SPD states that the Council will expect developers to have had consideration the financial implications of the affordable housing policy requirements when purchasing the land for development. However, there will be sites which have been recently purchased before the affordable housing policy was known and were therefore unable to take it into consideration. A blanket policy to ignore the purchase price of the land is therefore unrealistic and unduly inflexible and will in fact prevent affordable housing coming forward. Amend paragraph 35 as follow (deletions struck though): “ <i>This information will be assessed on whether the figures show satisfactorily that the scheme would be unviable with 50% affordable housing. The City Council expects developers to have considered the financial implications of the affordable housing policy requirements when purchasing the land for development.</i>”</p>	<p>The Local Plan was adopted in November 2005. Previous to this, the draft Local Plan, which drafted the 50% affordable housing (plus 10% key worker housing) provision policy, was published in June 2002. It would have therefore been prudent for developers to consider the proposed affordable housing policies from that point onwards when purchasing land. Although it should be common sense, it is considered necessary to include this statement to ensure that developers do factor in the affordable housing policies when doing their calculations as the overvaluation of land will not be accepted as a reason for not providing the expected level of affordable housing.</p>	No change
Paragraph 36	The Home Group	AHSPD20/9	<p>Objection: Add third bullet point: "alter the mix of affordable dwellings"</p>	<p>Make change that incorporates altering the mix of dwellings</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 36: "<u>second, progressively amend the mix of dwellings so that overall the proportion of affordable housing is reduced but the size of dwellings are increased to better meet housing need, reduce the affordable housing requirement.</u>"</p>

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 38	Oxfordshire County Council	AHSPD18/4	Objection: Paragraph 38 asserts that “The requirement for affordable housing will extend to retirement homes”, as it falls into the same use class as Residential. The definition of “Residential” and “Residential Institution” (where an element of personal care is provided) could be more carefully defined. If this requirement is applied to private care homes, it is likely to reduce the provision and thereby increase the cost of residential accommodation purchased on the market in Oxfordshire. Notwithstanding the definition of Residential and Residential Institution, the County Council's provision of places in care homes for the elderly or disabled would fall within the definition of “affordable housing” because it provides housing for those in greatest need.	The provision of affordable housing from a residential institution will apply where there are self-contained retirement dwellings proposed on site. If the affordable units are developed on the same site as the market retirement homes it is generally more appropriate that they are affordable retirement dwellings. There are people of retirement age who are in need of affordable housing so by expecting it on sites of retirement homes would not be reducing provision for the elderly across Oxford.	No change
Paragraph 39	The Home Group	AHSPD20/10	Objection: Integration of units is common but locations need to be decided in conjunction with the partner RSLs to enable management issues to be identified and minimised.	Government guidance is that the presumption is for on-site contributions and so it is only in in some exceptional circumstances that off-site contributions will be sought instead of on-site contributions (adopted Local Plan Policy HS.6)	No change
Paragraph 39	Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts	AHSPD17/5	Comment: The Community Land Trusts mechanism means that every household on a site is likely to own at least some of the equity in their own homes. It may therefore be a better mechanism for developers aiming at "exclusivity" in their development as it will be impossible to know which households are wholly owned by the occupiers and which only a small percentage owned.	Agree it is positive to ensure that different types and levels of affordable housing is well integrated with the development.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 39-40	Christ Church College	AHSPD2/4	Objection: It is an entirely reasonable and practicable approach to allow a flexible approach on the levels of affordable housing and its delivery on or off site for sites in the same ownership. The SPD should make specific reference to allowing such flexibility on sites under the same ownership in the West End. For examples, where there are existing concentrations of social housing where more benefit would be gained by locating new affordable housing in a different location. Suggest amending text to identify the potential for land use packages to include affordable housing on nearby sites within the same ownership.	The consideration of a number of different sites under the same ownership is possible where the planning permissions would be tied to each other. It is not considered necessary to specify in the SPD particular locations in Oxford where this might be appropriate. The issue of whether or not there was too high a concentration of affordable housing in some areas of Oxford will be judged against Policy HS.8 (Balance of Dwellings) in the Local Plan. This ensures that mixed and balanced communities are maintained.	No change
Paragraph 42	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/8	Objection: The Local Plan accepts that there will be situations in which providing off site contributions is preferable to affordable housing on site. However, the draft SPD's suggestion that a greater financial contribution than the equivalent on site provision will be expected will effectively undermine this provision of the Local Plan. The proposal therefore goes beyond the powers afforded to supplementary planning documents and will have the effect of preventing affordable housing coming forward. Delete paragraph 42.	It is agreed that there may be situations where off site provision is more appropriate. This paragraph ensures that of the new housing that is developed, 50% will be affordable, which is what Policy HS.5 seeks to achieve.	No change
Paragraph 42-44	The Home Group	AHSPD20/11	Objection: The requirement for 100% contribution off site rather than 50% on site may be excessive affecting viability.TCI need to be replaced in the contribution calculation formula as it is no longer in use. Consider use of a matrix similar to other LA's	Of the new housing that is developed, 50% will be affordable, which is what Policy HS.5 seeks to achieve.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 42 and 49	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/7	<p>Objection: By making a cash contribution towards affordable housing instead the developer would, in effect, be providing affordable housing providers not only with free affordable housing but also allowing them to use the rental stream for their own purposes. The correct method of determining developer subsidy (and thus the amount of commuted sum to be provided) is by assessing the cost of providing the affordable housing unit and deducting the two components of funding available to the affordable housing provider. Given that the principle of commuted sum equalling the developer subsidy had the affordable housing been provided on site is universally accepted, it is wrong for the Council to seek 50% of the total of both sites to make a contribution, when the secondary site is not a qualifying site to provide affordable housing.</p>	<p>Accept that the method for calculating developer contribution should have included reference to amount RSL would normally put in.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 43 to read: "<u>The amount of this payment will be equivalent to reflect the cost of providing building the required number of affordable dwellings of the size and type set out in the City Council's strategic mix for city-centre and out-of-centre sites combined (Table 2) and the value of the land needed to build them on at open market value, minus the amount equivalent to what would be payable by an RSL. The payment may also be used to purchase existing dwellings to use as affordable housing.</u>"</p>

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
					<p>Amend paragraph 49 to read: "<u>The City Council encourages mixed-use developments in appropriate locations as they promote sustainable communities. In order of preference, this is how the City Council decides the method of contribution: The standard method of contribution from commercial development would be financial. The contribution will be equivalent to the cost of building the required number of affordable dwellings of the size and type set out in the City Council's strategic mix for city centre and out-of-centre sites combined (Table 2) and the value of the land needed to build them on at open market value minus the amount equivalent to what would be payable by an RSL. The formula for calculating the financial contribution is set out in Appendix 4.</u>" Delete bullet points a)-c) of paragraph 49.</p>

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 45 onwards	Oxfordshire County Council	AHSPD18/5	<p>Objection: Provision of affordable housing by commercial developers in Policy HS.7 of the OLP is limited to those developments that have “significant demand” for affordable housing for their workers. However, the SPD appears to require the provision of on/off-site affordable housing for 5% of their workers regardless of the size of the commercial development and the likely number of workers requiring affordable housing. I wonder if the principle for commercial development shouldn’t follow the policy for off-site residential provision where double the numbers of affordable units have to be provided. It would be helpful if the affordable housing requirements could be clearer regarding the term “in perpetuity”. It might be sensible to use, for example, the Housing Corporations definition of 21 years. Under the <i>Method of Contribution</i> Section there could be further clarification over when payments/provision will be required. Often contributions are required in advance of provision of the rest of the development.</p>	<p>Policy HS.7 shows a presumption that affordable housing contributions from commercial development will be financial and therefore the SPD should be amended to reflect this. In order to better determine whether a significant demand has been created, it is considered helpful to give an indicative threshold.</p>	<p><u>Amend paragraph 47 to read: " Policy HS.7 contains no size threshold at which a contribution will be sought, however, an indicative threshold of around 2,000 sq.m. will be used to indicate that a contribution will be expected, as this size of development would be considered to generate a significant need for affordable housing ; There is no threshold on the size of commercial development to which Policy HS.7 relates. All sizes of commercial development can generate a need for affordable housing so small sites are not excluded from Policy HS.7. Whilst this indicative threshold exists, smaller commercial developments can generate a significant need for affordable housing. These will be considered on a case by case basis. "</u></p>
Paragraph 45-57	The Home Group	AHSPD20/12	<p>Objection: Although it is understood that policy is currently encouraging mixed use development, in some cases, such as family housing, it may not be suitable to provide the affordable housing on the development. Could HQIs be used to assess the suitability and sustainability of a site for residential development? Who would measure this and what would be the trigger/cascade point between a), b), and c)?There are concerns that commuted sums can be used for funding requirements other than new affordable homes, such as decent homes standard. We are keen to see the reaction of the commercial developers to these clauses.</p>	<p>Policy HS.7 shows a presumption that affordable housing contributions from commercial development will be financial and therefore the SPD will be amended to reflect this. However, on mixed use schemes where residential is an element, the presumptions will be for providing the affordable housing on site. The S106 will ensure that any financial contributions received will only be used on the provision of additional affordable housing (either new build or purchasing existing properties). This does not include the improvement of existing affordable housing.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 45	Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts	AHSPD17/6	Comment: OCLT are also investigating an innovative financing mechanism, using limited liability partnerships to create an investment bond like structure that would allow employers seeking to provide affordable housing to invest in an index linked income stream generated by that housing.	Noted, although this is too much detail for an SPD.	No change
Paragraph 46	Oxford Radcliffe NHS Trust	AHSPD15/2	Objection: The text relating to Policy HS.7 in the adopted Local Plan specifically excludes health sector developments, although this is not included within the SPD. A specific comment should be included to the effect that health and other public sector developments should be excluded, thus mirroring the comment for D2 uses under C2 which would include hospitals.	The last sentence in Paragraph 46 states: <i>"...except for retail and non-profit making public sector projects such as those in the education and health sectors."</i> This is considered to adequately make the point.	No change
Paragraph 46	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/9	Objection: Non-profit organisations such as charities should also be exempt from the requirement to contribute towards affordable housing in order to ensure that their resources are focused on fulfilling their work. Amend paragraph 46 as follows (additions highlighted in bold): <i>"All commercial development that is considered to generate a need for affordable housing would be expected to contribute to the provision of affordable housing, except for retail and non-profit making public sector projects such as those in the education and health sectors <u>or charities</u>."</i>	It is not considered necessary to expand on the sectors stated in the paragraph. Any other type of development will be considered on its merits.	No change
Paragraph 46	Oxford Science Park Joint Venture	AHSPD16/1	Objection: It should be clarified whether charities, such as Oxford Colleges and private education developments are exempt from providing affordable housing on the same basis as public sector services. There is no reason why retail property should be exempt as this sector is more likely to employ staff on lower wages than other sectors. Reword paragraph: <i>"All commercial development that is considered to <u>that generates</u> a need for affordable housing"</i>	This policy will be applied to all commercial developments that generate a significant demand for affordable housing. However, it will not be applied to retail developments or to non-profit making public sector projects, such as those in the education and health sectors.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraphs 47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 57. Appendix 4, Table A4.3	University College	AHSPD22/1	Objection: Object to method of calculating contribution to affordable housing from commercial development. Including objection that the Local Plan policy says "...financial or other..." contribution, where as the SPD's preference is for on site contribution.	Accept that Policy HS.7 refers to the contribution being "... <i>financial or other...</i> "	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD13/7
Paragraph 47	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/10	Objection: The supporting text to Policy HS.7 at paragraph 7.3.2 of the Local Plan refers to commercial developments which generate a "significant" need for affordable housing. It is therefore incorrect for the draft SPD to state that there is no threshold on the size of commercial development to which policy HS.7 relates. Delete paragraph 47.	In order to better determine whether a significant demand has been created, it is considered helpful to give an indicative threshold.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD18/5
Paragraph 47	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/10	Objection: There should be a minimum threshold for the provision of affordable housing on commercial sites otherwise this new policy will provide a major disincentive for the provision of small scale, low value business space. Suggest a threshold on 1000sq.m. which is the level that other contribution policies bite and is consistent with that approach.	In order to better determine whether a significant demand has been created, it is considered helpful to give an indicative threshold.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD18/5
Paragraph 48	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/11	Objection: The supporting text to Policy HS.7 at paragraph 7.3.2 of the Local Plan refers to commercial developments which generate a "significant" need for affordable housing. It is therefore incorrect for the Draft SPD to state that there is no threshold on the size of commercial development to which policy HS.7 relates. Amend paragraph 48 as follows (additions highlighted in bold): " <i>In deciding which types of commercial development should make a contribution, the City Council would consider whether the development would generate <u>significant</u> need for affordable housing. The examples of commercial development below demonstrate the City Council's approach:</i> "	In order to better determine whether a significant demand has been created, it is considered helpful to give an indicative threshold.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD18/5

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 48	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/12	Objection: Second bullet point. Requiring a company which locates from one base in Oxford to another to contribute towards affordable housing, even if the relocation does not create significant new need in itself but may free up commercial space into which another company could “potentially” move, lacks an appropriate justification. It will place an inappropriately onerous burden upon companies which will prevent the proper operation of the market and potentially cause significant harm to Oxford’s economy. Delete second bullet point of paragraph 48.	If a commercial company moves to a new site, it's previous site will have an existing use class that may qualify for providing a contribution towards affordable housing. The relocation of the company has therefore freed up commercial floorspace for a new company to potentially move to and therefore the company relocating will be expected to make a contribution. However, only where at the same time as the application for the new commercial development, the previous site is redeveloped for an alternate land use, would no contribution be required due to no new need being created.	Delete second bullet point from paragraph 48
Paragraph 48	Oxford Science Park Joint Venture	AHSPD16/2	Objection: First bullet point does not refer to the "need" test outlined in the policy and assumes that a change of use would create demand. Second bullet point should be deleted. It would not be possible to enforce.	A change of use from one use to a commercial use would create new commercial employment space. The proposal would then be judged against whether or not this was a significant need.	No change
Paragraph 48	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/13	Objection: Third bullet point. The requirement for both the residential and commercial elements of a mixed-use development to contribute to the provision of affordable housing lacks an appropriate policy basis and is an inappropriately onerous requirement which will stifle new development coming forward, especially since the provision of a mix of uses is likely to have already have an impact upon the viability of a scheme. It will therefore prevent new development coming forward, harming both Oxford’s economy and the overall provision of affordable housing. Delete third bullet point of paragraph 48.	It is recognised that the profit generated from a commercial scheme tends to be less than a residential scheme and that commercial development built on spec expects a greater profit than a scheme built with a guaranteed lessee. Therefore, any contribution sought from the commercial element must not be so onerous as to discourage mixed use schemes. In terms of the provision of affordable housing, both the commercial element and the residential element should be considered independently because developing one of these land uses does not mitigate against the need for affordable housing generated by the other. This is because the contribution from the residential element would be required regardless of whether the commercial development took place or not due to the high need for affordable housing in Oxford anyway.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 48	Christ Church College	AHSPD2/5	Objection: Affordable housing contributions based on commercial development should only relate to the net increase in floorspace. In addition, where new residential accommodation is provided as part of a mixed use development, and meets the affordable housing required under Policy HS.4 in accordance with the residential element, it would be inappropriate to also require affordable housing provision in relation to the commercial element.	In terms of the provision of affordable housing, both the commercial element and the residential element should be considered independently because developing one of these land uses does not mitigate against the need for affordable housing generated by the other. This is because the contribution from the residential element would be required regardless of whether the commercial development took place or not due to the high need for affordable housing in Oxford anyway.	No change
Paragraph 49	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/14	Objection: The proposed method of contribution for affordable housing is overly rigid and does not allow the particular circumstances of development to be taken into consideration, either at the construction or the management stage. It will therefore prevent new development coming forward, harming both Oxford's economy and the overall provision of affordable housing. Paragraph 49 should be deleted.	The purpose of Paragraph 49 gives the opportunity to take into account the particular circumstance of the development by allowing flexibility in how the contribution is made.	No change
Paragraph 49	Oxford Science Park Joint Venture	AHSPD16/3	Objection: "appropriate" location should be defined.	It is not possible to define what 'appropriate' is as it will be determined on a site by site basis.	No change
Paragraph 50-57	Oxford Science Park Joint Venture	AHSPD16/4	Objection: This section does not accord with the test set out in Policy HS.7 relating to need. Should be re-worded so that it only relates to development that directly generates a need for affordable housing.	In order to better determine whether a significant demand has been created, it is considered helpful to give an indicative threshold.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD18/5

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 51	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/15	Objection: The supporting text to Policy HS.7 at paragraph 7.3.2 states that commercial development which generate a "significant" demand for affordable housing will need to provide an affordable housing contribution. The proposed text at paragraph 51 of the draft SPD therefore lacks an appropriate policy basis to suggest that all commercial development will create affordable housing need unless developers provide evidence to suggest otherwise. It will therefore prevent new development coming forward, harming both Oxford's economy and the overall provision of affordable housing. Paragraph 51 should therefore be deleted.	In order to better determine whether a significant demand has been created, it is considered helpful to give an indicative threshold.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD18/5
Paragraph 51	Oxford Science Park Joint Venture	AHSPD16/5	Objection: It should be up to the City Council to prove that a need for affordable housing is directly related to a commercial development and not up to the occupier or developer to prove otherwise.	Sentence has been reconsidered and it is not considered necessary to refer to question whether or not developments generate a need.	Amend last sentence of paragraph 51 to read: " <i>The City Council therefore assumes that all commercial development will create affordable housing need, unless developers provide evidence to suggest otherwise.</i> "
Paragraph 51	Christ Church College	AHSPD2/6	Objection: It is inappropriate to "assume that all commercial development will create affordable housing need". Existing commercial occupiers may reconsider small-scale redevelopment proposals which could enhance existing buildings and the local environments. Suggest altering text to read " <u><i>The City Council may seek a financial (or other contribution) towards affordable housing from commercial development of an appropriate scale, if financially viable</i></u> "	In order to better determine whether a significant demand has been created, it is considered helpful to give an indicative threshold.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD18/5

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 53	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/16	Objection: The proposal that a contribution towards affordable housing should be equivalent to 5% of the estimated number of employees of a commercial development has no policy basis in the adopted local plan. It is therefore inappropriate to make such a proposal in the draft SPD. Moreover, as the SPD acknowledges, this is an entirely "arbitrary" figure with no reasoned justification at all. This is an entirely inappropriate way to produce planning policies.Paragraph 53 should therefore be deleted.	It is too complicated to assess the exact number of employees on a certain salary scale for each proposed commercial development, especially when the development is speculative. It is therefore more simple to use a standard figure for each site.The level of contribution has been reconsidered.	Amend paragraph 53 to read: " <i>The City Council considers that the contribution should be equivalent to providing affordable housing for generally a minimum of <u>1.5</u> % of the estimated number of employees of the commercial development. <u>This figure is considered a reasonable level of contribution to expect that will not discourage commercial development.</u> The City Council thinks it fair to use <u>a percentage</u> this arbitrary figure as it gives applicants a clear and consistent approach to follow. "</i>
Paragraph 53	Oxford Science Park Joint Venture	AHSPD16/6	Objection: There is no evidence provided to justify the 5% figure. This does not refer to a needs test. Reference to 5% should be deleted and replaced with a needs test of actual demand.	It is too complicated to assess the exact number of employees on a certain salary scale for each proposed commercial development, especially when the development is speculative. It is therefore more simple to use a standard figure for each site.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD12/16
Paragraph 53	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/11	Objection: Object to the arbitrary figure of 5% for staff in commercial development. Using this figure a development of 2,000 sq.m. would require a developer contribution of well over £1 million, which is clearly unrealistic.	It is too complicated to assess the exact number of employees on a certain salary scale for each proposed commercial development, especially when the development is on spec. It is therefore more simple to use a standard figure for each site. The figure has been reduced from 5% to 1% to ensure the viability of commercial developments.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD12/16

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 54	Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts	AHSPD17/7	Objection: Tied accommodation should be avoided wherever possible. Better to allow employers to invest in housing provision to add to the general pool of affordable housing through such investment schemes as the Open Capital Partnership idea. Tied accommodation is usually a commercial necessity - such as for enabling staff to remain on site overnight. It is not really suitable as general use housing and its applicability to this paper is questionable.	If developers provide staff accommodation in accordance with Policy HS.16, then they needn't provide affordable housing. This staff accommodation would be tied to the employee on a similar basis as a key worker homes would be tied to a key worker.	No change
Paragraph 55	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/17	Objection: The proposal that a contribution towards affordable housing should be calculated on the basis of completely unjustified employee/floorspace ratios which rely in part upon an entirely "arbitrary" figure of 5% of the estimated number of employees has no policy basis in the adopted local plan. It is therefore entirely inappropriate to suggest it in the draft Affordable Housing SPD. Paragraph 55 should therefore be deleted.	Employee/floor space ratios have been determined from DTZ and SEERA data. It is too complicated to assess the exact number of employees on a certain salary scale for each proposed commercial development, especially when the development is on spec. It is therefore more simple to use a standard figure for each site.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD12/16
Paragraph 55	Oxford Science Park Joint Venture	AHSPD16/7	Objection: This paragraph refers to speculative development from which no demand for affordable housing would have been generated. It would not be reasonable to assume levels of demand. This would not meet the tests of Circular 5/2005 on Planning Obligations.	Because of the high house prices in Oxford, all types of development will generate a need regardless of knowing who will be occupying the development. This does meet the tests of Circular 05/2005.	No change
Paragraph 57	Oxford Science Park Joint Venture	AHSPD16/8	Comment: It is assumed that the reference should be to Paragraph 49.	Noted	Amend.
Design Issues					
Table 2	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/18	Objection: The suggested mix of affordable housing on city centre and out of centre sites is inappropriately prescriptive and lacks an appropriately policy basis in the adopted Local Plan. Table 2 should therefore be deleted.	Policy HS.5 states that " <i>In assessing the mix of affordable dwellings types and sizes, the City Council will have regard to the characteristics of the site and tot its Supplementary Planning Documents</i> ". This Affordable Housing SPD serves that purpose.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Table 2 and paragraphs 59-63	Linden Homes	AHSPD11/1	Objection: Suggest additional paragraph: " <u>Subject to the submission of an affordable financial appraisal, the Council will review the mix of affordable housing and allow a reduction in overall provision in circumstances where the scheme viability is prejudiced.</u> "	Paragraph 36 sets out how the Council will approach the negotiations if non-viability is proven.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD20/9
paragraphs 59-63	Fairview Homes	AHSPD5/3	Objection: Object to specific housing mixes and tenures being set for developments and consider that there must be sufficient flexibility for the composition of residential development to be determined by developers at the time an application is submitted.	Paragraph 7.2.7 of the Local Plan states that the SPD will indicate the mix of affordable housing to be secured. The City Council will seek the delivery of affordable dwellings that best meet local need which is set out in table 2. In some cases, due to site constraints, it may be necessary to vary the mix although it is not envisaged that such a mix could not be achieved in the majority of cases.	No change
paragraphs 59-63	Carter Jonas LLP	AHSPD1/1	Objection: The Affordable Housing SPD should recognise that it will not always be appropriate or desirable to provide a broad range of dwelling types on all sites (particularly small sites). There will often need to be a balance struck between making the most efficient use of land (Local Plan policy CP.6) and delivering a broad range of dwelling types. On smaller sites, the provision of 3 and 4 bedroom affordable units is unlikely to be achievable.	It is recognised that some small sites may not physically be able to achieve the mix set out in Table 2. In all cases, the City Council will seek a mix of dwelling sizes that is appropriate to the site. Where constraints of the site limit family sized dwellings, this will be taken into consideration in judging whether an appropriate mix has been achieved.	Insert new sentence at end of paragraph 61: " <u>Where constraints of the site limit family sized dwellings, this will be taken into consideration when judging whether an appropriate mix has been achieved.</u> "
Paragraph 60	The Home Group	AHSPD20/13	Objection: 80% rented units is very high. As rented units tend to have negative land values RSLs would be unlikely to generate much of a land value for a scheme unless grant was provided.	The 80/20 split was identified in the Housing Requirements Study to best meet local housing need. The Housing Viability Study tested this tenure provision. There is opportunity to alter the tenure split should viability be proven as an issue. The Government has indicated that land values will be reduced to compensate for the provision of affordable housing. This is to be expected.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 60	Westgate Partnership	AHSPD24/1	Objection: The Westgate Partnership request that the text of Para 60 be amended to more accurately reflect the wording of Policy HS.5 of the adopted local plan. The tenure split identified on a site by site basis with regard to the specific site characteristics and any discussions with the Housing Association provider. The following additional text is suggested: - " <i>...will generally expect a tenure split of 80% social rented and 20% shared ownership on each site <u>however the exact split will be determined based on local site characteristics</u> .</i> "	The tenure of the affordable housing is unlikely to be affected by the characteristics of a site. Site characteristics are more likely to affect house size. For example, in City centre sites higher densities are generally more appropriate as the sites are often more constrained.	No change
Paragraph 60	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/12	Objection: Object to the proposed tenure mix in combinations with a 50% provision. This is likely to mean there is no incentive for the developer to proceed with the development. The Local Plan Inspector indicated that the City Council should avoid being over prescriptive. This proposed mix is too prescriptive and more flexibility should be built in.	The tenure mix was derived from the Housing Requirements Study and therefore best meets local housing needs. The Housing Viability Study tested sites with this tenure mix.	No change
Paragraph 60	Christ Church College	AHSPD2/7	Objection: Stating a tenure split of 80% social rented and 20% shared ownership on each site is considered to be overly prescriptive. Suggest: " <i>...in certain circumstances, to meet the aims of mixed and balanced communities, it may be appropriate to have a different split of social rented and shored ownership from the 80/20 split generally expected.</i> "	The tenure split of 80/20 was derived from evidence in the Housing requirements study to best meet housing need in Oxford. The tenure split would only be altered if a development was proved unviable at 80/20.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 60	Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts	AHSPD17/8	Objection: As noted in my comment to para 16 above, OCLT would dispute the real need for this mix and assert that it is only because no other mechanism was available at the time of Fordham to enable housing to be affordable for the majority of people in the "intermediate market" (households where their income would be great enough to pay more than target rents but not enough to be able to afford to buy or rent privately). We would like to see a more flexible approach when dealing with the mutual ownership model of CLTs. Examples can be provided to show how households of different incomes, all below the threshold to be able to afford to buy or rent in the mainstream private market effectively "cross subsidise" each other to make the development pay for itself.	Should other mechanisms become available that provide affordable housing that is available to those in housing need in accordance with the Local Plan policies, then these may be considered.	No change
Paragraph 63	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/8	Objection: The setting of separate targets for tenure are overly prescriptive and does not take into account the role that intermediate tenures have to play in ensuring local households have housing choice. In an area like Oxford, the need for intermediate housing is likely to be large.	Intermediate housing would not meet the need of those in greatest housing need in Oxford, which is the priority. The Local Plan inspector considered intermediate housing not to be an option in Oxford as it is not affordable.	No change
Paragraph 63	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/9	Objection: Current national policy does not support housing mix and tenure prescription on an individual site basis, but instead advises that consideration should be given to site specific circumstances, housing need at the time of the application and the availability of grant funding.	Paragraph 7.2.7 of the Local Plan states that the SPD will indicate the mix of affordable housing to be secured. The City Council will seek the delivery of affordable dwellings that best meet local need.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 64	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/10	Objection: There may be cases where the affordable housing would be more appropriately provided on another site, for example, high density specialist housing for the elderly could not sensibly be combined with affordable housing in the mix indicated.	If the affordable units are developed on the same site as the market retirement homes it is probably more appropriate that they are affordable retirement dwellings. In exceptional circumstances the Council may agree that off site provision or a financial contribution should be made instead. In these cases, general affordable housing might be acceptable.	Amend paragraph 38 to read: " <i>The requirement for affordable housing extends to all types of residential development including retirement homes. A retirement home falls into the same use class as residential (class C3) and is therefore expected to contribute to the provision of affordable housing. In these cases it may be more appropriate for the provision to be affordable retirement housing. Care homes and nursing homes (class C2), which are not self-contained, are not required to provide affordable housing. A retirement home developed on land allocated for residential development is expected to provide affordable housing whether or not it includes self contained units.</i> "
Paragraph 63, table 2	The Home Group	AHSPD20/14	Objection: Shared ownership percentages need to be reversed providing 5% 1 bed and 15% 2 beds as 2 bed units are much more popular on the shared ownership market. Unit sizes need to be included rather than just no. of bedrooms. There is an understanding that there is a requirement for larger family accommodation but the Housing Corporation look at grant per unit which makes the larger units less value for money and therefore less likely to attract grant. How feasible is it to achieve the strategic mix on constrained sites?	Considering both the need and the grant issues, the proportion of shared ownership 1 and 2 bed dwellings is amended.	Amended Table 2 so that of the shared ownership dwellings both 1 bed and 2 bed dwellings are at 10%
Paragraph 63	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/13	Objection: We do not know the extent of the "City Centre" for applying this policy and feel that it is unreasonable to expect us to comment on this aspect of the policy when there is no map available.	There were no changes to the City Centre boundary since it was first published in the First Draft Local Plan map. Any changes would have been shown in the Second Draft Map changes booklet or the Pre-Inquiry Changes booklet.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
			Table 2 appears to indicate that there is no requirement for 3-4 bedrooms shared ownership properties. This is not our understanding of the need's of RSLs. Amend table accordingly.	3 and 4 bed shared ownership dwellings are not affordable in Oxford and therefore would not serve a purpose in meeting local housing need. The Housing Requirements Study also shows a negligible need for 3 and 4 bed shared ownership dwellings.	No change
Paragraph 64	The Home Group	AHSPD20/15	Comment: Tenure blindness is very important in developing sustainable communities.	Noted and agreed	No change
Paragraph 64	Carter Jonas LLP	AHSPD1/2	Objection: In terms of the smaller sites that come forward in the Oxford area, a more flexible approach should be adopted, recognising the practical implications of mixing affordable and open market units within a single development block. In most instances, both the Registered Social Landlord and developer will prefer separate development blocks, albeit that on small sites they will be juxtaposed, helping to create a mixed community.	It is recognised that in some instances, it is more practical to have separate blocks for the affordable and market dwellings, however, the City Council's priority would be to develop mixed communities and therefore a change to the SPD is not considered necessary.	No change
Paragraph 64	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/19	Objection: The proposal that affordable housing should, as far as practicable, be distributed across the entire development is an inappropriately onerous requirement which will undermine the viability of the schemes and therefore in fact act to undermine affordable housing coming forward. Amend paragraph 64 as follows (deletions struck through): " <i>The City Council will usually expect affordable housing to be provided on site as part of the proposed development. The City Council will take into account the design quality and siting of the affordable housing in determining the application. The affordable housing should not be visually or operationally distinguishable from market or housing in such terms as details, build quality and materials etc. Also, the affordable housing should, as far as practicable, be dispersed across the development to create a mixed communities and avoid concentrations of affordable housing.</i> "	The City Council strongly disagrees that affordable housing should be distinguishable from the market dwellings on site. It is not considered that sites in Oxford are of such a scale that significant difficulties would be caused by affordable dwellings being dispersed across a site.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 64	Iffley Road Area Residents Association	AHSPD8/1	Objection: I would like to see a much stronger and more explicit commitment to design quality in both the internal and external design of all new and refurbished housing in Oxford, especially affordable housing. I suggest that the poor design that characterises private sector housing generally should be more strongly resisted, and should not create the context into which affordable housing is required to blend. I notice that many of the new developments in other places illustrated in the draft document do demonstrate a very welcome understanding of what design quality might mean in practice. The illustrations of developments in Oxford, however, suggest to me that the City Council could be more demanding. It is perhaps not easy to be explicit in defining design quality, but one can try.	Good design of new development is considered very important by the City Council. This is reflected in the Local Plan policies CP.7-CP.11. Generally speaking, it is agreed with the objector that the design quality of affordable housing developments in Oxford have not been to a high standard, especially in comparison with other examples from other areas as illustrated in the SPD. These examples were included to show that affordable housing can be designed to a high standard and that innovative design is encouraged in Oxford and therefore it is considered that the SPD could add a further emphasis on design.	Insert new sentence in paragraph 64: " <i>Innovative design is also encouraged.</i> "
Paragraph 65	Westgate Partnership	AHSPD24/2	Comment: We note an error in the text of Paragraph 65 and request the addition of text as follows: -"if the SDS are not met, RSL's would not receive funding..."	This is a typographical error.	Amend paragraph 65 to read: "" <i>If the SDS standards are not met, RSLs would <u>not</u> receive funding from the Housing Corporation.</i> "
Paragraph 65	Westgate Partnership	AHSPD24/3	Objection: The Westgate Partnership request the addition of text to provide for individual site characteristics to be taken into account in the design of housing schemes as follows" <i>...affordable housing should also meet lifetimes homes standards <u>where practicable</u> ...</i> "	The sentence in the SPD is inconsistent with Policy HS.12 although not with the wording the objector describes. The paragraph has been deleted as Policy HS.12 only refers only to market housing	Paragraph 71 deleted.
Paragraph 65	Oxfordshire County Council	AHSPD18/6	Comment: For Paragraph 65, should the sentence read 'if the SDS are not met, RSLs would <u>not</u> receive funding from the Housing Corporation'?	This is a typographical error.	Amend paragraph 65 to read: "" <i>If the SDS standards are not met, RSLs would <u>not</u> receive funding from the Housing Corporation.</i> "

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 65-66	The Home Group	AHSPD20/16	Objection: In order to secure Housing Corporation grant, schemes will need to achieve HQI scores, ecohomes, NHBC, the use of MMC and Secured by Design in addition to Lifetime Homes and SDS. The levels required for each of these measures are likely to change each bid round. Wording proposed: " <i>All affordable units must comply with Housing Corporation standards necessary to achieve grant at the actual point at which the agreement between the RSL and the developer to deliver the affordable units, is signed to start on site..</i> ". Suggested size matrix proposed. See further comments.	Agree that a size matrix would be helpful. The SPD refers to planning related standard but it is not considered appropriate to refer to all other standards.	No change
Paragraph 65	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/11	Objection: It is not appropriate to make Scheme Development Standards and Lifetime Homes standards compulsory through the use of planning agreements.	This is the only method by which it can be ensured that standards are met.	No change
Paragraph 65	Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts	AHSPD17/10	Comment: Typo - 'not'	This is a typographical error.	Amend paragraph 65 to read: " <i>If the SDS standards are not met, RSLs would <u>not</u> receive funding from the Housing Corporation.</i> "
Paragraph 67	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/12	Objection: The aspiration to ensure independent access is reasonable, but the practicalities of achieving this on all sites is unlikely given the demands placed on ground floor accommodation, especially in city centre locations where developments may be in mixed use.	The City Council's housing team consider that independent front doors would be suitable for some tenants. These will be negotiated where appropriate.	No change
Paragraph 67	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/20	Objection: The proposed requirement for some one bedroom social rented dwellings on the ground floor is not supported by any appropriate level of justification. It is an inappropriately onerous requirement without any policy basis which will act to undermine the viability of schemes and therefore in fact prevent affordable housing coming forward. Paragraph 67 should therefore be deleted.	The City Council's housing team are best placed to offer an opinion on the most appropriate method for housing vulnerable people which is reflected in this paragraph. The provision of some one bed dwellings to have a door to the outside rather than to an internal corridor is not considered onerous. It is highly unlikely that the cost of providing an external front door as opposed to an internal front door is going to affect the viability of a development.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 67	The Home Group	AHSPD20/17	Objection: The provision of a unit with an independent front door is likely to cause design issues and additional costs. In some cases an external front door is likely to make a resident more vulnerable. It might be better to suggest that the design needs to consider that some social rented residents may have specific needs that require independent arrangements.	The City Council's housing team consider that independent front doors would be suitable for some tenants. These will be negotiated where appropriate.	No change
Paragraph 68	Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts	AHSPD17/9	Comment: Housing needs could be met and exceeded by bringing more of the existing residential stock up to these sort of densities.	This type of redevelopment is an issue to be considered by the Housing Development team and is not an issue for the SPD.	No change
Paragraph 68	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/21	Objection: Policy CP.6 in fact states that residential developments should "generally" achieve a minimum density of 40 dwellings per hectare. The paragraph should therefore be amended to ensure accurate consistency with the adopted Local Plan. Amend text as follows (additions highlighted in bold): " <i>In Oxford, there is a huge need for housing, but only a limited amount of land available for development. The City Council therefore expects land to be developed efficiently. The City Council requires that residential developments <u>generally</u> achieve a minimum density of 40 dwellings per hectare and higher densities are appropriate in many locations.</i> "	Accept that the sentence should be consistent with Policy CP.6	Amend paragraph to read: " <i>The City Council requires that residential developments <u>should generally</u> achieve a minimum density of 40 dwellings per hectare and higher densities are appropriate in many locations</i> "
Paragraph 68, 70	The Home Group	AHSPD20/18	Objection: It must be ensured that the priority is the mix of units to suit need and not just numbers.	By applying the strategic mix, the units sizes that best meet need will be delivered. The cascade approach has been altered to allow for circumstances where if the proportion of affordable housing is reduced, the number of family sized dwellings will increase.	No change
Paragraph 71	Westgate Partnership	AHSPD24/4	Objection: The Westgate Partnership request the deletion of Para 71 which relates to standards for market housing. These requirements would be more appropriately identified in the emerging Local Development Framework. A consideration of standards for market housing should not be identified in guidance relating to affordable housing.	Agreed that it is not necessary to include this paragraph as Policy HS.12 only relates to affordable housing	Delete paragraph 71

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 71	Fairview Homes	AHSPD5/4	Objection: Request that the document recognises the potential for the effect of accessibility requirements alongside other planning requirements to affect the viability of delivering development.	It is not considered that the provision of accessible dwellings would affect the overall viability of a development as developers would be expected to take this requirement into consideration a when purchasing land as they would every with every other design requirement.	No change
Paragraph 71	Linden Homes	AHSPD11/2	Objection: Suggest that the City Council will seek at least 15% of new market houses to be designated to Lifetime Homes standards <i>where practicable</i> .	It is not necessary to include this paragraph as Policy HS.12 only relates to affordable housing	Delete paragraph 71
Paragraph 71	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/22	Objection: Policy HS.12 in fact states that the City Council will seek at least 15% of new market houses to be designed to a lifetime home standards “on suitable sites”. The paragraph should therefore be amended to ensure accurate consistency with the adopted Local Plan.Amend paragraph 71 as follows (additions highlighted in bold): “ <i>Paragraph 65 explains the requirements for affordable housing in terms of Scheme Development Standards. The City Council will seek at least 15% of new market houses to be designed to lifetime homes standards <u>on suitable sites</u> . These dwellings should be clearly identified on the plans accompanying the application .</i> ”	It is not necessary to include this paragraph as Policy HS.12 only relates to affordable housing	Delete paragraph 71
Paragraph 72	Fairview Homes	AHSPD5/5	Objection: Request that a greater level of flexibility is incorporated when seeking that eco homes standards are met by all affordable housing development.	It is not considered that developers would be unable to attain the required level of Eco-home standards. Developers would be expected to take this requirement into consideration a when purchasing land as they would every with every other design requirement.	No change
Paragraph 73	The Home Group	AHSPD20/19	Objection: Ecohomes rating of ‘Very Good’ are a current Housing Corporation requirement, however this is likely to change to ‘Excellent’ in the next bid round and it is suggested that the phrase stated in Clause 65 comments is used.	There was a error in paragraph 73 as the EcoSE manifesto target should read 'Excellent'.	Amend paragraph 73 to read: " <i>In accordance with the EcoSE Manifesto the City Council expects, in all cases, the affordable housing to meet EcoHomes Standard '<u>Excellent</u>' 'Very Good'...</i> "

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 73	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/23	Objection: This is an inappropriately onerous requirement which lacks an appropriate policy basis. Paragraph 73 should therefore be deleted.	Considering the national need to reduce energy consumption and the waste that occurs through buildings, to ensure that developments meet EcoHomes Standard 'very good' and Energy Efficiency Best Practice is not 'inappropriate'. The policy basis is clearly CP.15 and CP.18.	No change
Paragraph 73	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/14	Objection: Add to the end of paragraph: " <u>if it can be shown that all the homes in a development meet the eco-homes standard Very Good or higher, then there will be no need for an NRIA as well as this is a waste of resources.</u> "	Clearly the NRIA covers more resource issues than just the building design elements of the Ecohomes standards and therefore the suggested statement is incorrect.	No change
Paragraph 73	Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts	AHSPD17/11	Objection: All my figures for OCLT are based on costs for providing lifetime homes at "excellent" eco-home standards. We also believe that these standards will be absolutely necessary as the impact of climate change and fossil fuel costs become more apparent. The capital cost of housing may be increased a little, but the lifetime operating costs, especially in water and energy terms, will relieve fuel poverty and water use pressures into the future, saving residents running costs.	There was a error in paragraph 73 as the EcoSE manifesto target should read 'Excellent'.	Amend paragraph 73 to read: " <i>In accordance with the EcoSE Manifesto the City Council expects, in all cases, the affordable housing to meet EcoHomes Standard 'Excellent' Very Good...."</i>
Paragraph 74	The Home Group	AHSPD20/20	Comment: RSLs need to be included at pre-application discussion stage. Can the planning process put pressure on developers to have an RSL as an identified partner before the planning application is made?	Paragraphs 74-77 encourage developers to involve RSLs at an early stage which is the extent to which the SPD can make this point.	No change
Paragraph 75	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/15	Objection: No planning justification for using one of the RSLs set out in Appendix 7. Delete reference of encouraging applicants to use them.	It is clear from paragraphs 75 and 76 that the City Council does not <u>require</u> a developers to use one of the City Council's RSLs.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 75	Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts	AHSPD17/12	Comment: If we are accepted as a mechanism for providing affordable housing, we expect in the first instance to partner with CDS Cooperatives, a co-operative housing development agency based in London but managing properties for client co-ops throughout the south east of England (and involved in some of the Milton Keynes developments currently).	Noted. Although this is not appropriate detail for the SPD. It would be better directed towards the Housing Development Team who co-ordinate and review partnership working on housing issues.	No change
Ensuring the delivery of the affordable housing					
Paragraph 76	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/16	Objection: All reference to the Council selecting the RSL should be deleted; this is a choice for the applicant. As long as an RSL is registered with the Housing Corporation the City Council need have no concerns about the identity of the RSL.	It is clear from paragraphs 75 and 76 that the City Council does not <u>require</u> a developers to use one of the City Council's RSLs.	No change
Paragraph 76	Linden Homes	AHSPD11/3	Objection: Suggest new paragraph after paragraph 76: <u>"Non RSLs can make a positive contribution to affordable housing. Such organisations can assist in forming partnerships on residential development schemes to secure affordable housing delivery. The council will assess these organisations against the criteria included in para 76, which if met, will permit them to form the partnerships required to deliver and manage the affordable housing."</u>	The City Council considers that RSLs are the most appropriate method of managing affordable housing in Oxford.	No change
Paragraph 76	The Home Group	AHSPD20/21	Objection: Replace "tenant participation" with "resident involvement" and add "community investment" to the list. These add some weight to the criteria of operating RSL's and hopefully make it difficult for non-partner RSL's who would want to do the odd scheme here and there. It is also suggested that this section could link with the work of the Choice Based Lettings Project Team on the partnership agreement.	Agree to alter text. However, reference to the Choice Based lettings procedure is not appropriate for an SPD.	Amend bullet points in paragraph 76 to read: "... <u>resident involvement</u> tenant participation add new bullet point: " <u>community investment</u> "

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 77	The Home Group	AHSPD20/22	Objection: The chosen RSL needs to be included in the sign off of the S106 to ensure that the requirements of affordable housing are met. RSLs also need to be included at the pre application stage to ensure that the mix and layout will encourage a sustainable community. Mortgagee clause must also protect lender to a shared owner.	The method of signing off the S106 is too much detail for an SPD. Paragraphs 74-77 encourage developers to involve RSLs at an early stage which is the extent to which the SPD can make this point. Agree that mortgagee clause should be inserted.	Amend Appendix 5 (Legal Agreement number 1) to include paragraph: " <i>not bind on any individual owner of a share in or the whole of (pursuant to any rights of staircasing) the equity of any Affordable Housing Unit or any individual owner of an individual Affordable Housing Unit</i> "
Paragraph 79-80	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/13	Objection: No justification in national or regional policy to suggest that affordable housing should be delivered on S106 sites without the use of public subsidy.	This sentence is to make developers aware that funding may not be available from the Housing Corporation on future S106 sites and therefore to consider this point when working out their finances.	No change
Paragraph 81	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/24	Objection: The requirement on developers that affordable housing is built at the same time as market housing lacks a policy basis and is an inappropriately onerous requirement which may prevent affordable housing coming forward at all. Paragraph 81 should therefore be deleted	Ensuring that affordable housing is built at the same time as market housing ensures there is no delay in the delivery of the affordable housing and that the homes can be occupied as soon as possible.	No change
Paragraph 84	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/17	Objection: This is unacceptable as the developer/land owner is not party to discussions on nominations and cannot influence the outcome. This agreement may take some time to conclude but should not fetter the commencement of development. It is arguable whether it should feature in any Unilateral Undertaking submitted, which cannot bind other parties.	It is accepted that a nominations agreement is made between the City Council and an RSL. But, if the applicant has not come to an agreement with a suitable RSL, a nominations agreement cannot be signed between the RSL and the City Council, so the onus is on the developer to come to an agreement with an RSL.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Paragraph 85	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/18	Objection: Experience shows that the City and County Council are slow at negotiation S106 agreements. It is unreasonable to impose a time limits when the Council are the cause of the delay. 2 months should be extended to 4 months and reference should be made to refer to circumstances where extensions will be given.	On occasion in the past the City Council has been slow at negotiating S106 agreements, however, the process has been significantly improved. Regardless of this, it is not considered necessary to set out exact time limits for either party.	Amend sub-heading: " <u>Pre-application discussions</u> Time limits " Replace Paragraph 85 with: " <u>Pre-application discussions are greatly encouraged. Early negotiation, resolution and drafting of the legal agreement is also encouraged to allow it to be signed soon after Committee. The City Council expects that major applications involving a legal agreement will be determined within 13 weeks of the submission date. If completion of the agreement has been unduly delayed by the applicant, officers will be granted delegated powers by committee to refuse the application.</u> " Delete Paragraph 86.
Paragraph 86	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/25	Objection: The City Council has no statutory power to refuse planning permission simply because a legal agreement has not been completed within two months of the resolution to grant planning permission. It is a totally inappropriate requirement which the applicant may not be in the position to comply with as it may be the Council who are causing the delay Paragraph 86 should therefore be deleted.	It is now considered unnecessary to set out exact time limits for either party.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD23/18
Paragraph 87	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/19	Comment: We agree that monitoring is very important. In order to effectively monitor the implementation of the policies and SPD a reworking of the AMR will be required to include SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Timely) targets.	The AMR must follow guidance set down by government on an annual basis. Any further information will be monitored as required.	No change
Paragraphs 87-89	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/14	Objection: The Councils should undertake to produce detailed monitoring information on the implementation of the Local Plan policy and the SPD in real time. This could be used to judge the extent of the Local Plan's and the SPD's success and to identify the appropriate moment to review it.	The City Council will monitor supply; but there is always a temporary slow down in supply after a new policy (Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016) is introduced so this is to be expected,	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Appendices					
Appendix 1	Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts	AHSPD17/13	Objection: The most important thing that would get Community Land Trust/Mutual Home Ownership housing going in Oxford would be acceptance that the model can provide affordable housing within this definition. Your definition appears narrower than that of the DCLG and national planning guidance in that it appears to restrict provision to two mechanisms and two "cost levels" - RSL rents and minimal shared ownership.	This is an extract from the Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016 which was considered at a Local Plan Inquiry following the Local Plan Inspector supported this definition.	No change
Appendix 3	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/20	Objection: Strongly object to the reference in Appendix 3 to the Developers profit of 15% on GDV. There is no justifications of this figure in the SPD. The Local Plan Inspector's report makes reference to a 20% developers profit.	15% on GDV is an acceptable measure of profit but agree that reference should be made to 20% developer profit.	Amend paragraph 34 to read: 34. " <i>When applicants submit evidence of non-viability, the City Council will expect to see the calculations for the major factors (as listed in Appendix 3) set out in enough detail for viability to be properly assessed. <u>The City Council accepts that developers seek to achieve in the region of 20% total profit on cost (or 15% profit on Gross Development Value).</u></i> "
Appendix 3	Christ Church College	AHSPD2/8	Objection: Suggest that profits should be based on "development cost" not "development value". A specific profit percentage should not be specified as different sites have different risk and developers will therefore seek different profits accordingly.	Agree that the reference to solely development value was confusing.	See amendment in response to AHSPD23/20

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Appendix 4	Martin Robeson Planning Practice	AHSPD12/26	Objection: The proposal that a contribution towards affordable housing should be calculated on the basis of completely unjustified employee/floorspace ratios which rely in part upon an entirely "arbitrary" figure of 5% of the estimated number of employees has no policy basis in the adopted local plan. It is therefore entirely inappropriate to suggest it in the draft Affordable Housing SPD. Annex 4 should therefore be deleted.	Employee/floor space ratios have been determined from DTZ and SEERA data. It is too complicated to assess the exact number of employees on a certain salary scale for each proposed commercial development, especially when the development is on spec. It is therefore more simple to use a standard figure for each site.	Amend paragraph 53 to read: " <i>The City Council considers that the contribution should be equivalent to providing affordable housing for <u>15%</u> of the estimated number of employees of the commercial development. <u>This figure is considered a reasonable level of contribution to expect that will not discourage commercial development.</u> The City Council thinks it fair to use <u>a percentage</u> this arbitrary figure as it gives applicants a clear and consistent approach to follow. "</i>
Appendix 4	McCarthy and Stone	AHSPD13/15	Objection: Not certain that the 7% uplift upon which the Council has decided to use in order to update it's figures beyond April 2006 reflects a considered analysis of development costs. Objector to the failure to adjust this figure to reflect the amount affordable housing providers can pay based on the rental stream or other receivables from the provision of affordable housing.	Accept that the method for calculating developer contribution was incorrect.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD13/7
Appendix 6	Oxford Science Park Joint Venture	AHSPD16/9	Objection: Draft legal agreements should be altered to reflect our other comments. It would be fair and reasonable that if the money is not spend on affordable housing, due to a lack of available land, within three years then it should be returned to the applicant. This is similar to e.g. education contributions.	The development of land for housing is planned for over long time periods and therefore it would not be reasonable to expect the contribution to be returned after only 3 years.	No change

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
Appendix 6	West Waddy ADP	AHSPD23/21	Objection: An initial review of the standard terms for legal agreements gives rise to cause for concern. We would ask you to note that the Members of the Consortia have not had the opportunity to discuss these points with their legal advisors. The Commencement definition needs exclusions, to exclude works prior to construction. Clause 2(b) and Schedule 1 will need amending in line with objections raised to this SPD. The reference to 50% under the heading of "sale of affordable housing to RSLs" is too rigid. The figure should be omitted as it is a matter for negotiation. With regard to "Form of Transfer" it is our understanding that the reference to a 70% staircase limit in unacceptable to RSLs and it is also unacceptable to us. These points should be carried through to the other forms of legal agreement in Appendix 6.	Any changes in the SPD that require a change in the legal agreements will be made. Only in exceptional circumstances will it be necessary to vary the wording of the legal agreement. This will be deal with on a case by case basis. Reference to an upper staircasing limit has been removed.	See amendment in response to objection AHSPD20/4

No comment					
	Countryside Agency	AHSPD3/1	Due to other priorities we are unable to offer any comments at this time	Noted	No change
	Highways Agency	AHSPD7/1	We do not wish to make any comments at this time	Noted	No change

List of Respondents

Our ref.	Respondent
AHSPD1	Carter Jonas LLP
AHSPD2	Christ Church College
AHSPD3	Countryside Agency
AHSPD4	Dr Peter Sargent
AHSPD5	Fairview Homes
AHSPD6	Government Office of the South East
AHSPD7	Highways Agency
AHSPD8	Iffley Road Area Residents Association
AHSPD9	Knight Frank LLP
AHSPD10	Lee Mikhelson

Affordable Housing SPD - comments following consultation

Section/ paragraph	Consultee	Reference	Summary of representation	Officer response	Officer recommendation
AHSPD11	Linden Homes				
AHSPD12	Martin Robeson Planning Practice				
AHSPD13	McCarthy and Stone				
AHSPD14	Oxford Pastorate Housing Association				
AHSPD15	Oxford Radcliffe NHS Trust				
AHSPD16	Oxford Science Park Joint Venture				
AHSPD17	Oxfordshire Community Land Trusts				
AHSPD18	Oxfordshire County Council				
AHSPD19	South East of England Development Agency				
AHSPD20	The Home Group				
AHSPD21	Town Furze Allotments				
AHSPD22	University College				
AHSPD23	West Waddy ADP				
AHSPD24	Westgate Partnership				