

Daventry District Council

Housing

Supplementary Planning Document

Statement of Consultation

Adopted July 2017



Introduction

This report sets out the focused consultation undertaken on changes to appendix J of the Housing Supplementary Planning Document (HSPD) adopted in July 2016. A separate statement of consultation has been published for consultation on the SPD, dated July 2016.

This report is required by regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012.

Consultation

Consultation commenced on Thursday 1st June 2017 for a four week period. Because of the very limited changes proposed to the recently adopted SPD, consultation was focused with the affected parish councils of the affected parishes, developers and registered providers

The consultation was undertaken alongside consultation on changes that were necessary to the council's Allocations Scheme.

Publicity

The focused changes to the SPD could be accessed from the Planning Policy, Housing Strategy and Consultation pages of the Daventry District Council Website.

Copies were available in all district libraries as well as the Council Offices at Lodge Road, Daventry.

Consultation Period

Consultation took place for a period of 4 weeks from 1st June 2017 until 4.30pm on 29th June 2017.

Comments received.

5 responses were received to both consultations. Four of the consultees stated that they had no comments to make on the consultation. One consultee made detailed comments on the SPD and allocations scheme. The entirety of the comments is included in appendix A for completeness.

Consideration of Responses

The representations were reported to the Council's Strategy Group on 6th July 2017, with a further report to Full Council on 27th July 2016 when the document was adopted.

The Council carefully considered all of the comments received. These are covered in the appendix A. A change has been made to the SPD as a result of these responses.

Appendix A – Responses to consultation on Housing SPD and Allocations Scheme

Respondent		Comment	Agreed Response	Agreed Action
1	Boughton Parish Council	Boughton Parish Council have no further comment to make on the above consultation.	Noted	No change
2	Historic England	Historic England have no comment to make	Noted	No change
3	Equality and Human Rights Commission	<p>The Commission does not have the resources to respond to all consultations, but will respond to consultations where it considers they raise issues of strategic importance.</p> <p>Local, parish and town councils and other public authorities, as well as organisations exercising public functions, have obligations under the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) in the Equality Act 2010 to consider the effect of their policies and decisions on people sharing particular protected characteristics. The PSED is an on-going legal requirement and must be complied with as part of the planning process. The Commission is the regulator for the PSED and the Planning Inspectorate is also subject to it. In essence, you must consider the potential for planning proposals to have an impact on equality for different groups of people.</p>	Noted. This has been taken into account in preparing the report.	No change

Respondent	Comment	Agreed Response	Agreed Action
4	<p data-bbox="264 252 609 327">Harlestone Parish Council</p> <p data-bbox="627 252 1281 402">Firstly HPC welcome the intention of DDC to simplify the nomination process with regard to Affordable Housing, the current system appears unwieldy and confusing.</p> <p data-bbox="627 438 1281 657">For clarification HPC assume that only those items of text that are red and underlined constitute the changes to the document and therefore the comments and observations set out below have only had account of these highlighted sections of the document</p> <p data-bbox="627 694 974 730">Pg 4 – HPC observation</p> <p data-bbox="627 769 1281 1098">HPC would respectfully request [t]hat an opening paragraph that clearly states that the purpose of this document is to focus solely upon the allocation of affordable housing within DDC’s administrative area but explicitly excluding the NRDA. It is noted that reference e is made throughout the document to this, however it would be helpful to have this clarified at the outset.</p> <p data-bbox="627 1252 1281 1321">Pg 5 - HPC suggestions highlighted as underlined text</p> <p data-bbox="627 1359 1281 1396"><i>The Council has developed an approach with</i></p>	<p data-bbox="1294 252 1400 290">Noted</p> <p data-bbox="1294 438 1684 475">That assumption is correct</p> <p data-bbox="1294 769 1742 1177">The Allocations Scheme in its revised form will cover the entire Daventry District, but will have a different approach for the part of the District which is also covered by the NRDA policy, or any other application which is approved to meet Northampton’s needs. This is already clearly set out in the opening paragraphs.</p> <p data-bbox="1294 1359 1662 1396">The suggested additional</p>	<p data-bbox="1780 252 1953 290">No change</p> <p data-bbox="1780 438 1953 475">No change</p> <p data-bbox="1780 769 1953 805">No change</p> <p data-bbox="1780 1359 1998 1396">Add ‘<u>currently</u></p>

Respondent	Comment	Agreed Response	Agreed Action
	<p><i>neighbouring authorities – Northampton Borough and South Northamptonshire Council – to nominations for housing in the Northampton Related Development Area (NRDA). Within this area, which includes part of Daventry District, the housing which is being developed is to meet the <u>currently identified housing</u> needs of Northampton. The policies setting this out can be found in the West Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy – a plan identifying the NRDA boundary is included at appendix G.</i></p> <p><i>Cross references are made throughout this document to the Northampton Borough Council’s Allocations Scheme. The ‘section’ references relate to the current version, adopted in December 2013) but could change during the lifetime of this scheme. <u>Where appropriate DDC will seek to update and/or amend this document to reflect any changes to the Northampton Borough Council document where it may impact upon the adopted DDC document.</u></i></p> <p>Page 10 HPC Comments highlighted as underlined text</p>	<p>wording is helpful and can be added.</p> <p>The suggested additional wording is helpful and can be added.</p>	<p><u>identified housing’</u> to first paragraph on page 5.</p> <p>Add ‘<u>Where appropriate DDC will seek to update and/or amend this document to reflect any changes to the Northampton Borough Council document where it may impact upon the adopted DDC document.</u>’ to fifth paragraph on page 5.</p>

Respondent	Comment	Agreed Response	Agreed Action
	<p><i><u>The allocation and potential occupation of affordable housing provision within the Northampton Related Development Area (NRDA) – as discussed in the section above</u></i></p> <p>Section 9.2 HPC Observation</p> <p>HPC seek clarity that the “criteria” set out in this section is consistent with the supporting documentation. We note that the criteria does differ from the criteria set out in the draft Housing SPD for example.</p> <p><u>Housing Supplementary Planning Document – Proposed focused change Consultation Draft</u></p> <p>General Observation – it would have been useful to have the two versions of the table either alongside one another or with tracked changes.</p> <p>Specific HPC Comments</p>	<p>The suggested additional wording is helpful and can be added.</p> <p>Section 9.2 sets out the local connections criteria for anyone wishing to join the register. The local connections criteria are not set out in the Housing SPD.</p> <p>Noted. On reflection this would have been helpful.</p>	<p>Add <u>The allocation and potential occupation of affordable housing provision within the</u> ” to final bullet point on page 10.</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Respondent	Comment	Agreed Response	Agreed Action
		<p>Part 1C needs to be read as a whole with the introductory text, it then reads <i>the applicant is a person with a close relative .. and requires support/care from the relative</i>. It is therefore clear that it is the applicant in need of care.</p> <p>The requirement is for a period of six months, this could be split or continuous. Agree it would be helpful to clarify this.</p> <p>Noted. Section 1 has been amended to align with the approach adopted by Northampton Borough, the remaining sections maintain the approach adopted by DDC for the remainder of Daventry District.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Add additional text at section 2A <u>'This could be a continuous period of 6 months or a combination of periods totalling 6 months'</u>.</p> <p>No change.</p>
	<p>Proposal - 1C: It is not particularly clear as to whether the qualifying person should be a carer, the person to be cared for or both. HPC would suggest this is reworded and made clearer.</p> <p>Proposal - 2A: Does the 6 (out of 12) months period have to run concurrently or could the period be split into different periods of residency that in total add up to (more than) 6 months. HPC would suggest this is clarified.</p> <p>HPC notes the hierarchical nature of the allocation system, however there does appear to be inconsistencies with regard to proposals 1B (employment – including temporary employment) and also 1C (relating to carers). It is noted that the general thrust of these qualifying criteria is not carried forward into the sections 2, 3, 4 and 4.</p> <p>HPC would respectfully request that in order to be consistent then the criteria's</p>		

Respondent		Comment	Agreed Response	Agreed Action
		<p>requirements should trickle down into the wording of the remaining locational restrictions. For example should the wording of Criteria 2B, 3B, 4B and 5B also include reference to employees who are “<i>permanent contract, temporary/fixed term or self-employed for a minimum of 16 hours per week, for 9 out of the past 12 months</i>”</p> <p>I trust the comments set out are helpful, should you require any further information or clarification then please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>		
5	Natural England	<p>Whilst we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic of the Supplementary Planning Document does not appear to relate to our interests to any significant extent. We therefore do not wish to comment.</p>	Noted	No change