

**Affordable
Housing
Supplementary
Planning
Document**

**Consultation
Statement**

February 2023

Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document Update (February 2023)- Consultation Statement

Why is the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document being updated?

The Waverley Borough Council [Local Plan Part 1](#); Strategic Policies and Sites (LPP1) was adopted by the Council on 20 February 2018. LPP1 requires us to have an Affordable Housing SPD to include details on the approach to calculating financial contributions; up to date information on the type and size of affordable housing required; the cascade mechanism to be applied to cases where viability is an issue; other matters of detail interpretation/ application of the policies. An adopted Affordable Housing SPD is a material consideration for planning applications determined within the borough.

The current Affordable Housing SPD was adopted in April 2021. Its purpose is to provide clarity to developers, affordable housing providers, Development Management officers, stakeholders and local residents on our affordable housing requirements. An update is necessary to take into account changes in national policy and to reflect the commitment to lower rents in our adopted Affordable Homes Delivery Strategy (April 2022) set out below:

Social Rent

The need to prioritise building housing for social rent is highlighted, in line with our [Affordable Homes Delivery Strategy](#)¹. Social rents are the lowest rent of all, set at an equivalent to around 55% of market rent, for our lowest income households.

Affordable Rent Cap

¹ Affordable Homes Delivery Strategy; Build More, Build Better, Build for Life (2022) Waverley Borough Council

If social rents are unviable, we will require a cap of 70% of market rents on 1 and 2 beds and of 65% on 3 and 4 beds, in line with supporting evidence on need from the Affordability Study² and viability from the Three Dragons³ study.

First Homes

The update reflects the national First Homes requirements which were introduced since the Supplementary Planning Document was originally published and sets out how the policy is applied locally.

Viability

This update clarifies that all applications seeking to amend or reduce affordable housing provision will go to committee, following the addition of this new requirement to the Waverley Scheme of Delegation to Officers approved by Full Council 18 October 2022.

Locally affordable homes

Councillors have been keen to ensure that homes are affordable, in relation to local incomes. This is reflected in the affordability measures such as the priority for social rents and the recommended caps on affordable rents.

Evidence

Policy ANH1 of the Waverley Local Plan Part 1 states that ‘the mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenure split should reflect the type of housing identified as being required in the most up-to-date evidence of housing needs’. The following studies were completed in 2021 and provide an update to our evidence base, now reflected in the recommendations for the mix of new provision:

- [The Waverley Housing Affordability Study \(Justin Gardner Consulting / Icen\)](#) considers affordability for the end user
- [The First Homes Viability Update \(Three Dragons\)](#) considers the viability of delivering affordable housing to the developer, taking into account national First Homes requirements and a cap on affordable rents

² Waverley Housing Affordability Study (2021) Justin Gardner Consulting/ Icen

³ The First Homes Viability Update (2021) Three Dragons

What was the consultation process?

The Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document updates were consulted on between 17 October and 28 November 2022 in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. The Council published the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document updates and accompanying documents on its website and planning policy consultation portal and placed hard copies in the Council offices and local libraries. All members of the Council's Local Plan database were notified of the consultation by email or letter. The database includes statutory consultees, Town and Parish Councils, residents' associations/groups, local businesses, developers, landowners and Waverley residents. A public notice was also placed in the Surrey Advertiser, Farnham Herald and Haslemere Herald newspapers setting out the details of the consultation and how representations could be made.

Consultees and members of the public were invited to comment via the following methods:

- Using our online consultation portal at <https://waverley.inconsult.uk>
- By email to planningpolicy@waverley.gov.uk.
- By post to Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document Update, Planning Policy, Planning Services, Waverley Borough Council, The Burys, Godalming, GU7 1HR.

What issues were raised?

The full representations are published on the Council's planning policy consultation portal at <https://waverley.inconsult.uk/HousingSPDUpdate/ConsultationHome>

A summary of the main issues raised and how the comments have been considered and addressed are included at Appendix A. Themes are shown in the list of contents over the page.

Why is the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document being updated?	2
What was the consultation process?.....	4
What issues were raised?.....	4
How were the issues addressed?.....	5
Appendix A – Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document Update Consultation Responses	6
Social Rent	6
Affordable Rent Caps	8
Affordable Housing Mix.....	12
Rounding.....	15
Clustering.....	16
CIL.....	18
Locally Affordable Homes.....	20
First Homes.....	24
Viability.....	30
Affordable Housing Contacts.....	36
Commuted Sums	37
Design and Space Standards.....	38
Further comments	39
Regulation 12 – Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012	46

How were the issues addressed?

All representations received have been recorded, analysed and recommendations made about how they should be taken into account to inform the final SPD.

Following the consultation, the SPD has been amended to address the issues raised.

Appendix A – Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document Update Consultation Responses

The table below provides details of comments received and Waverley Borough Council’s response to address the issue.

✓ denotes comment noted/ agreed with/ no further action required

Social Rent

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW THE ISSUE HAS BEEN ADDRESSED?
Aster	<p>Aster Group are supportive of social rents where it is appropriate and financially viable for these to be delivered. Tenures should be secured / defined within s106 agreements at the time of granting consent to optimise delivery.</p> <p>Any restrictions on affordable rents (such as capping at 70%) should also be secured within s106 agreements to ensure these are captured within the consent and consistently applied to sites where developers offer the units for sale to the RP market.</p>	<p>✓ Agreed.</p>
G Fox	<p>On suitable developments only. A poor and totally mismatched socio-economic mix could cause discord within the development. It could also have a bearing on the sale value of the non-social housing which may in turn affect the overall viability of the development</p>	<p>The Housing Enabling team will implement layout requirements – see clustering section</p>
Edward Fox	<p>[social rents for households on the lowest incomes remain a priority for the Council and should be provided on new developments whenever possible] agree</p>	<p>✓</p>
Stonewater	<p>Most developers will push for the affordable rent at 65/70% over social rent as it will provide more favourable offers for the affordable homes from Housing Associations than social rent, however I</p>	

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW THE ISSUE HAS BEEN ADDRESSED?
	<p>understand the social rent option has been included partly to enable Housing Associations to use grant funding to convert these homes to social rent later if they wish to and funding is available.</p> <p>In order to get some social rented homes on the ‘true’ s106 element of a scheme, perhaps the Council could consider 25% s106 affordable housing on schemes which provide 100% of the s106 rented accommodation as social rent?</p> <p>Some discretion may need to be applied to sites which have already been purchased based on 80% affordable rents for a transition period after the new SPD is launched or scheme viability will be significantly affected.</p> <p>It would be useful if the definition of rents in the s106 made it clear that an annual rent increase in line with Homes England guidance is permitted, for the avoidance of doubt.</p>	<p>30% affordable housing will be required however applying a 60:40 tenure mix should improve viability. Other funding options will be explored.</p> <p>✓ Discretion to be applied during transition period. Once updated SPD is adopted, requirements re. rent levels will be known from the outset.</p> <p>ACTION: added to para 60 for clarification</p>

Affordable Rent Caps

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS THE ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
Abri	The proposal at paragraph 58 to cap affordable rents at the lower of LHA or 70% for 1- and 2-beds and 65% for 3- and 4-bed homes is a concerning addition to this SPD. Such a change would have clear, significant economic changes on the viability of residential development and this, the NPPF and PPG make clear, should be reserved for strategic local planning policies. The PPG states that supplementary planning documents <i>“cannot introduce new planning policies into the development plan ... [and] should not add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development”</i> (Plan Making, paragraph 008).	Local Plan Part 1 points to latest evidence. The Housing Affordability Study 2021 and Three Dragons First Homes Viability Update 2021 are our latest evidence. The Affordable Housing SPD advises how Local Plan Part 1 should be applied, taking into account the latest evidence.
Abri	<p>The proposed new caps on affordable rented houses would have a clear and significant impact on the deliverability of affordable housing, effectively reducing the ability of the Council’s Registered Provider partners to bid for and acquire new homes.</p> <p>The introduction of this policy may have a longer term effect of dampening housebuilder interest in delivering in Waverley, with the overall effect of reducing overall delivery of affordable housing. As a matter best left for policy, we ask that this text, and the updates in the Appendices, are removed from the SPD update.</p>	Viability of lower rents at 60% of market rent has been assessed in the Three Dragons First Homes Viability Update 2021. Following consultation with affordable housing providers on our Affordable Homes Delivery Strategy, caps of 70% & 65% were agreed, to improve viability and provide two rented tenure options.

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS THE ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
G Fox	[Rent caps should be] higher... Affordable rents should not be seen as a cushion for life. Those in real need and on benefits already have subsidies applied to their rent so further enhancements aren't really necessary.	See Waverley Housing Affordability Study 2021.
Edward Dwyer	[We would like your views and comments on the following proposed changes: We are proposing capping affordable rents at 70% of open market rents for homes with 1 and 2 bedrooms and 65% of open market rents for homes with 3 and 4 bedrooms. Do you think these rents are about right, or should be lower or higher?] Lower. I think each case should be considered on its merits. E.g. a care worker earns a lot less than say a nurse who earns less than a train driver etc	Waverley Housing Affordability Study 2021 recommends rents in relation to local incomes.
Aster	About right... Rent levels need to be secured and defined within the s106 – so that they are applied consistently to a scheme as/when the homes are offered to the RP market.	Noted.
Stonewater	About right... This gives a good balance between affordability and preventing delivery due to viability.	✓
Haslemere CLT	Rented homes The Waverley Housing Affordability Study 2021 states at paragraph 22 “Overall, it is concluded that it would be reasonable to seek a higher level of discount than 20% from the market and it is considered that providing lower Affordable Rents (at 60% of market values, including service charges) would be a sensible starting point, subject to the viability of delivering housing at these costs.” In addition, the Waverley First Homes Viability Update modelled affordable rent at a 40% discount on market rents thereby proving the viability of various schemes with this discount. In paragraph 58 of the SPD it is stated that: “Social rents for households on the lowest incomes should be a priority. However, where this is not viable,	Social rents are our priority, however the circumstances of each site will be different. 60% rents have been assessed to be viable and following consultation with affordable housing providers on our Affordable Homes Delivery Strategy, caps of 70% & 65% were agreed, to improve viability

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS THE ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
	<p>affordable rents should be capped at 70% for 1 and 2 beds and 65% for 3 and 4 bed homes (including services charges) or the Current Local Housing Allowance rate for the area; whichever is lower, in order to be affordable to local households. ” It is unclear why the SPD does not suggest capping all affordable rents at 60% of market rents. We suggest in paragraph 58 the percentage is lowered to 60% for all homes. In paragraph 60 of the SPD there is a provision that suggests both social and affordable rent should be defined in Section 106 Agreements “to allow providers to deliver social rent instead of affordable rent if funding becomes available at a later date”. This makes sense but this should not allow developers to substitute affordable rented homes in place of social rented ones unless exceptional circumstances arise and changes are supported by financial viability appraisals.</p>	<p>and provide two rented tenure options.</p> <p>All changes to affordable housing amount, mix or tenure now go before Planning Committee as set out in an update to the Scheme of Delegation approved by Full Council in October 2022.</p>
Redwood Southwest Ltd	<p>The CIL Viability Study prepared in 2017, acknowledges that “Rent levels for affordable housing have an impact on residual land value”. Savills typically assumes that an affordable product, has a blended value of circa 50-60% of Open Market Value. Private developers often sell parcels of consented land to Registered Providers, who would, naturally, value affordable rented or intermediate at the higher end of the discount.</p>	<p>Once the updated SPD is adopted, our expectation is that valuations and bids will be made on the basis of the capped rents.</p>
Witley Parish Council	<p>Witley Parish Council supports the updates to the Affordable Housing SPD. In particular,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are pleased to see that the affordable rent has been set at 65% (3 or 4 bed) or 70% (1 or 2 bed) of market rates, with a ceiling of the local housing allowance. 	<p>✓</p>
Thakeham	<p>Thakeham seeks further clarity on paragraph 58. The Council need to include “of prevailing Market Rents” (or similar) to clarify precisely</p>	<p>“of local market rent” is used</p>

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS THE ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
	<p>what basis the rents are capped at. The current wording leaves ambiguity by not confirming what the 65/70% cap relates to. As well as this, the cap on Affordable Rent is typically 80% therefore, the reduction to 65/70% may increase viability concerns from new developments.</p>	
Sovereign	<p>As per our response to the Affordable Homes Delivery Strategy earlier in the year, Sovereign would support a lower rent cap, particularly for one and two beds which poses greater affordability challenges.</p>	<p>Social rents are our priority, however the circumstances of each site will be different. 60% rents have been assessed to be viable and following consultation with affordable housing providers on our Affordable Homes Delivery Strategy, caps of 70% & 65% were agreed, to improve viability and provide two rented tenure options.</p>

Affordable Housing Mix

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
Abri	The suggested mix of affordable housing by size and tenure set out on page 23 reflects our understanding of the local needs and demands. This should remain a 'suggested' mix to allow for site-specific variation responding to needs at each scheme.	✓
Redwood Southwest Ltd	<p>Redwood conclude that the impact of altering the tenure requirements should be properly tested through the full Local Plan Review, so that a thorough assessment can be conducted, and the outcome tested. The proposition of 60% of the total affordable as social rented or affordable rents, 25% of affordable homes as First Homes, and the remaining 15% recommended as shared ownership, may have a detrimental impact on viability through the introduction of any prospect for social rents (theoretically, at up to 60%). The implications require assessment in the context of any CIL review (or future Infrastructure Levy). Thus this might only hinder the delivery of affordable units further, which means a situation of poor delivery will likely worsen, as opposed to improve. This seems to be contrary to what the purpose of this emerging SPD should be.</p> <p>3.2. Redwood's wish to highlight a key objection to this document. Principally, the change in the tenure requirement. This reflects concerns that the SPD will impact upon the delivery of affordable homes given the considerable uncertainty it will introduce into the application process both pre- and post-determination. "The overall housing target is to provide 60% of the total as social rents or affordable rents. 25% of affordable homes need to be First Homes, in</p>	<p>The updated SPD <u>reduces</u> the percentage of social rent/ affordable rent recommended within the affordable housing mix, from 70% to 60%. It has not been increased.</p> <p>AHN1 points to latest evidence (Three Dragons & Justin Gardner)</p> <p>Changes are as a result of national guidance; the Local Planning Authority has no choice.</p> <p>First Homes is a strategic planning matter and would therefore be looked at through any future review of LPP1. However, the AH SPD</p>

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
	<p>line with the revised National Planning Policy Framework. The remaining 15% are recommended as shared ownership.”</p> <p>3.3. The remedy is either to defer the calculation, and specifics to supporting documentation to the time of a full Local Plan Review, or to make clear a lower proportion of social rent, and circumstances whereby social rent might be applicable. It is the case that the majority of schemes deliver affordable rent and shared ownership, and on the basis of the values, this still is not delivering sufficient affordable housing.</p> <p>The prioritisation of social rent and reduced levels of affordable rent might only worsen the situation.</p>	<p>is designed to provide guidance to applicants on how we will apply national policy requirements in the interim period.</p> <p>Paragraph 53 of SPD has been updated following consultation to emphasise national policy requirements (but to give flexibility)</p> <p>Viability of lower rents has been assessed.</p>
Witley Parish Council	<p>It is good to see that the housing mix specifies that 30% of the affordable rented homes and 30% of the shared ownership homes should be 3 or more bedrooms.</p> <p>Our main concern is that developers appear to have the option to ignore the “recommended” mix if they produce a viability assessment. Can the policy be strengthened so that the word “recommended” is replaced by “specified” wherever it occurs (paras 17, 54, and 57)?</p> <p>We would also question whether it is necessary to give developers alternatives to the required mix on page 51, point 19 which includes providing only 20% affordable housing, as an example.</p>	<p>We cannot prescribe a blanket policy; sites will be looked at on a case by case basis</p>
Thakeham	<p>Thakeham supports the new proposed affordable housing mix the splitting of the Affordable Housing mix reflects the latest Affordability Study and the current demand from the Council’s Housing Register.</p> <p>The wording of this document, throughout, also needs to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility to reflect the need at the time a new</p>	<p>The Affordable Housing SPD is guidance designed to give flexibility</p>

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
	<p>scheme for development is proposed, as well as meeting the requirements of an RP.</p> <p>Thakeham supports the new proposed affordable housing tenure (60% social rents or affordable rents, 25% First Homes, 15% Shared Ownership). The Affordable Housing tenure now includes the requirement for First Homes and reflects the current need shown in the latest Affordability Study.</p>	<p>✓</p>

Rounding

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
Abri	<p>We note the new text at paragraphs 54 and 55.</p> <p>The indication at paragraph 55 that the Council will be pragmatic in rounding the numbers of individual tenures to prioritise affordable homes to rent is supported.</p> <p>It would be useful to clarify whether the delivery of affordable housing without First Homes will be acceptable to the Council, in line with our comments above and the NPPF paragraph 63 which expects affordable housing to contribute to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities</p>	<p>25% First Homes required in order to comply with national planning policy</p>

Clustering

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
Abri	The update at paragraph 76 to amend reference to the delivery of clusters of affordable homes is helpful, introducing greater flexibility into this guidance.	✓
G Fox	The design and layout should be integrated as appropriate for the site as a whole. Small clusters will just define what could become ghetto areas, socially and economically divorced from the overall development	Feedback from affordable housing providers indicates that small clusters are preferred over 'pepperpotting' for housing management reasons
Edward Dwyer	Small clusters across a development could help to integrate the affordable housing with the private homes, although it can be easier to manage a scheme if Housing Association homes are closer together. Small clusters would need to be waived for any sites that are being proposed as 100% affordable.	✓
Edward Dwyer	[The Council expects the affordable homes to be distributed throughout the site in small clusters appropriate for the scale and design of the development] I agree, a mix of housing and residents is preferable. It reduces the them and us groupings.	✓
Aster	Clusters should be of appropriate size so as to facilitate the efficient management of the affordable homes and their surrounding communal areas.	✓
Stonewater	Small clusters across a development could help to integrate the affordable housing with the private homes, although it can be easier	✓

	to manage a scheme if Housing Association homes are closer together. Small clusters would need to be waived for any sites that are being proposed as 100% affordable.	
Witley Parish Council	We support the requirement to pepper-pot affordable homes throughout a site.	Feedback from affordable housing providers indicates that small clusters are preferred over 'pepperpotting' for housing management reasons
Thakeham	Thakeham supports the removal of a defined cluster of affordable homes to be more flexible and suited to the future management of plots/areas by RP's.	✓
Sovereign	Whilst unit based clusters provide a useful benchmark, some flexibility should be provided based on existing provision within the area ensuring balanced communities and the clustering is proportionate to the scale of development being delivered. Some broad guidance on percentage clusters to ensure related to scale of the scheme.	Partners have been contacted to investigate other models of good practice on clustering

CIL

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
Abri	<p>The CIL Regulations are clear that there is no legal requirement to tie affordable housing in a s106 agreement to support an application for mandatory social housing CIL relief, except under regulation 49(7A).</p> <p>This specifically relates to condition 5 where the units are not being provided by a local housing authority or a registered provider; this is a very specific set of circumstances that may be satisfactorily managed in the general administration of the levy.</p> <p>In view of this distinct requirement, it is evidently clear it is not necessary in all other circumstances, such as where the whole site is delivered as affordable housing when the CIL Regulations permit the use of social housing relief across all units.</p> <p>We understand from the recent Affordable Housing Provider Forum that contrary to the Regulations the Council intends to seek to charge CIL on all affordable homes delivered as additionality outside S106 Agreements.</p> <p>This decision is very damaging to the Council’s aspirations to deliver more new affordable homes to meet local housing needs as it will make additional delivery unviable.</p> <p>As there is a shortfall in the delivery of affordable housing (both rented and shared ownership), it is very important to ensure that</p>	<p>The operation and implementation of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) must be in CIL Regulation 2010 (as amended).</p> <p>To qualify for CIL social housing relief, sufficient evidence must be provided that the dwellings being brought forward will be qualifying dwellings in accordance with the CIL Regulation 2010 (as amended). As established by the recent case of Stonewater vs Wealdon District Council, a CIL charging authority has the flexibility to require dwellings, for which CIL social housing relief is being applied for, to be secured through aS106 agreement.</p>

	<p>additional routes to delivering outside S106 Agreements can be maintained.</p> <p>We ask that the Council reassure its RP partners that it will not seek to charge CIL on affordable housing delivered outside S106 Agreements.</p>	
<p>Redwood Southwest Ltd</p>	<p>The context in which this emerging SPD sits must be considered when assessing whether it imposed acceptable and viable requirements and guidance. WBC has adopted Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in October 2018.</p> <p>The CIL charging rate is one of the highest in the country ranging from £388.38-£454.15 for residential development (based on the 2022 indexation). This is a significant cost for developers which must be considered in context, noting that it is also typical for larger schemes to progress with Section 106 costs, secured in respect of site-specific matters.</p> <p>CIL and the affordable housing requirements combined could result in impacts such as, viability arguments to which seek to suppress the total affordable provision, reduced biodiversity net gain (BNG), little or no Section 106 obligations, reduced quality building materials and the loss of community infrastructure from masterplans. This, in the context that CIL may not normally be avoided, unless in exceptional circumstances.</p>	<p>As part of evidence base behind the SPD, the First Homes Viability Update considered the impact of CIL, First Homes, rent levels and tenure mix.</p>

Locally Affordable Homes

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
G Fox	<p>Good idea.</p> <p>The definition in of Local must be firmed up so there is no incomer queue jumping by outsiders who want to work in the area</p>	<p>✓</p> <p>Please see requirements to meet eligibility criteria in Housing Allocations Policy</p>
Edward Dwyer	<p>[The Council is committed to delivering Locally Affordable Homes that local workers and households on low incomes can afford] Agreed</p>	<p>✓</p>
Aster	<p>Whilst local connection is important, it is important that homes built are occupied in timely manner.</p> <p>Local connections generally works well for rented homes.</p> <p>For low cost home-ownership homes consideration needs to be given to how local connection criteria is applied so that homes are not left empty as/when no one with a local connection comes forward.</p>	<p>✓</p> <p>✓Please see requirements to meet eligibility criteria in Housing Allocations Policy</p> <p>Waverley Borough Council will apply local connection requirements from Homes England Capital Funding Guide.</p>
GBC	<p>Whilst under the provisions of the Duty to Co-operate (referred to in https://www.gov.uk/guidance/plan-making) we would normally restrict our comments to matters of a cross-boundary nature, which the draft SPD did not present, as colleagues we have identified a few areas of the document where we felt our informal comments may be helpful.</p>	<p>Noted. This comment relates to part of the SPD that has not been updated therefore outside the scope of this consultation</p>

	<p>Paragraph 17 of Part 1 of the draft SPD states that the threshold for affordable housing contributions in ‘non-designated rural areas’ in Policy AHN1 of Local Plan Part 1 will be amended to match the NPPF’s definition for major development of 10 or more new homes or where the site has an area of 0.5 hectares or more. The paragraph then goes on to explain that, ‘<i>affordable housing is required on major developments</i>’ under the revised NPPF. This is not entirely correct, as paragraph 64 of the NPPF states: ‘<i>Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer)</i>’ (our emphasis). Our understanding of this is that national policy permits affordable housing to be sought for major developments, not that it is a requirement for local plans to seek this. Further, as Waverley Borough Council’s Local Plan Part 1 is adopted and has not yet been revised, we feel that it may not be appropriate for an SPD, which provides guidance upon and cannot supersede development plan policy, to seek to amend this policy’s scope to include smaller sites.</p>	
<p>Redwood Southwest Ltd</p>	<p>Shared ownership share % Turning to a separate matter, paragraph 68 of the SPD sets an expectation that shared ownership rents should be offered at 2.5% of the value of the unsold share of the property. This is lower than the maximum of 3%, and the recommended 2.75% upon first sale, that is set out in Homes England’s Capital Funding Guide for shared ownership homes. As with the Council’s approach to affordable rented housing, this lower proportion of rent can affect development values and Registered Providers’ ability to fund their future business activity. We recommend that the figure of 2.5% is amended to 2.75% for consistency with Homes England’s own guidance for the shared ownership model.</p>	<p>S106 affordable housing requirements do not receive Homes England funding. Homes England guidance is national, but affordability issues in Waverley are unique. The 2.5% rent on remaining equity is not a new update to the SPD; this was included in the original SPD adopted April 2021; based upon exceptionally high open market values in Waverley.</p>

Sovereign	This should not just be driven by the housing register but also utilising help to buy data for shared ownership. It should also recognise the new shared ownership model allowing buyers to enter at 10% shares where grant attached.	References to shares from 25% amended to 10%. References to Help to Buy Agent removed
-----------	---	--

First Homes

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
Abri	<p>The First Homes Viability Update 2021 suggests that the introduction of First Homes will not adversely affect the viability of residential development across the Borough, nor the overall level of affordable housing delivery.</p> <p>However, this also shows that the level of rented affordable homes, the discounts on market rents, and the numbers and sizes of shared ownership homes will need to be changed to accommodate this tenure.</p> <p>As noted in the Viability Update and Affordability Report, the market for First Homes units is limited to smaller units and the inclusion of this tenure will directly affect the price paid per rented and other low cost home ownership units.</p> <p>This gives rise to genuine concern that the evidence does not support the inclusion of this tenure within the general affordable housing mix on all schemes and should be limited.</p>	<p>25% First Homes required by national planning policy.</p>

Edward Dwyer	Sorry this is too complicated for me to provide a valid answer.	✓
Abri	Where First Homes would not be the most effective mechanism for meeting local needs, the Council should look to support a more targeted mix, such as reinstating the proportion of shared ownership	25% First Homes required in order to comply with national planning policy.
G Fox	Agreed	✓
Aster	First Homes may appeal to a niche market only – additional criteria may further limit the households who can purchase the homes, which is undesirable.	✓
Stonewater	I have no comments on this section as we do not provide First Homes as a Housing Association (on a standard s106 scheme the developer would provide these and on 100% affordable schemes I understand that there is no First Homes requirement).	✓
Haslemere CLT	As a Community Land Trust our aim is to deliver affordable homes that remain affordable in perpetuity, we therefore welcome the addition of First Homes as an affordable housing option because the percentage discount from market value is preserved for future sales.	✓
Haslemere CLT	It is unfortunate that viability testing has not included testing at discounts above 30% of market value for First Homes. The Waverley First Homes Viability Update found that all schemes tested were viable so it is possible higher discounts on some First Homes could be offered which could enable some 3 bed homes to be provided. Paragraph 74c) refers to the Housing Allocation Policy but it is	The Affordability Study suggested a larger discount would reduce subsidy available for other tenures such as social rent, for which there is

	<p>unclear which document this is. Is it the Housing Allocation Scheme May 2020? We suggest a link to the Policy is added to this SPD.</p>	<p>greater need. Therefore, it has been concluded that a larger discount is not desirable.</p> <p>Link to Housing Allocations Policy added to SPD</p>
<p>Redwood Southwest Ltd</p>	<p>Private developers may soon have to factor 25% provision of First Homes (at circa 70-80% of Open Market Value). The provision is First Homes is not thought to be of interest to Registered Providers, and thus private developers will need to factor within the cashflow assumptions the market sale of a greater proportion of properties on site. WBC should be mindful of the delivery implications arising.</p> <p>It is worth highlighting that the sale of First Homes units after a discount must be under £250,000, thus this is likely to result in a high number of smaller units notably one beds. This is the result of limited affordability in the Borough, such as the Housing Affordability Study (December 2021) states “Waverley is an expensive area to buy housing with the average (median) price of a home in 2020 being £500,000; this is nearly double the average for England (£259,000)”. It will also be impossible to deliver 3 bedroom houses as the discount would be so significant to keep within the cap as to render delivery unviable. This only</p>	<p>Response highlights important points re. national First Homes policy</p>

	<p>serves to underline the wider policy failure to address housing supply in Waverley and moderate house prices in general.</p> <p>If circa 25% of the affordable units were one beds, this would result in a high proportion of one bed units. It is possible there will not be demand for this level of one beds and in this instance, would not reflect the needed housing mix in the Borough as per the SHMA / SPD or offer a varied and sustainable community. There should be flexibility added to the SPD that would allow for the First Home provision to be judged on a case-by-case basis and the provision of affordable housing including First Homes, to be negotiated and agreed with WBC via Section 106.</p> <p>It is also not yet clear how the First Homes will be delivered and work in practice in the borough. As Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) is silent on First Homes, it might be opportune to revisit the implications and implementation of First Homes to the full Local Plan Review due in February 2023.</p>	<p>First Homes is a strategic planning matter and would therefore be looked at through any future review of LPP1. However, the AH SPD is designed to provide guidance to applicants on how we will apply national policy requirements in the interim period.</p>
--	---	---

<p>McCarthy Stone</p>	<p>Add a new para after para 70 to read: Some forms of specialist accommodation will be exempt from providing First homes in line with para 65 of the NPPF. These exemptions include Build to Rent homes; specialist accommodation e.g. older people or students; people who wish to build or commission their own homes and schemes which are exclusively for affordable housing.</p>	<p>C2 or C3 distinction is relevant here. We will continue to require affordable housing on C3 older persons' housing schemes</p>
<p>Thakeham</p>	<p>Thakeham supports the inclusion of the First Homes Policy, which is a National Policy and complies with the definition of Affordable Housing in Annexe 2 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Sovereign</p>	<p>"Governments aspirations for First Homes was first set out in the Written Ministerial Statement dated 24th May 2021 and supplemented by further guidance in the National Planning Practice Guidance (23 December 2021). Since December 2021 the requirement of First Homes have not be expanded within the Framework or primary policy.</p> <p>Due to the wording of the Written Ministerial Statement, it has been implied that First Homes is a mandatory requirement necessitating that 25% of all affordable housing secured through developer contributions must be First Homes. This is not the case. Many local planning authorities have taken this requirement as read and not sought to question it further.</p>	<p>25% First Homes required in order to comply with national planning policy.</p> <p>First Homes is a strategic planning matter and would therefore be looked at through any future review of LPP1. However, the AH SPD is designed to provide guidance to applicants on how</p>

	<p>Sovereign urge the Council to update the SPD to introduce a degree of flexibility with affordable home ownership products and in particularly the application of First Homes.</p> <p>Due to the high values within Waverley First Homes are only likely to be a feasible product for 1 and 2 bed properties, predominantly flats, and therefore mix aspirations should reflect this. Greater flexibility of other affordable home ownership products should also be considered to ensure a wider group of affordable need is addressed.</p> <p>As noted previously, the SHMA has not be updated since 2015 and along with wider local plan policies the viability of First Homes has not been fully considered."</p>	<p>we will apply national policy requirements in the interim period.</p> <p>Viability of First Homes has been assessed in the First Homes Viability Update 2021 (Three Dragons)</p>
--	---	---

Viability

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
G Fox	Agreed. Once the decision has been made and PP granted any subsequent application to reduce the affordable housing allocation should be rejected as matter of course. Viability of the site is the remit of the Developer not the Council.... I feel very strongly that once the AH allocation has been set as part of the original PP it should be cast in stone and not seem to be open to ongoing reduction as has happened only too often in Waverley. It is up to the developer to take account of this at the time he purchases the site and progresses the design. Lack of Viablity due to poor and inadequate research and preplanning should not be of concern to the council	✓
Edward Dwyer	[All applications which seek to amend or reduce the affordable housing requirement on the basis of viability will be taken to Planning Committee] This seems fair.... Totally agree	✓
Aster	Agree	
Haslemere CLT	Amendments and reductions to affordable housing In Haslemere, we have witnessed developers submitting planning applications that fail to meet LPP1 policy AHN1 and are concerned that changes can be made to the quantity and type of affordable homes in a scheme, after planning permission has been granted. We therefore support the added provision in paragraph 85 that: "All applications which seek to amend or reduce the affordable housing requirement on the basis of viability will be taken to Planning Committee." The council should ensure Developers support every viability assessment by providing the evidence listed in Appendix 2 of the SPD. Even amendments that increase the amount of affordable homes	✓

	<p>offered should be thoroughly reviewed, especially those on greenfield sites where profits are potentially much higher.</p>	
<p>Bewley</p>	<p>Unfortunately, the Council appears to be taking a different approach with the draft updates to the SPD. At Paragraph 58 on Page 25 of the draft the Council suggests that all schemes should include Social Rent unless a viability test is passed. This approach, to introduce a viability test to differentiate between affordable tenures is not supported by National policy in the Framework nor the PPG. In fact the Council has no basis whatsoever to seek to introduce such a requirement when the Government position is clear that Affordable Housing can comprise one or more of the types identified in Annex 2 of the Framework. At no point does the Government stipulate that a particular tenure should take precedent over another.</p> <p>2.7 In fact the Council's own adopted Development Plan Policy (Policy AHN1) contains no support for the introduction of a mandatory level of Social Rent and instead seeks a reflection of the type of housing as being required in the most up-to-date evidence. A 'reflection' of the type of housing required is not a mandatory requirement.</p> <p>2.8 The underlying evidence base relied upon by the Council, particularly the Waverley Affordability Study 2021 prepared by Justin Gardiner Consulting, again provides no support for the approach being taken by the Council. In fact Paragraph 6.2 confirms that the report does not give the answers in terms of how affordable housing should be delivered. Paragraph 6.3 goes on to advise the Council that it will be important to have a clear view about what is viable in a local context.</p> <p>2.9 There is no evidence presented by the Council to demonstrate how it has considered viability particularly in relation to the draft proposal for Social Rent and the proposed caps to Affordable Rent. A viability assessment is essential to ensure that the proposed updates are realistic and will be deliverable. In fact the Justin Gardiner Consulting report makes this exact point in Paragraph 6.3.</p>	<p>Viability Assessments are only required when the policy requirement of AHN1 are not being met</p> <p>The SPD does not require a mandatory level of social rent. The recommendations in the SPD are based upon the latest evidence (2 studies). AHN1 points to latest evidence.</p> <p>SPD is intended as guidance; designed to give flexibility.</p> <p>Viability of Affordable Rent caps has been assessed in the Three Dragons First Homes viability update.</p>

	<p>2.10 Bewley Homes has serious concerns with the approach the Council is taking in relation to the updates to the SPD. The answer to improving affordability within the Borough lies primarily through increased delivery of new homes, which is a matter the Council needs to tackle urgently through a review of the LPP1 and not through updates to an SPD that have not been properly tested and will be unlikely to deliver the real step change in affordability and delivery of affordable homes that the Borough so desperately --</p>	<p>Housing delivery is a strategic planning matter and would therefore, be looked at through any future review of Local Plan Part 1.</p>
<p>Redwood Southwest Ltd</p>	<p>2.3 The CIL Viability Study prepared in 2017, acknowledges that “<i>Rent levels for affordable housing have an impact on residual land value</i>”. Savills typically assumes that an affordable product, has a value of circa 50-60% of Open Market Value. Private developers often sell parcels of consented land to Registered Providers, who would, naturally, value affordable rented or intermediate at the higher end of the discount.</p> <p>2.4. In addition, private developers may soon have to factor 25% provision of First Homes (at circa 70-80% of Open Market Value). The provision is First Homes is not thought to be of interest to Registered Providers, and thus private developers will need to factor within the cashflow assumptions the market sale of a greater proportion of properties on site. WBC should be mindful of the delivery implications arising.</p> <p>2.5. The Affordable Housing SPD presently poses a risk in undermining the viability of development proposals in the borough, which in turn will mean that other planning benefits are not provided. As an example, CIL and the affordable housing requirements combined could result in impacts such as, viability arguments to which seek to suppress the total affordable provision, reduced biodiversity net gain (BNG), little or no Section 106 obligations, reduced quality building materials and the loss of community infrastructure from masterplans. This, in the context that CIL may not normally be avoided, unless in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>2.6. The impact of effectively reducing the number of shared ownership homes in a scheme as a result of First Homes policy will result in affordable</p>	<p>Once the updated SPD is adopted, our expectation is that valuations and bids will be made on the basis of the capped rents.</p> <p>First Homes is a national policy.</p> <p>As part of evidence base behind the SPD, the First Homes Viability Update considered the impact of CIL, First Homes, rent levels and tenure mix.</p>

	<p>housing providers having less scope to cross subsidise social/affordable rented housing. Combined with the further proposal to reduce affordable rents to 65- 70% of Open Market Value this compounds viability issues and there is no robust evidence from the Council that demonstrates affordable housing delivery will not be impacted. It is a serious flaw of the current consultation that a fully worked up financial viability study has not been undertaken.</p> <p>2.8 It seems clear to us that more and more planning applications will need to be accompanied by viability reports, making planning decisions more challenging and slowing down housing delivery, with no obvious upside to the new policy if affordable housing delivery is negatively impacted.</p>	<p>See First Homes Viability update.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Redwood Southwest Ltd</p>	<p>3.6. Whilst the Council’s desire to increase the delivery of social rented housing (or secure greater discounts against open market rents than the 80% of Affordable Rent) is understandable, it is important to recall that Affordable Rent enables affordable housing to be delivered with less reliance on scarce public subsidy, and enables the Registered Provider to generate a greater return to be reinvested in their core activities of providing affordable housing, when compared with social rent.</p> <p>3.7. Paragraph 58 implies that social rented housing should be prioritised and only where it is not viable should the Council consider alternative rent levels. This appears to place a requirement upon the applicant to demonstrate viability (or a lack thereof) and to have potentially secured grant funding if they seek to deliver affordable housing at anything other than social rent. It is common practice that policy-compliant levels of development do not need to provide a viability report. The requirement as set out goes beyond the requirement of policy AHN1. In practice, if this is adopted, this will place all applicants at the extra cost and time of commissioning viability evidence; and will place the Council at the additional cost and time of reviewing that evidence. In doing so, this creates barriers to development and could slow or inhibit the delivery of much-needed affordable housing.</p>	<p>Viability Assessments are only required when the policy requirement of AHN1 are not being met</p>

	<p>3.8. Moreover, it also increases the uncertainty and planning risk in the planning process for the applicant since they must make a viability argument even where their proposals are otherwise compliant with policy AHN1. For Registered Providers in particular, who typically operate on a non-profit basis (or reinvest profits into more affordable housing), this could harm their ability to compete in the land market against commercial players, due to their reduced appetite for risk.</p> <p>3.9. Overall, we hold significant concerns about the SPD's provisions that will affect the viability of development, the ability of registered providers to fund their future business activity (which includes the ongoing provision of more affordable homes) and the creation of additional 'hurdles' that must be overcome through the planning application process. Whilst the aim of these measures is laudable there is a risk they will simply inhibit or delay the delivery of affordable housing as an unintended consequence. We recommend that the additional text at paragraph 58 is deleted; and reference to social rent at paragraph 54 is deleted. The most appropriate place for matters of rent levels in particular is through the Development Plan, when the impacts upon viability can be considered in the wider context of what is achievable and viable.</p>	<p>The SPD does not require a mandatory level of social rent. The recommendations in the SPD are based upon the latest evidence (2 studies). AHN1 points to latest evidence.</p> <p>Rents at 60% have been assessed to be viable in the Three Dragons First Homes Viability Update 2021 (part of the remit of which was to assess viability of reduced rents as well as the implications of First Homes)</p>
<p>Redwood Southwest Ltd</p>	<p>Housing Affordability Study (December 2021)</p> <p>4.1. This document has been prepared to provide analysis of the affordability in WBC, to inform the housing strategy.</p> <p>4.2. Whilst this report does not focus on need, there is an evident overall need for affordable homes in the borough. It is also clear that this document does not focus on viability itself, it says: <i>"it will be important for the Council to have a clear view about what is viable in a local context. The Council will also need to form a view about how to deal with situations where viability is an issue. This essentially means making a decision between providing a quantum of affordable housing or a better quality offer (i.e. more affordable to the end user). For example, if affordable rents at 60% are not viable for</i></p>	<p>Rents at 60% have been assessed to be viable in the Three Dragons First Homes Viability Update 2021 (part of the remit of which was to assess viability of reduced rents as well as the implications of First Homes)</p> <p>The Affordable Housing SPD is guidance. The Housing Enabling team will continue</p>

	<p><i>the number of units required, does the Council reduce the number of units or increase the proportion of the market rent?”</i></p> <p>4.3. Redwood agrees with the statement above provided by J G Consulting, to advise WBC. However, it is not clear that GBC have considered this advice or shown that they have responded to it in any of their consultation material. In the SPD update, part three is on viability and the only update appears to relate to applications which seek to reduce the affordable housing requirement will be taken to planning committee.</p>	<p>to consider specific sites on a case-by-case basis.</p>
<p>McCarthy Stone</p>	<p>PPG addresses Supplementary Planning Documents and at Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 61-008-20190315 states that ‘Supplementary planning documents (SPDs) should build upon and provide more detailed advice or guidance on policies in an adopted local plan. As they do not form part of the development plan, they cannot introduce new planning policies into the development plan. They are however a material consideration in decision-making. They should not add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development’.</p> <p>We would also remind the Council of the role of viability testing in relations to Local Plan’s in Paragraph 58 of the NPPF and that the PPG states that “<i>The role for viability assessment is primarily at the plan making stage. Viability assessment should not compromise sustainable development but should be used to ensure that policies are realistic, and that the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine deliverability of the plan</i>” (Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 10-002-20190509).</p>	<p>As part of the evidence base behind the SPD, the First Homes Viability Update considered the impact of CIL, First Homes, rent levels and tenure mix.</p> <p>The SPD is designed to provide applicants with guidance on how the AH policies in LPP1 will be implemented and the new First Homes requirement.</p>
<p>Thakeham</p>	<p>Paragraph 52 states “Providers should pay developers in the range of approximately 30% to 70% market value”. Firstly, it is questioned whether it is appropriate for an SPD to be dictating commercial terms between a developer and an RP. Whilst ‘should’ suggests some flexibility there is potentially some ambiguity on how this is phrased</p>	<p>The Affordable Housing SPD is guidance. The Housing Enabling team will continue to consider specific sites on a case-by-case basis.</p>

	and there is, as a minimum, a need to include “subject to prevailing values, unit type and tenure, providers would be expected to pay...”.	
Sovereign	Sovereign support the Councils proposed policy to refer schemes subject to viability assessment to Planning Committee. Assessing development viability is now an integral part of planning and should become part of normal planning practice. We would encourage the Council to seek in-house expertise in respect to assessing open book development viability, noting the delay and cost associated with independent assessments.	✓

Affordable Housing Contacts

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
Abri	<p>The list of affordable housing developer contacts on the Waverley website currently lists Radian.</p> <p>It would be useful to have this updated to the new name and Abri email address, with the same wording as for other providers, noting Abri as a general needs provider developing larger sites of typically 20+ affordable homes.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Web page amended</p>

Commuted Sums

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
McCarthy Stone	<p>The SPD should also clarify that certain specialist housing schemes such as those meeting the needs of older people should be exempt from providing affordable housing on site and that a financial contribution will be acceptable instead. This is because specialist housing for older people is often delivered on smaller sites of up to 50 units in central sustainable locations where it would not be viable to deliver on site affordable housing. In addition, it is often not appropriate to mix affordable housing in specialist housing schemes for older people which by their very nature are based around communal facilities and communal living and delivered on smaller sites. This would ensure the SPD is consistent with both national policy and the SPD’s own evidence and to ensure that the SPD proposed changes do not <i>add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development</i>.</p> <p>Therefore add to the end of para 103 to read: A commuted sum will also be accepted for schemes delivering specialist accommodation such as housing for older people.</p>	<p>C2 or C3 distinction is relevant here. We will continue to require on-site affordable housing on C3 older persons’ housing schemes.</p>
Witley Parish Council	<p>We support the statement in CI 110: “On-site provision of affordable housing will be required and only in exceptional circumstances (which are listed) will an alternative to on-site provision be considered”.</p>	<p>✓</p>

Design and Space Standards

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
Thakeham	<p>Thakeham seeks further clarification on Paragraph 78. Whilst Thakeham supports that Affordable Homes should meet the Nationally Described Space Standards, the standards do not separate between affordable ownership and affordable rented. Therefore, clarity/ amendment is needed to explain why 3b5p is not acceptable for affordable rented if the unit still meets the 93sqm standard. This amendment limits options on unit types thereby deterring some RP's and there should be more flexibility around such provision.</p> <p>Thakeham supports the inclusion of the new minimum floor area for 4-bed houses which was omitted from the current Affordable Housing SPD.</p>	<p>ACTION: Further clarification added to para 77</p>

Further comments

	SUMMARY OF ISSUE RAISED	HOW HAS ISSUE BEEN ADDRESSED?
CW and BA Wicks	<p>Sir</p> <p>If you have every sat in your car (in Farnham SOUTH STREET, WAVERLEY ROAD. TILFORD ROAD. AND THE A31 EAST AND WEST) you will have no doubt the problem is the Farnham RAILWAY STATION GATE CLOSURES due to long 14 carriages mainly going back and forth all most empty, approximately every 5 /6 minutes where the gates are closed for so long, it has become unbearable.</p> <p>So until that and other road, schools, surgeries, hospitals, and all the other services that have now become a pain to live in Farnham. New housing (all types) should be put on hold until all the new builds sitting unoccupied, and those with planning permission that are not being built should be seriously considered .</p> <p>Therefore it is a BIG NO to SPD. It would be nice to see the outcome, because I cannot believe there is more room in Farnham for more house building.</p> <p>Regards CW & BA Wicks</p>	<p>Comment noted however not within the scope of this consultation.</p>
Edward Dwyer	<p>Not really other than to say it is essential we get more AH in the borough to attract the necessary skills required in our hospitals, schools etc</p>	<p>✓</p>
Aster	<p>The SPD should set out clearly what the Councils expectations are - these should then be secured in each and every consent in detail so that rent caps etc are stipulated within s106 agreements.</p>	

	<p>The SPD should also set out the Council's approach to securing additional affordable homes on sites. Will such homes be supported and receive CIL relief, and how will the council ensure their requirements placed on these homes do not conflict with an RPs ability to apply Homes England Grant.</p>	<p>The Affordable Housing SPD flows from Local Plan Part 1, which does not contain a policy on additional affordable homes, therefore the SPD does not cover this topic. The Housing Enabling team will continue to work in partnership with affordable housing providers to optimise new affordable housing, including through additionality.</p>
Cranleigh Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council SUPPORTS the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document.</p>	<p>✓</p>
Haslemere CLT	<p>Enforcement We are pleased to see, at paragraph 34, the intent to ensure planning obligations are met: “the Council will consider all options including enforcement to remedy the solution.” However, this provision could be improved by listing example of the options available rather than stating “all options</p>	<p>The Council cannot fetter its discretion by listing options</p>
Bewley	<p>As a starting point it is important to note that Waverley Borough is an inherently unaffordable place to live. In fact the latest Affordability Ratio data published by ONS on 23 March 2022 confirms that Waverley is the least affordable local planning authority area outside of London in the country with a median workplace based ratio of 18.32. That is significant. The consequence of such a high ratio is that more of the population are forced out of the open market within Waverley. This further increases the amount of need for affordable homes to be provided. There is no question</p>	<p>✓</p>

	<p>that affordable housing should be a key corporate priority for the Council and that each housing development that meets the necessary thresholds should make an appropriate contribution towards that need. It is important to understand why Waverley is so unaffordable. The simple answer to this is the extensive history of under delivery within the Borough dating back over at least the last 10 years. The Council has been in a continual cycle of not being able to demonstrate a rolling 5- year housing land supply, which has just be reconfirmed in its latest 01 April 2022 based housing land supply position statement</p> <p>A substantial part of the solution is therefore to deliver more housing across the Borough on sites that meet the threshold requirements set out in the adopted Local Plan Part 1 and therefore are able to deliver onsite affordable homes.</p>	
<p>Rushmoor Borough Council</p>	<p>No comments to make but please continue to notify us of future consultations</p>	<p>✓</p>
<p>Redwood Southwest Ltd</p>	<p>Affordable housing delivery Affordable housing delivery in Waverley is already low. It seems clear to us that more and more planning applications will need to be accompanied by viability reports, making planning decisions more challenging and slowing down housing delivery, with no obvious upside to the new policy if affordable housing delivery is negatively impacted.</p> <p>These changes should be through Local Plan review and not SPD</p> <p>3.4. Through the draft SPD and particularly paragraph 57, the Council is setting rent requirements that go well above and beyond the remit of adopted policy AHN1 ‘Affordable Housing on Development Sites’. Furthermore, the delivery of social rented homes, or homes at rents capped at 65% to 70% of open market rents, inevitably affects development viability. It is a long-held principle that Supplementary Planning Documents must not create development plan policy ‘by the back</p>	<p>Local Plan Part 1 points to ‘latest evidence’ – the updated Waverley Housing Affordability Study and First Homes Viability Update are the latest evidence. The SPD does not create policy but reflects national policy changes over which local authorities have no control or choice.</p>

	<p>door’ but the emerging SPD extends its reach considerably beyond that set out in policy AHN1 (which does not prescribe the tenure mix to be sought) by setting prescriptive expectations on tenures and rents that can affect development viability. Planning applications should be determined in accordance with the adopted policy, and whilst a SPD can be a material consideration, such divergence from adopted policy as prescribed, will inevitably hinder the determination of otherwise policy compliant planning applications.</p> <p>3.5. Planning Practice Guidance also confirms that SPDs should “not add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development” (Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 61-008-20190315). Since development must address sometimes competing priorities (including affordable housing, quality of design, CIL contributions, biodiversity net gain, amongst other important matters) the correct place for viability to be considered is through the Development Plan where those priorities can be considered in the round.</p> <p>Taking planning applications to Committee Paragraph 85 of the Draft SPD indicates that any application which departs from the tenure requirements set out in the SPD will be considered by the Planning Committee. This reason alone would mean <i>any</i> application that does not provide the expected amount of social rented dwellings could be presented to the Committee (particularly those on smaller sites which the Council can deal with efficiently under delegated powers) even if it complies with adopted policy AHN1 as a whole. This again increases the planning risk for applicants; leaving affordable housing matters aside, the Committee can take a contrary view to officers on any aspect of a proposal and can refuse permission even where officers recommend approval. Ultimately, this could result in sites being brought to Planning Committee on affordable housing grounds (even where they comply with the Development Plan) but being refused on other matters. We recommend that the proposed additional sentence to paragraph 85 is deleted.</p>	<p>25% First Homes required by national planning policy</p> <p>This is not a new requirement in the SPD, but had been included for clarity. The requirement to take to planning committee was added to the Waverley Scheme of Delegation to Officers (approved by Full Council 18 October 2022) ACTION: Amended para 85 to change to all applications will be dealt</p>
--	--	---

		with in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation
Natural England	We have checked our records and based on the information provided, we can confirm that in our view the proposals contained within the plan will not have significant effects on sensitive sites that Natural England has a statutory duty to protect.	✓
National Highways	We have reviewed this consultations and associated documents and have 'No Comments'.	✓
McCarthy Stone	<p>Need for and benefits of older person's housing</p> <p>There will be a significant increase in older persons' projected and the provision of suitable housing and care to meet the needs of this demographic should be a priority of emerging SPD.</p> <p>Older peoples housing produces a large number of significant benefits which can help to reduce the demands exerted on Health and Social Services and other care facilities.</p> <p>Retirement housing releases under-occupied family housing and plays a very important role in recycling of housing stock in general. There is a 'knock-on' effect in terms of the whole housing chain enabling more effective use of existing housing.</p>	<p>We do not dispute the benefits of affordable housing for older people. The SPD relates to affordable housing, not private market housing. Older people's housing needs are already addressed in LPP1. Planning for older people's needs to be addressed as part of any Local Plan Review. SPD cannot create policy. Downsizing is addressed in the Affordable Homes Delivery Strategy action plan</p>
McCarthy Stone	In addition, we note that some related information refers to the draft Waverley Borough Council Climate Change and Sustainability Supplementary Planning Document which was consulted upon earlier in the year. With any revised SPD, the opportunity should be taken to assess the viability, and in this case the viability of the suggested sustainability	Viability assessment takes into account all requirements including climate change

	<p>initiatives if the climate SPD is going to be progressed as the climate change SPD does not do this itself. This would be in accordance with PPG para Paragraph: 001 Reference ID: 10-001-20190509 'These policy requirements should be informed by evidence of infrastructure and affordable housing need, and a proportionate assessment of viability that takes into account all relevant policies, and local and national standards, including the cost implications of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and section 106'.</p>	<p>Outside the scope of the Affordable Housing SPD updates consultation</p>
Historic England	<p>Historic England has no specific comments to make on the above document but would advise that the Council's own conservation staff are closely involved in its preparation, as they are often best placed to advise on local historic environment issues and priorities, sources of data and, consideration of any matters relating to the historic environment.</p>	<p>✓</p>
Witley Parish Council	<p>Witley Parish Council supports the updates to the Affordable Housing SPD.</p>	<p>✓</p>
Thakeham	<p>Thakeham supports paragraph 66 however, the Council need to add to the last sentence "unless a waiver is agreed by Homes England". This removes any potential conflict if there are changes by Homes England.</p> <p>Thakeham supports the removal of the affordability ratio and the number of households waiting on Waverley's Housing Register for affordable or social rented housing. Whilst the removal from the SPD is sensible as the document is unlikely to be updated yearly (for most up to date figures), the Council should make sure that these figures are then reported in the Annual Monitoring Report, as it is important to understand the latest situation with regard to affordability and those waiting for affordable homes.</p>	<p>ACTION added to para 65 "unless a waiver is agreed by Homes England".</p>

<p>Haslemere CLT</p>	<p>Enforcement We are pleased to see, at paragraph 34, the intent to ensure planning obligations are met: “the Council will consider all options including enforcement to remedy the solution.” However, this provision could be improved by listing example of the options available rather than stating “all options”.</p> <p>Paragraph 74c) refers to the Housing Allocation Policy but it is unclear which document this is. Is it the Housing Allocation Scheme May 2020? We suggest a link to the Policy is added to this SPD.</p>	<p>Worded in this way based upon legal advice to ensure that the Council does not fetter its discretion.</p> <p>ACTION added hyperlink to para 73 (c)</p>
<p>Sovereign Housing Association</p>	<p>The Councils latest Annual Monitoring Report confirms the Borough have delivered 754 (gross) affordable homes since 2013, just under 22% of all supply against a target of 30%. To ensure local affordable need is being met it is important other forms of affordable supply are acknowledged.</p> <p>With reference to Funding of Affordable Homes on Page 23, the SPD could provide further commentary around “with grant” provision of affordable housing, the benefits this can bring to meeting local needs and how the Council will support additionality and/or all affordable schemes made possible through maximising RP’s access to grant such as through Homes England strategic partnerships.</p> <p>Sovereign are keen to deliver new affordable homes in the Borough championing our Homes and Place standard and would be happy to work closely with the Council.</p>	<p>✓</p>

Regulation 12 – Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England)

Regulations 2012

This consultation statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 12(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, which states that before a local planning authority adopts a supplementary planning document it must prepare a statement setting out:

- i. The persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document;
- ii. a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
- iii. how those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document.

This statement sets out who was consulted in the preparation of the draft Supplementary Planning Document: Affordable Housing, how they were consulted, what issues were raised and how those issues influenced the preparation of the document.

The Local Plan Regulations set out that LPAs should make the document 'available' for a minimum of four weeks. During such time, the document should be made available for inspection at the council offices and other appropriate locations, and should be published on the local planning authority website.

Regulation 13 states that any person may make representations about the SPD and that the representations must be made by the end of the consultation date referred to in Regulation 12.

As set out in Regulation 12 when seeking representations on an SPD documents must be made available in accordance with Regulation 35; which requires the Council to make documents available by taking the following steps:

- (i) make the document available at the principal office and other places within the area that the Council considers appropriate;
- (ii) Publish the document on the Council's website.