



LOCAL PLAN
Housing: Preferred Sites and Policies

Responses to earlier consultation.

Contents

The relationship between housing policies in this document and policy areas covered in the 2007 Issues and Options document	4
Question 1 Do you agree with the draft objectives for housing?	6
Question 2 Are the figures in Table 1 appropriate to create and maintain sustainable communities in Eden?	6
Question 3 Should the percentages for housing provision in the different settlements be shown as band ranges rather than specific figures?	7
Question 4 Should the size of individual developments in Local Service Centres continue to be limited in order to allow development to be spread across the district each year (if proposals are for developments greater than the threshold this limit could be achieved through phasing)?	7
Question 5 Should a more flexible approach to the affordable housing requirement be adopted for social rented housing (allowing less than 50%) in certain circumstances to ensure social rented houses is provided to meet local needs?	8
Question 6 Should the Council consider allowing affordable housing to be provided off-site?	9
Question 7 Should the Council allocate sites as being suitable solely for providing affordable housing?	9
Question 8 What is the best way to define and measure affordability in Eden District?	10
Question 9 Should an indication of the household size, type and tenure be given, based the Housing Needs Survey, for all sites that are allocated?	10
Question 10 Would you support a viability test, in principle, for assessing the proportion of affordable housing that should be provided on individual sites (when developers propose a lower figure than that stated in housing policies)?	11
Question 11 Should the Council support the use of the following in order to provide affordable housing in Eden – Community Land Trusts, Self Build, Coat Tailing, Other)?	11
Question 12 Do you think that the Council should consider the conversion of holiday accommodation to provide affordable housing?	12
Question 13 How can the Council ensure that affordable housing remains affordable and is not lost in the future?	12
Question 14 Do you agree with the definition of a local connection to the area as described?	13
Question 15 Should a local connection be allowed to extend beyond the district boundary in parishes on the edge of the district?	13
Question 16 Should the Council attach a local occupancy clause to all new housing in Penrith, a proportion of new housing in Penrith, or only the affordable element of housing in Penrith?	13
Question 17 Do you support, in principle, a standard contribution on housing developments to provide for infrastructure?	13
Question 18 Should the Housing DPD make an allowance for a very small number of windfall developments to take place to provide affordable housing in Eden?	14
Question 19 If windfall sites are to be allowed, should they be allowed on previously developed sites (including and excluding agricultural dwellings), or previously developed sites and small greenfield rural exception sites to provide affordable housing in perpetuity?	14

Question 20	Should Eden consider agricultural buildings as being previously developed land when searching for sites and applying the sequential approach?	15
Question 21	If agricultural buildings are considered to be previously developed, should they be considered for development?	15
Question 22	If a need for gypsy and traveller sites is identified in Eden District, should these sites be located as extension to existing sites, in Penrith, in all of the Key Service Centres as appropriate, or in Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres?	15
Question 23	How should the Council seek to prioritise the search for sites in Local Service Centres and other villages?	16
Question 24	When considering sites for housing development within Local Service Centres and villages, should the Council identify sites that are in the village envelop only, or within it and directly adjacent to it?	16
Question 25	Should the maximum size of individual sites that are allocated in villages be limited – up to 0.33 hectares or ten dwellings/0.67 hectares or 20 dwellings/1 hectare or 30 dwellings, or no maximum size?	16
Question 26	How can the Council meet the housing needs of an increasingly ageing population?	17
Question 27	Do you have any additional comments you wish to make regarding housing issues in Eden?	17

The relationship between housing policies in this document and policy areas covered in the 2007 Issues and Options document.

In 2007 the Housing Issues and Options document asked a series of questions relating to policy areas. A full breakdown of responses is included in the Housing Issues and Options: Summary of Responses document produced in January 2008. This is available on the Council's website.

Since this time much of what was asked has been superseded by the adoption of the 2010 Core Strategy and the Housing Supplementary Planning Document. However, responses have been examined again, to inform this work and make sure nothing was missed. This document provides a brief summary of the responses made at the time.

The following table also shows how the issues raised at the time have been or will be taken forward by this and other documents.

Subject of the question	Question number	How has this been taken forward, or how will it be taken forward?
Draft objectives for housing	1	Through the Objectives set out in Chapter 4 of the Core Strategy and Policy CS7 - Principles for Housing.
Locational Strategy and Numbers	2, 3, 4	Through the Core Strategy development strategy.
Affordable Housing and Viability	5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13	Through the Core Strategy and Housing SPD.
Housing Mix	9	Through Draft Policy HS5 of the preferred options document.
Use of self build and Community land trusts.	11	Through Draft Policy HS9 of the preferred options document
Use of holiday accommodation for housing	12	Through Section 4.5 of the Housing SPD.
Local Connection and Occupancy	14, 15, 16	Through the Core Strategy and Housing SPD.
Standard developer contributions	17	Through the Core Strategy and Housing SPD. Current policy does not apply a standard rate for contributions, which are established through negotiation. Any future move towards applying standard contributions will have to be made through the development of a Community Infrastructure Levy.
Windfall development	18, 19	The question asked whether the Housing DPD should not include a windfall allowance in calculating the amount of land that should be allocated, or whether there should be a factoring in of windfall sites to provide affordable housing in Local Service Centres or all villages.

		<p>There was support for windfall sites to come forward for affordable housing. Draft Policy HS4 aims to encourage the delivery of small scale windfalls to meet local affordable housing needs. The allocations strategy and targets do not factor windfalls into its housing targets as it is considered that previous shortfalls in housing supply require a policy response that gives as much certainty as possible that particular sites will come forward. Given the size and sparseness of Eden District it is also possible to identify sufficient sites to meet housing targets without having to factor in an element of windfall development.</p>
<p>Agricultural Buildings classed as previously developed land.</p>	<p>20, 21</p>	<p>The definition of previously developed land set out in the National planning Policy Framework specifically excludes agricultural buildings. They are therefore not considered to be favoured for development over other Greenfield sites.</p> <p>Section 4.6 of the 2010 Housing Supplementary Planning Document contains the Council's approach to the conversion of farm buildings, and allows for the sensitively designed conversions where buildings are in or adjacent to Key and Local Service Centres.</p>
<p>Gypsy and Traveller Sites.</p>	<p>22</p>	<p>Policy CS7 of the adopted Core Strategy now contains a policy with criteria for consideration of Gypsy and Traveller Sites.</p>
<p>Site based questions.</p>	<p>23 - 25</p>	<p>The questions related to the selection of sites and use of site size thresholds. The most common view was that affordable housing need and public transport accessibility should be factored into the selection. These criteria have formed part of the assessment of sites. There was no preference for adoption of a maximum site threshold; accordingly none is suggested with this document.</p>

Other Issues	26, 27	Question 26 asked how the Council can best meet the needs of older people. Draft policy HS7 in the preferred options document has been drafted in response. Question 27 was a call for any other issues to be identified.
--------------	--------	---

This appendix summarises the responses to questions asked in the 2007 Issues and Options document and explains how they have been taken into account.

Question 1- do you agree with the draft objectives for housing?

These were:

- To provide quality affordable housing and meet local housing need
- To provide everyone with a decent home
- To create and maintain balanced communities
- To provide housing that is accessible to local services and jobs
- To ensure housing development is provided sustainably

What you told us...

Number of responses	61
Summary	A majority of respondents (59%) supported the draft objectives within the Issues and Options paper.

How have comments informed this document?

This document does not contain separate objectives for housing as the Core Strategy, adopted in 2010 now contains a series of spatial objectives which this document aims to implement.

Question 2 - Are the figures in Table 1 appropriate to create and maintain sustainable communities in Eden?

The figures set out are the same as those in the adopted Core Strategy.

What you told us...

Number of responses	59
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 73% of respondents did not feel the figures suggested were appropriate. • The figure of 60% for Penrith is too high. • General support from statutory agencies for significant growth at Penrith • The Environment Agency raised concerns over flooding at Penrith and Appleby and sewer overflow issues at Penrith. • Support for redistribution of some growth to Alston,

	<p>Appleby and Kirkby Stephen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire for more growth in areas not designated as Local Service Centres – 5% suggested. • Parishes outside of the Key Service Centres should receive an allocation of 1% growth in households per annum, with the removal of Local Service Centres. • Support from those who responded for the use of band ranges (79% out of 57 responses); those preferring specific figures highlighted the benefit of certainty for developers, and for infrastructure providers. • Out of 58 responses 62% supported the continued limitation of the size of individual developments in Local Service Centres. The majority of those who expressed a numerical figure supported the current limit of 5, or a slight increase to 6.
--	--

How have comments informed this document?

The distribution of housing has since been established in the Core Strategy which remains current policy.

Question 3 - Should the percentages for housing provision in the different settlements be shown as band ranges rather than specific figures?

What you told us...

Number of responses	57
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 79% of respondents said that figures should be presented as band ranges.

How have comments informed this document?

The distribution of housing has since been established in the Core Strategy which remains current policy.

Question 4 - Should the size of individual developments in Local Service Centres continue to be limited in order to allow development to be spread across the district each year (if proposals are for developments greater than the threshold this limit could be achieved through phasing)?

What you told us...

Number of responses	58
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 62% of respondents answered 'yes' to this question.• The majority of those who expressed a numerical figure supported the current limit of 5, or a slight increase to 6. A few suggested higher figures of 10 or 12. There was also general support for phasing in order to manage development in settlements over a period of time and ensure it is matched by sufficient infrastructure.• A limit of 1% growth based on existing households was suggested several times, by those involved with the Upper Eden Community Plan.

How have comments informed this document?

Comments are noted and the preference for smaller sites distributed across the district has been considered as part of distribution strategy, which includes a filter to sift out larger sites in LSCs.

Question 5 - Should a more flexible approach to the affordable housing requirement be adopted for social rented housing (allowing less than 50%) in certain circumstances to ensure social rented houses is provided to meet local needs?

What you told us...

Number of responses	52
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There was a large range of responses to the question of whether there should be a more flexible approach to the proposal in the preferred options draft of the Core Strategy that at least 50% affordable housing and some extremes of opinion.• Some respondents would like the Council to seek 50% social rented as a minimum while others thought 30% was appropriate for all forms of affordable housing.• There was generally support for as much affordable housing as could be provided to meet local needs.• Some respondents felt that a lower percentage required could stimulate development and thus generate housing and affordable housing• Viability was mentioned by several respondents and that rigid requirements could prevent brownfield and listed building developments to occur.

How have comments informed this document?

Targets for affordable housing have since been established in the Core Strategy which remains current policy.

Question 6 - Should the Council consider allowing affordable housing to be provided off-site?

What you told us...

Number of responses	63
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 43% of respondents replied yes, in locations with low levels of affordable housing need in the Housing Needs Survey, with a further 38 % replying yes, in any location.• A few respondents stressed the need for flexibility in providing affordable housing and that off-site provision can be one of the mechanisms to address affordable housing need where it is required. However, most respondents favouring off-site provision added caveats to their response, such as not wanting to see large areas of affordable housing.

How have comments informed this document?

Current affordable housing policy has since been established through Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy and the Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

Question 7 - Should the Council allocate sites as being suitable solely for providing affordable housing?

What you told us...

Number of responses	60
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 61% of respondents were in favour.• Many respondents, both supporting and objecting to sites being allocated as solely for affordable housing, seemed to be happy with the idea of allocating small sites as being suitable. This was also seen as most appropriate for Local Service Centres and villages by its supporters.• There were a few comments saying such developments would not be viable and may deter developers.

How have comments informed this document?

Current affordable housing policy has since been established through Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy and the Housing Supplementary Planning Document. Policy CS9 also sets out a 'Rural Exceptions' policy where unidentified sites coming forward in rural areas can be considered for 100% affordable housing.

However, such sites are not allocated development. Policy HS4 is presented in this document and aims to deliver a significant element of affordable housing on small scale sites coming forward in Local Service Centres.

Question 8 - What is the best way to define and measure affordability in Eden District?

What you told us...

Number of responses	56
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">No clear preference was expressed, although a method which set a price range for different types of housing was marginally favoured.

How have comments informed this document?

Current affordable housing policy has since been established through Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy and the Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

Question 9 - Should an indication of the household size, type and tenure be given, based the Housing Needs Survey, for all sites that are allocated?

What you told us...

Number of responses	56
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">There was a variation in response, but the common theme was a need for flexibility.There was support in referring to the Housing Needs Survey/Housing Market Assessment to provide the steer and basis for negotiations to ensure needs are met. However, respondents would require this data needs to be robust and kept up to date.

How have comments informed this document?

Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy and the Housing Supplementary Planning Document contain policy on achieving a mix of housing. It is not considered practical to identify exact housing size and type mix on individual sites as supply and demand changes the mix needed over time. However, a new policy (HS5) has been included to specify that applications for residential development will be expected to take account of housing issues

identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and any local housing needs surveys. Policy HS7 also encourages the provision of housing for older people and people in need of supported housing.

Question 10 - Would you support a viability test, in principle, for assessing the proportion of affordable housing that should be provided on individual sites (when developers propose a lower figure than that stated in housing policies?)

What you told us...

Number of responses	59
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 71% of respondents supported the viability test

How have comments informed this document?

Current affordable housing policy has since been established through Policy CS10 of the Core Strategy and the Housing Supplementary Planning Document. This includes a viability test in the circumstances set out.

Question 11 - Should the Council support the use of the following in order to provide affordable housing in Eden – Community Land Trusts, Self Build, Coat Tailing, Other)?

(Note: Community Land Trusts own land in perpetuity on behalf of the community and lease it out to provide a number of local requirements, including affordable housing. With Self Build the land is donated (possibly from one family member to another) in order to build a house that is affordable to that particular household and meet their needs. Coat Tailing refers to a form of Self Build where additional land is provided for affordable housing use.)

What you told us...

Number of responses	64
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There was general support for all types schemes Other suggestions included providing incentives/grants to older people to subdivide their property, the conversion of redundant agricultural buildings, holiday lets and other empty buildings for affordable housing, the District Council/Housing Associations investing in a stake of schemes to give them a say in future owners/prices/tenants or building new affordable housing and providing the self build/coat tailing option to employers as the landowners.

How have comments informed this document?

The Council's stance on Community Land Trusts and Self Build housing is now set in proposed Policy HS9 of the preferred options document and section 4.2 and 4.3 of the 2010 Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Question 12 - Do you think that the Council should consider the conversion of holiday accommodation to provide affordable housing?

What you told us...

Number of responses	57
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There was a large amount of support for this idea, as long as it met the affordable housing needs of villages only.

How have comments informed this document?

The Council's stance on the conversion of holiday lets is now set in Section 4.5 of the 2010 Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

Question 13 - How can the Council ensure that affordable housing remains affordable and is not lost in the future?

What you told us...

Number of responses	Several respondents
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The following suggestions were made – the use of local occupancy clauses (and enforcing them), the use of Section 106 agreements/covenants, Community Land Trusts, more building by the Council and/or Housing Associations, restricting the proportion that can be bought and/or the price it can be sold for.

How have comments informed this document?

The Council's approach to ensuring that affordable housing remains affordable in perpetuity is now set in Section 3.1 of the 2010 Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which sets out a definition of affordable housing which ensures that affordable housing remains affordable to future households.

Question 14 - Do you agree with the definition of a local connection to the area as described?

Question 15 - Should a local connection be allowed to extend beyond the district boundary in parishes on the edge of the district?

Question 16 - Should the Council attach a local occupancy clause to all new housing in Penrith, a proportion of new housing in Penrith, or only the affordable element of housing in Penrith?

What you told us...

Number of responses	60, 60, 56
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80% agreed with the definition of a local occupancy clause as set out in the Issues and Options paper. There was support (67%) for extending this to adjoining Parishes. • There was disagreement over whether this is best achieved by not overly restricting the housing market, or whether local occupancy clauses are necessary to enable local working people to afford housing locally rather than new open market housing being taken up by second homes and retired in-migrants. • 67% of respondents supported the principle of local connections extending beyond the district boundary where parishes were on the edge of the district. • 55% of respondents thought that local occupancy clauses should only be attached to the affordable element of housing development in Penrith. 24% suggested local occupancy should be attached to a proportion of development in Penrith (e.g. 80%), and 21% suggested it should be applied to all new housing development in Penrith.

How have comments informed this document?

The Council's approach to ensuring local occupancy is now set in Policy CS7 of the 2010 Core Strategy and Appendix E of the Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

Question 17 - Do you support, in principle, a standard contribution on housing developments to provide for infrastructure?

What you told us...

Number of responses	61
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There was broad support for a standard contribution on housing developments to support affordable housing, community open space provision & play equipment, flood alleviation and water extraction, and transport infrastructure. A significant minority wanted flexibility, so that contributions can be tailored to individual developments through negotiation.

How have comments informed this document?

The main vehicle for introducing a standard change for new developments is the Community Infrastructure Levy, which was introduced after production of the 2007 Housing Issues and Options Document. The Council will consider whether to introduce such a levy in 2013.

Question 18 - Should the Housing DPD make an allowance for a very small number of windfall developments to take place to provide affordable housing in Eden?

Question 19 - If windfall sites are to be allowed, should they be allowed on previously developed sites (including and excluding agricultural dwellings), or previously developed sites and small greenfield rural exception sites to provide affordable housing in perpetuity?

What you told us...

Number of responses	59, 55
Summary	<p>80% said that windfall sites should be allowed in any village to provide affordable housing. 10% said there should be no allowance for windfall sites and 10% said windfall sites should only be permitted in Key and Local Service Centres.</p> <p>Based upon 55 responses 72% said that if windfalls are to be allowed they should be on previously developed land and small Greenfield rural sites to provide affordable housing in perpetuity. 40% said they should be allowed on previously developed land (including agricultural buildings) and 10% said they should be allowed on previously developed land (excluding agricultural buildings).</p>

How have comments informed this document?

Since production of the Housing Issue and Options Paper to Core Strategy was adopted in 2010. This includes a policy (CS9) encouraging the development of affordable housing on rural exceptions sites. Such sites are unidentified and as such count as windfall sites.

Question 20 - Should Eden consider agricultural buildings as being previously developed land when searching for sites and applying the sequential approach?

Question 21 - If agricultural buildings are considered to be previously developed, should they be considered for development?

What you told us...

Number of responses	60
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was general support for the conversion of agricultural buildings and there seemed to be general agreement among respondents that conversions of traditional agricultural buildings fit well into the landscape as an alternative to modern housing developments. There was also support for conversion rather than demolition and new build wherever possible. • 58 respondents commented on the question of where agricultural dwellings should be considered if they were on agricultural land. There was an emphasis on using such development to meet affordable/local housing need and that utilising agricultural buildings had a lesser impact than using Greenfield land. The majority of comments were made by those supporting the option allowing the conversion of agricultural buildings in any rural areas.

How have comments informed this document?

Since production of the Housing Issue and Options Paper the National Planning Policy Framework was published in 2012. Annex 2 specifically excludes agricultural buildings from the definition of previously developed land. This continues previous definitions set out in earlier guidance. Section 4.6 of the 2010 Housing Supplementary Planning Document contains the Council’s approach to the conversion of farm buildings.

Question 22 - If a need for gypsy and traveller sites is identified in Eden District, should these sites be located as extension to existing sites, in Penrith, in all of the Key Service Centres as appropriate, or in Key Service Centres and Local Service Centres?

What you told us...

Number of responses	47
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Out of 47 comments, there were some comments that provision should have the same considerations and follow the same settlement hierarchy as other development. In contrast, there was a comment about cultural factors and differing circumstances to those affecting permanent dwellings.

How have comments informed this document?

The 2010 Core Strategy now contains Policy CS11 relating to the provision of gypsy and traveller sites. Should a future assessment of needs reveal a need for additional sites the Council will look to allocate sites in future versions of the Local Plan.

Question 23 - How should the Council seek to prioritise the search for sites in Local Service Centres and other villages?

Question 24 - When considering sites for housing development within Local Service Centres and villages, should the Council identify sites that are in the village envelope only, or within it and directly adjacent to it?

Question 25 - Should the maximum size of individual sites that are allocated in villages be limited - up to 0.33 hectares or ten dwellings/0.67 hectares or 20 dwellings/1 hectare or 30 dwellings, or no maximum size?

What you told us...

Number of responses	57, 56, 52
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allocating sites according to housing need was the most popular response, although there was also support for allocating according to public transport services and the services provided in the village.• There were concerns that public transport and services can change, but also the opinion from some that some larger development could be used to support and improve such services.• Of the 56 responses were made to the question on whether sites should be located within the village envelope or within the village envelope and directly adjacent to it. 77% of respondents supported the latter.• There were 52 responses to the question 'should the maximum size of individual sites that are allocated in villages be limited?' The majority of comments were from those either supporting no maximum size or not

	expressing a preferred option. The most common comment was a desire to see any such maxima related to the size of individual villages, rather than a blanket policy for all villages/Local Service Centres.
--	---

How have comments informed this document?

The method used to allocate housing sites to Local Service Centres is set out in the accompanying technical paper. This uses a combination of factors, including housing need and public transport accessibility considerations, as well as the number of services within each village.

Sites are allocated according to how they perform against a range of criteria, including whether they are within the existing built form.

Question 26 - How can the Council meet the housing needs of an increasingly ageing population?

What you told us...

Number of responses	Several respondents
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The most common response favoured building/allocating sites for sheltered accommodation. Bungalows and retirement flats were also frequently cited. Freeing up larger, family properties for local people was mentioned, as was the importance of access to local services and transport links. Design was commonly mentioned, both in terms of Lifetime Homes standards and also issues like energy and water efficiency to keep running costs down. Some supported measures which facilitate younger family members to care for the elderly were also favoured by some respondents.

How have comments informed this document?

This document now contains draft policy HS7 - Housing for Older People and those in Need of Support (Policy HS5)

Question 27 - Do you have any additional comments you wish to make regarding housing issues in Eden?

What you told us...

Number of responses	Various respondents
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about the infrastructure capacity (e.g. sewerage, schools, roads, parking, healthcare facilities) and criticism that this didn't seem to have been taken into account in the Issues and Options document.

In addition, other themes (in no particular order) included:

- That any policies are appropriate for rural areas and Eden as a whole.
- The scale of development proposed – a number of respondents questioned the need for such large scale building targets over the next 15 years as this could affect the character of the district and its settlements, while a few wanted to see higher rates of development to increase housing supply.
- The availability of additional employment to justify additional housing (a) in rural communities and (b) in the district as a whole was questioned
- Several respondents wished to see efficiency measures (energy, water etc.) in developments to reduce their impact on the environment and reduce running costs. Some also wanted to see a policy (or link to a policy elsewhere) requiring energy production on site.
- There was support for self-build
- Comments that playing fields and other green space within towns should be preserved
- Several respondents stressed that brownfield sites should be a priority
- Concerns about design were expressed.
- There was some concern about second homes and holiday lets
- There were contrasting comments on whether development should be going to small villages (though, again, the balance was in favour). Some respondents also expressed a need for affordable and market led housing in rural communities.
- There were some calls for closer working with developers, parish councils and local communities as this document and schemes are progressed
- A few respondents mentioned avoiding flood risk
- A few respondents mentioned converting farm buildings