

Examination of the Maldon District Local Development Plan**Agenda for 10.00 hours Tuesday 3 February 2015*****DAY 7 (AM) - Matter 8: Affordable Housing, Housing Mix and Specialist Needs*****Three Rivers Golf & Country Club, Stow Road, Cold Norton, Purleigh, Essex CM3 6RR**

Discussions will focus on whether the District Local Plan is legally compliant and sound (positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy) and, if not, how it should be modified to make it so

Opening Announcements

- Health and safety, people present, and attendance list
- Purpose of the hearing sessions
- Conduct of the hearing session
- Inspector's report

Consideration of any site visits

- Suggestions from representors & from the Council
- Can an agreed site visit programme be given to me later?

Affordable Housing, Housing Mix and Specialist Needs

Note: this session deals with the detail of development. The strategic principles (numbers and distribution) were discussed at the Matter 2 hearing.

1. The PPG advises at ID: 23b-012 that "*contributions should not be sought from developments of 10-units or less and which have a maximum combined gross floorspace of no more than 1000sqm*" for affordable housing, whereas policy H1 requires contributions from five or more homes. The Council says at paragraphs 8.2 to 8.5 of its Statement that it has assessed this advice and that it suggests no modifications to the policy. However, the Council seems to accept that the policy should be modified to accord with the PPG advice because it says that "*the new guidance could potentially reduce the number of affordable units being delivered.*" Is the Council therefore accepting that I should make a main modification to the policy to apply the PPG's target limits?
2. If I agree with the Council's suggested modifications in its Position Statements of 30 January 2015 that the North Heybridge Garden Suburb requirements in policy S4 for a strategic flood alleviation scheme and a Country Park should be deleted, does this mean: a) that site S2(d)'s viability is greatly enhanced; and b) that therefore there is now a need to increase H1's affordable homes requirement for site S2(d) North of Heybridge from 25% to 40%. If not, why not?
3. If I were not to agree with one or both of the above suggested modifications by the

Council, are the target levels in policy H1 for the North Heybridge Garden Suburb set correctly in viability terms? If not, please provide the viability evidence to justify a variation.

4. Some representations suggest that the South Maldon Garden Suburb is currently not viable if it has to provide the 40% affordable homes target set in policy H1. Some have suggested 20% [e.g. CODE for Commercial Estates on S2(a)]. Are these still being pursued? If so, please provide the evidence to justify any variation.
5. Will policy H1 meet the affordable housing need? The SHMA indicates an annual requirement of 130 affordable homes per annum (1950 over the plan period) and the key strategic sites will provide 1200 such homes. Please would the Council explain, with evidence, how maximising the existing housing stock and rural exception schemes will meet the shortfall of 750 homes (Statement paras 8.13 to 8.15).
6. What do participants think of the suggested change by Dalton Warner Davies (its Q5) to the Council's suggested modification 051 (free serviced land)?
7. In policy H2, is the SHMA only to be a guide to the housing mix of a particular site as per Phase 2's Statement? Should policy H2 and H3 contain a reference to viability as a factor as Phase 2 suggest?
8. Are policies H2 and H3 effective in that they delegate housing mix and specialist needs accommodation to later non-DPD documents? Is the Council's suggested modification 072 to this effect acceptable for policy H3?
9. Are there any other respects in which these issues in the Plan would not be sound that have not already been discussed here or previously?

Any Other Matters

- Any other points representors wish to make