

East Devon Local Plan – Topic Paper

Chapter 8. Meeting Housing Needs for All

Audit trail local plan evolution document and consultation statement

February 2025 – Version 02 – Ref: OTE-009 and CSD-007



Contact details

Planning Policy Team
East Devon District Council
Blackdown House, Border Road
Heathpark Industrial Estate
Honiton
EX14 1EJ

Phone: 01395 516551

Email: planningpolicy@eastdevon.gov.uk

<http://eastdevon.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/>

To request this information in an alternative format or language please phone 01395 516551 or email csc@eastdevon.gov.uk

Contents

1	Introduction.....	4
2	The Publication draft of the Local Plan	4
3	Summary of proposed redrafting of Chapter 8 of the consultation plan	4
4	Issues and Options consultation	5
5	Draft plan consultation	5
6	Further Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024.....	6
7	Sustainability Appraisal feedback	6
8	Habitats Regulations Assessment	6
9	Repetition of theme in representations and avoiding duplication of responses.....	6
10	Assessment of policies in chapter 8.....	7
11	Conclusions	97

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This is one of a series of topic papers that will sit behind and help explain the content of and evolution of the Publication draft of the East Devon Local Plan.
- 2.1 There may be new versions of this topic paper as plan making progresses to Publication and thereafter into and through plan Examination.
- 3.1 This topic paper specifically addresses Chapter 8 of the plan – meeting housing needs.

2 The Publication draft of the Local Plan

- 2.1 This report is a redraft of an earlier report and in revised form it is specifically concerned with supporting the local plan at the Regulation 19 stage of plan making work. There are specific Government regulations that apply to local plan making and these set out actions that need to be undertaken at different regulatory stages (this report specifically relates to Regulations 18, 19 and 20).
- 2.2 The proposed Publication draft text of the local plan is an edited and amended draft of the consultation draft plan published in November 2022. The draft plan was consulted on under plan making Regulation 18 with further limited additional consultation under this regulation in the Spring of 2024.

3 Summary of proposed redrafting of Chapter 8 of the consultation plan

- 3.1 From the Reg 18 to the Reg 19 plan Chapter 8 has been edited down quite considerably to simplify presentation and concentrating on the most significant issues and removing matters not directly relevant to planning policy considerations and local plan provision. This has included some text that was about the stages of plan making work we were previously at and the plan making work going forward.
 - 3.2 Key more detailed changes to the plan, from the consultation draft to this redrafting, include:
 - Highlighting in policy the aspiration to secure accommodation for younger people to assist in supporting a younger workforce.
 - Removal of First Homes from policy on affordable housing and more so for policy throughout the plan. First Homes are an affordable housing type that applies a discount to market house sales. But they are not favoured by the current Government and their provision has not been supported through plan engagement. There is minimal evidence of the development industry wishing to see them developed and other forms of affordable housing are seen as far more credible and desirable. We will, need to keep this under review given that we are seeking to progress the plan under transitional arrangements
-

that mean it would be assessed against the December 2023 version of the NPPF which includes reference to requirements for First Homes. However the hope is that, given that this is not the new governments policy and they would not meet the identified needs in East Devon, the removal of reference to them would not be challenged.

- Under affordable housing policy we have placed the emphasis on social rent provision. The affordable housing policy will, however, need to be subject to careful scrutiny under viability assessment.
- We have lowered expectations for elderly person housing delivery. In the draft plan they are considered to be too high and demanding, and site size threshold on which they would be required are too low.
- Policy on accessible and adaptable homes seeks somewhat lower levels of provision noting that the needs in the draft plan were not realistically justified, we were duplicating provision that would otherwise be provided through other, social care means and as drafted previously plan policy would have very significant cost implications.
- We have removed the Policy that specified the mix, by bedroom sizes, sought on new housing development sites. This is seen as being too prescriptive and that better outcomes will be achieved in terms of consideration of actual applications that come in and responding to site specific considerations.
- For rural exception housing sites we have deleted the 15 dwelling upper size threshold. Noting that some schemes may reasonably be for larger developments given local needs. But we would still seek to ensure that any development allowed is not disproportionate to the size of the host settlement.

4 Issues and Options consultation

- 4.1 Prior to production and consultation on the draft local plan the Council consulted on a local plan Issues and Options¹ report. This included a series of questions that responses and comments were invited on. A feedback report was published².
- 4.2 Feedback on comments is set out further on in this report.

5 Draft plan consultation

- 5.1 In the draft plan consultation Chapter 8 formed one of the plan chapters that was consulted on. A full feedback on the consultation can be viewed at - [accessible-reg-18-consultation-feedback-report-spring-2023.pdf](https://www.eastdevon.gov.uk/accessible-reg-18-consultation-feedback-report-spring-2023.pdf) ([eastdevon.gov.uk](https://www.eastdevon.gov.uk))
- 5.2 Comments on matters raised and officer responses are set out in the table below. There were a significant number of comments in respect of housing policy, but more so in respect of housing numbers being planned for, with many challenging them over being too high but also, especially from a developer perspective, of challenges that they were not high enough. That

¹ [issuesandoptionsreport-jan2021.pdf](https://www.eastdevon.gov.uk/issuesandoptionsreport-jan2021.pdf) ([eastdevon.gov.uk](https://www.eastdevon.gov.uk))

² [2a. Consultation feedback report Ver 03.pdf](https://www.eastdevon.gov.uk/2a.Consultation%20feedback%20report%20Ver%2003.pdf) ([eastdevon.gov.uk](https://www.eastdevon.gov.uk))

said, this chapter of the plan is not for the most part directly considered with the actual numbers of houses planned.

6 Further Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024

- 6.1 In the late Spring of 2024 there was further Regulation 18 consultation on selected topic matters. Community buildings and facilities were not matters that were explicitly consulted on. No specific relevant feedback is noted in this report, though it is recognised that some matters consulted on could impact, under final plan policy, on sites that may be allocated for development.

7 Sustainability Appraisal feedback

- 7.1 The draft local plan was supported by a Sustainability Appraisal³ (SA). This SA will be updated and refined as plan making progresses and it will be one of the documents that is submitted as part of the submission for Examination.
- 7.2 The SA report of the draft plan was supportive of the policy approach being taken forward.

8 Habitats Regulations Assessment

- 8.1 The local plan will need to be assessed under the Habitat Regulations. An preliminary assessment of policies in the draft plan has been produced – [east-devon-local-plan-hra-110723-2013-doc-from-footprint.pdf \(eastdevon.gov.uk\)](#)
- 8.1 The assessment work did not identify any concerns in respect to the policies in the draft plan.

9 Repetition of theme in representations and avoiding duplication of responses

- 9.1 Housing matters, including the number of houses being planned for and policies around such matters as housing mix, locations for development and affordable housing have received many representations through consultation – more so than for any other local plan topic matter.
- 9.2 In preparing this topic paper it is clear that many themes and issues have been repeated many times with minimal or no real variations) in comments made at different stages of plan making work. We fully acknowledge the importance that representors attach to the

³ [sa-of-pos-consultation-draft-lp_2022.pdf \(eastdevon.gov.uk\)](#)

points raised and in this document we include summary feedback of matters highlighted. However, to avoid repetition of officer responses, somewhat repeatedly through various parts of this report, we have sought to not included feedback in later report sections where we consider matters have already been addressed in response to earlier comments made (earlier chronologically as set out in the document).

10 Assessment of policies in chapter 8

10.1 Chapter 8 of the draft plan set out a series of policies that are reviewed below.

General issues raised on Chapter 8

Key technical evidence sources

The housing chapter of the plan has primarily drawn on the ORS Housing Needs Assessment report - [East Devon, Exeter, Mid Devon and Teignbridge Local Housing Needs Assessment 2022](#)

Issues and options consultation

Paragraph 5.10 of the Issues and Options report identifies nine housing policy areas, including encouraging more self-build homes, allocating sites for retirement housing and setting minimum space standards for new homes.

Most respondents, 67%, ticked the yes box to the question about whether these 9 policy areas are appropriate to be addressed in the new local plan. Their comments on the nine additional housing objectives largely focused on applying other proposed local plan objectives to these policy areas, indicating potential aspects of Local Plan housing policy.

A number of respondents did suggest other major housing policy areas as well. A few responses to other questions also suggested housing policy areas. There is some overlap with other policy areas, notably design, climate emergency, jobs/economy and natural environment.

Officer commentary in response:

- It is noted that the policy areas identified in the issues and option report were generally regarded as appropriate subject matters/ areas for inclusion in the local plan.

Draft Plan consultation

<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <p>Overarching comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some developers challenge the suite of housing need policies.• The ability for the vision, homes and jobs to be delivered must be central to the setting of Local Plan policy but they do not consider this is the case. The Plan’s approach, viewed as a whole, is in grave danger of impacting negatively on delivery of housing.• The plan almost completely relies on the private sector to deliver the plan aims/objectives but the endless ratcheting up of policy requirements will kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. This will be to no one’s benefit. For my client to build 40 of the dwellings he wishes to build, he has to, according to draft policy, find land for 100 dwellings with sufficient additional land to provide the aspirational 20% BNG and also some employment land, which may or may not relate to any market demand.• One respondent commented that this section is too prescriptive. The LPA must have control but should put the Councils/national Vision as the driving force, which can get lost with multiple sub points in each policy. Recognise that the world in 10 years will be very different to now. Questions whether a more prescriptive policy will remain fit for purpose• Keep exceptions to a minimum to avoid abuse of policies.• Another wants coherent strategic thinking that addresses specific housing need in rural areas and the climate change crisis at the same time• The East Devon AONB team note that AONB’s are included as part of a designated rural area for the	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The vision in the plan has been significantly changed from that in the draft plan. The vision and the policies that follow from it have been drafted to set out a strategy to delivery required levels of housing, as a minimum, as set out in national planning policy.• The plan is being reviewed to ensure that policies add up in viability terms. Final policies will be adjusted to ensure plan viability.• The plan seeks to set an agenda that establishes outcomes sought whilst still providing flexibility. Policies have been redrafted to be less prescriptive and to avoiding seeking to address every possible scenario. It is relevant to build in flexibility on policy to acknowledge that exceptional or atypical circumstances can and do arise.• The plan seeks to strike a balance for housing provision in all areas, but also seen against an appreciation of a range pf other considerations, including climate change concerns.• In the AONBs the local plan, through housing and other policies, will seek to meet broader AONB objectives.
--	--

<p>purposes of locating affordable housing, and suggest that even if there is a proven need for affordable housing it should meet NPPF 177 if required, be located and designed to respect the aims and purposes of the AONB designation and include an appropriate LVIA.</p>	
<p>Supplementary Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This consultation did not specifically seek comment on housing policy matters, though it is highlighted that there were a number of potential housing allocations in Green Wedge and Coastal Preservation areas that were consulted on. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If it is ultimately deemed appropriate to allocate housing or development on sites in Green Wedge and Coastal Preservation areas the expectation would be that the landscape designated would be removed.
<p>Sustainability Appraisal</p>	
<p>See Sustainability Appraisal table below.</p>	
<p>Habitat Regulations Assessment</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The housing chapter policies in the draft local plan raised no direct concerns in the draft Habitat Regulations Assessment work. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific points are noted.
<p>Commentary on policy redrafting for the Publication Plan</p>	
<p>On a general level policies in this chapter of the local plan have been simplified and edited down, concentrating on key themes and matters.</p>	

Strategic Policy 39 – Housing to Address Needs	
This overarching local plan sets an overall picture for the policies of the chapter and describes the broad housing types sought and means for delivery.	
Issues and options consultation – it should be noted that comments noted below also apply to many of the comments received on the draft plan consultations, specifically and directly as relevant to Strategic Policy 39. These feedback comments broadly relate to subject matters covered in Strategic Policy 39, though also touch on other policies in the draft plan as well.	
<p>In Chapter 5 of the Issues and Options report we set out the current Government requirement for us to build at least 928 new homes a year (although this figure can change). Paragraph 5.4 explains that we may need to almost double the number of affordable homes (to 461 every year for the next 20 years) to meet current and future needs. We asked about what level of housebuilding people would favour.</p> <p>Of the respondents that favoured an alternative number quite a lot stated (or it could be inferred) that they favoured a level below 928. Had a below 928 been an option it might be expected that some respondents would have ticked that box. We will seek to do further work looking into possible numbers.</p> <p>Comments that were received are summarised below under broad subject area headings.</p> <p>HOUSING NEED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whose need/What type of need? • Government’s ‘Local Housing Need’ is not need, it’s demand/want/aspiration 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <p>Housing need feedback commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A great many of respondents questioned overall levels of housing proposed. However, matters have moved on since the issues and options report with the new government setting out minimum housing requirements that at the time of drafting the proposed Regulation local plan establish a clear need, with extremely limited flexibility to do otherwise, to plan for delivery of an average of at least 946 new homes per year. Though this may change should a new NPPF be published in late 2024/early 2025 (or indeed at any other time). • It is relevant to understand needs for differing types of people, specifically affordable housing, but these need to be seen within the context of Government minimum housing members. • We have no evidence of (and suggest it would be hugely unlikely) that other local authorities would buy houses in East Devon to house residents from their area. • We note that there were a lot of challenges to the worth and application of the standard method for calculating housing numbers.

- Only plan on the basis of affordable housing need relating to local residents
- Want need assessment to focus on needs of specific groups
- Prioritise meeting needs for younger people/economically active
- Prioritise meeting needs of an ageing population; older household downsizing
- East Devon’s need assessment should not be used to provide dumping ground for large conurbations to buy up housing and move its problems here
- Standard method for assessing local housing need (LHN)
- Need clarification of how new house building is forecast why and where. Is it government use of disastrous algorithms or "guesswork"?
- Government should focus on its levelling up agenda, less on East Devon
- Are Government requirements applicable to East Devon?
- Challenge e.g. by CPRE to standard method/underlying assumptions/use of 2014 National Household Projections – advocating much lower figures
- EDDC must challenge the Standard Method & its use. ORS report –standard method giving 900pa (18,000) includes 1677 dws for net in-migration increase; 70% of housing built in previous plan period occupied by in-migrants. Impact on local residents’ well-being
- Use of emerging evidence e.g. new population estimates, projections and 2021 Census data. Will it show that population is less than the level which informed 2014

Such matters are effectively outside of the control of the Council and as such are not commented on in this feedback report. Scope to present a case for exceptional circumstances applying a lower number is less now than it possibly used to be (though in reality there was previously limited scope) so it is not deemed credible to pursue such an option.

- It is not considered to be appropriate to plan for housing delivery that would be substantially in excess of standard method outputs (either those of the current government or previous government standards/levels. Work for the Council by ORS establishes a 'need; level taking into account demographic trends and household formation data. This work shows a picture of housing 'needs' falling some way below standard method outputs. The implication in the ORS work is that if standard method numbers are built the occupation of houses would come about through additional net additional in-migration (above that arrived at through use of demographic assessment) into East Devon.
- Assessment work by ORS shows a match between future jobs, under a clean job growth agenda, and the net increase in workers resulting from new housing growth. The jobs are marginally higher than workers in East Devon but this situation is reversed by some way across greater Exeter as a whole.

household projections? – possible impact of Covid and Brexit

- East Devon population is shrinking. Why are more homes needed?
- Want LHN based on proper needs assessment of local population eg local parish surveys
- Standard Method (SM) – amount of need
- 928pa is too high, it will drive up in-migration. Local residents' need is much less.
- PPG allows lower than SM figure provided there are exceptional circumstances
- Why oversupply homes to deliver need to meet affordable housing?
- Want housing need to reflect minimum LHN figure based on standard method
- Further uplift to housing need figure
- 928 dwellings pa is too low. Want LHN figure to be above standard method
- PPG indicates if previous housing delivery exceeded minimum LHN, LPA should consider if this level of delivery is indicative of greater housing need. Delivery in the last 4 of last 7 years has been higher than LHN. Basing requirement on this LHN is not 'boosting supply'
- LHN figure is below the current Local Plan annualised requirement
- Standard Method is only a starting point. PPG advises there may be circumstances for increasing the LHN above Standard Method rate

- House price to annual work place based earnings increased from 6.0 in 2000 to 10.57 in 2019. East Devon's affordability ratio is one of the lowest in country.
- Must consider the reasons why significant uplifts taking may be needed, e.g.:
- Demographic change
- Market signals relating to housing affordability
- Meeting all Affordable Housing Need (including all affordable home ownership aspirations). Additional to the Standard Method's affordability uplift. The ORS figure of 461 pa Affordable Housing Need is twice the delivery rate achieved in recent years
- Economic aspirations/economic projections. Will there be sufficient working age population? Exeter and East Devon Enterprise Zone has a growth agenda. May need housing above LHN to support EZ ambitions
- Meeting unmet need from neighbouring areas (Duty to Cooperate) e.g.
- Lyme Regis – Dorset Council -. Limited opportunities at the town to meet needs for affordable homes and employment. Should consider opportunities in the vicinity of Lyme Regis to help meet the needs of the constrained town. Sites in East Devon well related to the town may be more suitable than sites in Dorset. Developer comment - Adopted East Devon Local Plan's commitment to work with West Dorset DC, Uplyme PC & Lyme Regis TC to explore solutions to meet local needs at Lyme Regis. Have collaborative discussions occurred & DtC been met?
- Torbay Council advised GESP that Torbay is unlikely to accommodate its standard method LHN (586pa) beyond 2030. East Devon Local Plan needs to take account of

neighbouring needs as part of ongoing consideration of cross boundary needs.

- Exeter City – (developer comments) East Devon already meets a substantial part of Exeter’s need. This will continue. Exeter Core Strategy Requirement total of at least 12, 000 fell short of the 15,000 need. Shortfall in Exeter supply/delivery. East Devon Issues and Options paper didn’t consider this matter but it can’t be ignored. If Exeter cannot meet its needs within its boundary, then may need to consider how East Devon could help meet this unmet need
- 2014 household projections used in standard method are not fit for purpose. They rely on past trends- a period of suppressed household formation. Increase LHN to address huge past under supply/national housing crisis
- Should use much higher LHNA figure. Comments suggest a range of figures:
- At 30% provision, 461 dws equates to 1536 pa (30720 over 20 years). Achieving a lower % of affordable housing raises the rate further
- over 1600 pa (i.e. previous Government SM figure)
32,000+ dws total
- significantly more than 1614 pa, helping to meet Exeter City needs
- Increase LHN to 2000+ dws pa (40,000+ over 20 years)
- If the Council are seeking to fully meet the 461 AHN and if affordable provision of new homes is 20-25%, then the total local housing need would be 1,844-2,305 dws pa (equates to 36,880 and 46,100 total dws over 20 years – this will be a challenge)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unmet East Devon Housing Need South Somerset DC seek confirmation through Duty to Cooperate that EDDC are able to meet their own housing needs within the District 	
<p>HOUSING SUPPLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments divide into expand/accelerate supply (largely developers/ landowners) and constrain new build/use other sources (communities) as follows: • Local Plan must comply with the Government policy and guidance. Must meet tests of soundness, e.g. be consistent with NPPF on boosting housing supply • Local Plan needs to allocate more land for housing development. Several respondents used their Q8 response to support allocating their site • For supply forecasts to be realistic, evidence needs to be consistent with NPPF and PPGs • Large proportion of commitments are in the control of a small number of developers risky strategy. Too much reliance on a major site (Cranbrook) • Need for a degree of flexibility in supply, to ensure housing requirement is met • Already built more than we need. Devon CPRE shows East Devon provided 33% (1155) more housing than current Local Plan required in the past 5 years. Can recent over-supply be counted towards meeting Local Housing Need? • Supply constraints - developers not using land holding. Don't allocate more 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <p>Housing supply feedback commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting local plan tests is understood and will be applied in plan drafting. Consistency with NPPF, PPG and other rules and guidance will be applied. • The local plan will provide for a t least standard method housing numbers. • We note that there are some large sites where a small number of developers have control of sites, but this is something of an inevitability where big schemes such as Cranbrook are proposed. It is important to recognise that Cranbrook is delivering and has delivered substantial housing numbers. People are happy to live there and those that don't have wide options to choose elsewhere. • The drafting of the local plan will ensure flexibility, through site provision, is made. • With a start date of 2024 housing numbers will be calculated from that date bearing on mind requirements in place. • We have no substantive evidence of developers not bringing forward sites for development. Though large sites such as Cranbrook will be phased. • With respect to what developers build we need to work within the context of planning and wider rules that exist and apply. • Empty homes and other sources of non-development offer only limited potential. New homes and sites will be needed to meet Government requirements. This also applies to office and other

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers’ business models control speed of delivery and focus on narrow range of development/house types and sizes that maximise profit, not need. • Want no new build but could make better use of existing homes (use empty homes; subdivide), better use of land (higher densities), reuse land (redevelop brownfield) • Convert offices to small units - meet homeless/young people’s housing needs • More Method of Modern Construction dwellings; More self-build/custom build • 	<p>conversions, plus such conversions result in the loss of employment premises and opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does not oppose modern construction methods but it is considered that they cannot be established as a requirement. We have plan policy for self-build.
<p>HOUSING REQUIREMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan must set a strategic policy net housing requirement expressed as a minimum for the plan period for market and affordable dwellings, in line with government policy. • Requirement figure must be justified by evidence, to demonstrate how the figure has been derived and is it realistic and achievable More work needed to evidence exact requirement, assess the likely proportion of homes that are affordable, and how far this meets need • Requirement should not be below the level of need, including affordability • Requirement should be realistic and achievable, meet full range of housing needs (specialist needs of the elderly, affordable and specialist housing) • With a 30% affordable housing requirement on sites, applied to 1614 pa need over 20 years equates to 32,280 dws requirement (about 9,684 affordable homes). Is it 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <p>Housing supply feedback commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan does refer to minimum numbers, noting Government wording. • We have robust evidence on demographic need requirements, though these are superseded and exceeding by government standard method numbers. • We are planning to meet a full range of housing needs. • It is not seen as realistic or credible to plan for sufficient housing overall so that full affordable housing needs would be met as a percentage of these. Good credible sites to allocate do not exist and full housing numbers would be highly unlikely to be built. • In the next draft of the plan neighbourhood plan housing numbers will be stated. •

<p>achievable? Taking account of environmental constraints; 1200 - 1614 pa is more realistic, deliverable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase housing provision across the district; growth address housing shortages • Need to evidence the impact of requirement figure • Local Plan should provide requirement figures for Neighbourhood plans • Neighbourhood plans should determine their housing needs/requirements • Policy target should be expressed as a maximum • The higher the target the harder to achieve, not demonstrating 5 year supply • Housebuilding has over-delivered - can we reduce the new plan target because current supply exceeds existing housing policy requirement • Council should not plan or commit to any specific figure for new houses -focus on redevelopment/conversions/brownfield land • Plan for little as possible new development. East Devon is overdeveloped • No more housing. Should not set policy targets, they are arbitrary • Should have a negative housing requirement if we want sustainability 	
<p>HOUSING AND SPATIAL STRATEGY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Links between spatial strategy, distribution of housing, meeting requirement • Locate housing near employment or accessible by public transport 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <p>Housing supply feedback commentary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The allocations in the plan, in quantitative terms, align with plan strategy.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restrict new housing to cities/towns; but avoid urban sprawl • Opportunities for major scale development delivering housing; but risks of relying on this • No more housing near Exeter; area is over developed. • More housing in and at villages • Wider dispersal of housing across the district e.g. to support smaller settlements. Broad issue of no housing in the countryside (potentially this comment could include isolated development, Class Q development, rural workers housing) • All of new housing built needs to be evenly distributed over all East Devon • What is the impact of new housing on existing neighbourhood and residents • Scale of development continues the concreting over the countryside • Prioritise use of brownfield land for housing sites • Make best use of land; avoid cramming and cramped dwellings, need better quality/ energy efficient homes. Demand for more space in homes likely to increase house prices, • Don't build on greenfield land; protect Green Belt from housing development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan places the onus on development in excising larger locations (though noting new town policy) but to not development in villages would miss-out on needs to address local needs. • Development near to Exeter has a strategic logic given infrastructure, needs, lack of constraints and market demands in this area. • Development in the countryside is constrained noting lack of services and facilities and car dependence that can result. • The plan supports brownfield development, but there is limited brownfield land in East Devon, and some that does exist is in remote rural locations. • Policies will seek to secure high quality development at appropriate locations.
<p>Affordable Housing Need (AHN) and Affordable Housing Supply</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include total affordable housing requirement in Local Plan policy 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <p>Housing supply feedback commentary</p>

- Plan should Meet all Affordable Housing Need. Have mixture of house sizes and tenures
- Need to retain affordable housing in perpetuity to avoid loss to market
- On site delivery of affordable housing is preferable (otherwise need off-site contributions)
- Increase percentage of housing in a development that is affordable - preferably 30% plus
- Vary affordable housing minimum % on sites, by settlement type. Ensure it is adhered
- Impact on viability from setting site affordable housing percentage too high
- What is the connection between AHN and overall Local Housing Need?
- Is the Affordable Housing Need (9,220) in the 2020 ORS report calculated correctly?
- Housing monitoring data needs to separate affordable housing supply achieved from development (256 last year) from other supply (64 last year)
- Supporting Neighbourhood Plans/parishes' housing surveys is more effective in delivering affordable housing than higher Local Plan housing requirement
- Define what is meant by affordable. Want more good quality social rented/Council housing -residents can't afford affordable rent
- Prioritise low cost housing for local people
- Should small sites and self build count as affordable?
- Make better use of existing homes/ council houses
- Impact of second homes/buy to let/holiday homes on house prices/affordability

- Total affordable housing needs will be set out in the plan, but plan policy cannot realistically be set to meet all of these.
- Plan policy will seek to retain new affordable housing in perpetuity. But we are governed by rules that go beyond planning, and such issues go beyond planning and the local plan, in respect of sale/loss of affordable housing.
- We will seek the highest reasonable affordable housing %s, subject to viability testing and other asks of development with financial implications.
- We seek to monitor affordable housing delivery – noting some new affordable housing arrives through the planning system and some through purchases/acquisitions that are non-planning/non-local plan policy related agreements.
- We welcome neighbourhood plan initiatives to deliver affordable housing, but would see these as relevant as coming alongside local plan requirements.
- We are tied in to Government definitions of affordable housing, albeit with some flexibility, and noting that new emerging Government thinking places greater emphasis on social housing.
- We do seek to establish 'local test' for affordable housing occupancy.
- Small sites and self-build do not automatically meet test for affordable, but properties in these categories can be 'affordable' if relevant legals test are addressed.
- We do not see robust evidence to seek to establish planning tests and therefore policy restrictions in respect of second and holiday homes.
-

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of spatial strategy and the balance between small and large sites on ability to deliver sufficient affordable housing 	
<p>Draft Plan consultation</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <p>It should be noted that the issues raised below should be seen as a continuation, in practical terms, of matters noted above.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Numerous responses from communities, developers, and registered providers. Mix of views. Detailed housing policies flow from this strategic policy. To simplify, where comments relating to matters in the detailed policies are repeated for the strategic policy, they are reported against the relevant detailed policies (40 to 50) <p>General comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for: principle for developing good quality homes that meet identified needs; creating sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities; delivery of full range of housing Well phrased and appropriate, other than settlement hierarchy Parish Council support this policy through its Neighbourhood Plan policies Policy should be delivered in every community in the district, and support communities' demographic diversity Alternative view - Rather than being part of general housing schemes being required to provide the mix of needs, instead the plan should allocate sites specifically for self-build and custom housebuilding, and sites for gypsies, travellers and 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for provision of homes is noted and welcomed. The settlement hierarchy is seen as needed and appropriate. Policy will apply across the whole of East Devon and should be read alongside neighbourhood plan policy. We do propose to allocate sites for some specific housing forms, but there is lack of national policy to be overly specific, for example allocating for self-build only. Policy provides a generic strategic overview, it is not a requirement for all sites, but we do not see the need for this to be explicitly stated. The policy, read in conjunction with others in the plan, provide for flexibility. We have drawn on more than the LHNA to justify plan policy. Plan viability work is ongoing and will support the plan at submission. Whilst new Government housing requirements are not absolutely mandatory, they are close to being so, though its acknowledged that at the time of drafting this response NPPF consultation conclusion outputs have not been published. Policy provision seeks to provide for where need is seen to exist and also draws on where land is available – not that some 'availability' is on poor quality potential development sites. We have sought to construct policy, noting policy framework set out by Government and need for compliance, that provides for all

showpeople, - separate from allocations for unrestricted market housing, or be allowed to come forward as unallocated exception sites beyond settlement boundaries.

- Should clarify policy – it represents a district-wide objective and does not prescribe a mix which is expected to be delivered through individual sites
- Wants flexible approach on mix, to recognise that needs and demand varies within the district and between sites; need to ensure scheme is viable and provides an appropriate mix for location, size, suitability/capacity and market.
- Refer to other evidence not just the LHNA; and include consideration of current demand
- Need whole plan viability study prior to submission, ideally with development industry input
- Policy issues are appropriate, but EDDC needs to provide evidence on their deliverability
- Concerns: Policy is too long. Not easy to digest. Out of date. Government housing targets not mandatory; more housing/people will increase pressure on services; need infrastructure; housing is being driven by demand, not by meeting local needs.
- Government's arbitrary formula puts district under immense, unreasonable pressure
- Housing distribution/spatial strategy including proposed new town, conflicts with policy 39– ie growth is not located where there is a need but where land is available
- The plan should take account of the rural dimension of housing needs. Trend for increasing property values and rental costs in the rural housing market as insufficient open market and affordable housing were delivered over many years. The trend's harmful impacts are significant and varied, eg:

sectors of the community. But there are limitations on what the planning system and the local plan can achieve and seek to achieve.

- We will look to improve coverage of space standards.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People with local connections are often unable to afford to buy or rent properties. They are priced out of their own communities. • Young people are disproportionately affected by issues of affordability and exclusion from the rural property market • Demographic diversity in rural communities is reducing as they become increasingly dominated by older people. Young families are an ever-diminishing proportion of the rural population as they cannot afford to buy or rent in those communities. • Declines in demographic diversity have adverse consequences for rural communities eg viability of local facilities and the ability of rural communities to support social clubs and community events vital to their local sustainability • Important to create a social mix and meet future generation needs. To create healthy communities, homes should be mixed up on sites, not segregated • Need small houses for starter homes and for people to down-size to in their own communities, including need for park homes. Current assets may not provide sufficient value for some households to enable move into e.g. new build smaller units • Devon County Council state the internal space of buildings should be of practical size to allow adaptability and include sufficient space for families to spend time together. 	
<p>Affordable Housing Many community responses with a range of comments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acute need for affordable housing • Affordable rent and housing must really be affordable • People can't afford housing build below market value. • Want affordable housing, not luxury developments 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for affordable housing is noted. • We have to work within the context of Government rules when it comes to affordable housing definitions. That said we are placing a greater emphasis on social housing provision in policy redrafts.

- Want more affordable units of decent size, not just 1 and 2 bed units
- Need to provide affordable housing for older people wanting to downsize
- Maximising delivery of affordable housing is an empty promise. Lacks detail
- Query the definition of "affordable housing". Government definition doesn't address lack of affordable rental accommodation for singletons, the elderly (single/couples), people on limited incomes and young families. Not enough housing built for young people
- Poor provision of social housing across East Devon.
- Right to buy caused a major shortage in social housing, and should not occur
- Sale of council houses, and increasing reliance on private landlords to deliver rented accommodation is a problem as private landlords are now leaving the market
- Real need in East Devon is for affordable/social housing. EDDC should address need for more 'council-style' housing which is affordable and built to zero-emissions standards. Want EDDC to cooperate with housing associations and small builders
- Alternative view - Too much emphasis on affordable/social housing.
- Want higher targets/lower thresholds
- Community support for a minimum affordable housing provision that is clear and robust enough to withstand the pleas of viability from developers
- Concerns about implementation: Developers must meet affordable houses commitments; want allocation of new build housing specifically for locals need to be put in place with

- We would aim to secure a mix of affordable housing sizes and for differing age groups, but evidence does point to greatest net need coming from younger people.
- The local plan can have no bearing on 'right to buy' matters, but it is appreciated why concerns are raised.
- Targets and thresholds are tested through viability assessment. Noting a general view that more affordable housing is desirable (though appreciating that some may take a counter view).
- Where possible legal constraints are put in place for retention of affordability status on developments.
- We do not see sufficient evidence to seek to have policy that restrict occupation of new homes for non-second home use or use of homes for holiday or other rental occupation/use. The Government does not offer support through the NPPF for such policies. Financial matters, for example Council Tax, are outside of the role of the local plan.
- It would not be appropriate for natural environment considerations to feature in policy as they are addressed elsewhere.

legal covenants; local connection test should apply to all sites, not just rural exceptions

- Concerns about principal residence: not just second homes, but also holiday lets displacing permanent tenancies in buy to let market; where is the evidence that the issue is just coastal towns? Property in this area is being bought up on a large scale as second homes and short term lets. Second homes need to pay high council tax- they impact on potential for locals to own their own home.
- Some community comments - want limit to AirBnB rentals and much tighter planning/ tax controls. Concern over impact of unregulated short term lets on local housing market eg loss of long term residential rental units to short term holiday lets/non-residential lets
- All new housing should be for local people, not for second homes nor AirBnB and should not draw in people from other parts of the country
- DCC (Economy) comment that short term lets is only an issue in a small number of coastal areas
- DCC (Public Health) wants the influence of second homes to be adequately addressed in relation to sustainability and affordable housing
- Should be a requirement for housing for essential local workers
- Use Land Registry Covenants to restrict the purchase of new builds so they can only be sold to local residents in problem areas
- Local connection criteria should apply to Sidmouth and smaller settlements, not just to rural exception sites
- Devon Wildlife Trust want policy to include requirement for enhancement of natural environment and building to achieve net-zero carbon.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <p>Registered provider comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Association planning consortium supports using LHNA and up to date local housing evidence – it ensures affordable housing is provided in line with objectively assessed needs • And supports mix of tenures to meet affordable housing need over the plan period, particularly needs of younger people and key workers • Supports keeping on-site affordable housing threshold under review - maximise opportunity for affordable housing delivery. The threshold should continue to be as high as possible • Developer comments • Not clear what “maximising” delivery of affordable housing means, so replace with “optimising”. • Some developers concerned that inclusion of second New Town delivers fewer affordable dwellings than if development is elsewhere. Cranbrook was only deliverable due to the injection of considerable amounts of Government grant • More comments are set out under Policy 40 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for use of the LNHA is welcomed. • In changes we reference importance of housing for younger people, though have not sought to establish definition of or policy approach around key workers. We lack evidence to determine who in East Devon would, could or should be classified in this category and why. Rather we place the emphasis on providing for a diverse range of housing provision and types. • ‘Maximising’ affordable housing delivery is seen as more definite, reflecting need, rather than referencing ‘optimising’. • It is recognised that development of a second new town may result in fewer affordable homes than building elsewhere. But there is a wider planning balance that justifies new town development.
<p>Specialist housing provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide range of housing options for older people. Including apartments (sheltered living; extra care); lifelong housing; adapted housing; specialist care including dementia care • Is the demand more for independent living in own home, designed to meet the more specific needs of older people • Opportunity for large care village (400-500 freehold apartments) with communal facilities available on site, plus ‘satellite’ areas for housing for families caring for older relatives • Support - convalescence / care homes are needed 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have sought to strengthen plan policy, those also been more realistic, in respect of specialist provision for older people. In the draft plan it was considered that policy aspirations were in some respects unrealistic. • The plan acknowledges that some older people do not need/want dedicated care accommodation. Policy seeks to ensure new homes are built to accommodate elderly person needs and are adaptable.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative view: Is there really a need for more care homes? • Why encourage retirement homes? Contributing to our unbalanced age demographic. Retirement complexes create ghettos, breakdowns communities/leads to resentment when younger people don't see affordable housing being delivered. Policy could give a green light to developers to deliver more age restricted/ retirement accommodation in Exmouth that is then marketed out of region. • If there is an identified local need for age-restricted accommodation, want a local connection restriction to ensure that the policy facilitates freeing up of family homes locally • Housing for older people should be within easy walking distance of town centres • Should support adapted older persons housing in villages to enable downsizing What evidence is there that older people want to mix with families 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not see the evidence to plan for a large-scale care village and have not seen a realistic promotion, specifically with a specific site identified, for such provision. • Evidence we have does show a need for care home provision. Many people going into care homes will have lived in proximity to where they are being provided and can no longer cope with living independently. It is the case that some people will choose to relocate in to sheltered provision from other locations, but we lack evidence to indicate that new provision has a net actual impact in promoting such relocation. Nor evidence of actual net adverse impacts arising where this occurs. • Location matters and adaptability are capture in older person housing related policies.
<p>Adaptable housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports good quality designs for homes, with flexible internal layout. Occupiers needs naturally change over time. • DCC comments that internal space of buildings should be of practical size to allow adaptability and include space to enable families to sit together to eat • Self build/custom build housing • Opportunity to build high quality homes at an affordable price, help local people build their own affordable home. Supports including self build on smaller sites • Self build is one of the key initiatives that help local people build their own affordable home • Self-build is not a priority at a time when we have housing shortages. Self-build should not incur any subsidies from council-tax payers. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome support for policy seeking good quality housing. • We support policy reference to good space standards. • Policy actively encourages self-build housing, though many financial matters associated with self-building fall outside of the control or remit of the local plan. • We keep a register of self build interest and through its use have sought to ensure a balance in policy for requirements Vs regular housing provision routes. • We would seek high design standards in all new housing, self-build or not, though would highlight that self-built schemes can be of high quality.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an unnecessary constraint to developers, especially as there isn't always a demand for self- build/custom build plots. Only require them where there is clear market demand • Allocating for selfbuild can inflate cost of plots • Have any self build plots been approved by EDDC? • Very few windfalls come onto the open market; should not compare windfalls to the Self build register • Concern over impact of self build on local area's characteristics • Some developers do not agree that there is always demand for self build plots and consider the policy unnecessarily constrains developers – policy should be reworded so only required where there is clear market demand. 	
<p>Private rented housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relied on private landlords to provide capital to deliver rented houses, since sale of social housing with no funds for councils to replace it. But landlords continue to leave the market due to regulatory/tax changes, higher interest rates, threat of longer-term tenancies, and a broken court system • Housing for rent should be carefully monitored, landlords shouldn't be able to buy up lots of these properties just to profit from them • Admirable set of intentions around renting. But is it realistic without more joined up thinking/investment in social housing/a different Government? • Town Council concern: impact of unregulated AirBnB accommodation on the local rental market is not addressed and that support needs to be given. Wants EDDC to get involved in the government's review into short-term lets, to regulate home rentals effectively. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through the local plan we have no control on fiscal matters impacting on decisions taken by private landlords or legislation relating to lettings. • We also have no controls over who purchases properties being sold on the open market. • We note that there is a different Government in power than that when the draft plan was consulted on. • Regulation of short term rent matters fall outside of the remit of the local plan.

<p>Needs assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDDC has vastly overestimated the amount of housing needed • How are needs quantified. How can assumptions be challenged? • Where was the public involvement in assessing local needs for housing? • Local market evidence represents suitable/appropriate evidence from which to determine local housing needs 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing numbers set out in the plan are determined through a Government standard method. We do not believe we have any realistic option other than applying them. • Other ways to quantify need, whilst they may be of academic interest and some may suggest more valid, are highly unlikely to be found sound at examination (unless they exceed Government numbers)
<p>Mix of housing types</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should maintain a social mix, and meet future generation needs. • Be clear what is meant by 'mixed housing'. It should be mixed up to create healthier communities, not segregated. • Where is the evidence about impacts of meeting mix of housing needs within a site? and eg do elderly people want to live next to families with children? • Want more small houses for starter homes and for people to downsize to in their own communities. Makes their larger houses available for families. • Often preferable to develop town centre brownfield sites, but living in small often overdeveloped town centre properties most without parking, often doesn't suit a growing family and compromises the ability to work from home • Too much old, non-energy efficient housing available. New housing should be well built, sustainable, social housing for people with a local connection. • EDDC should repossess vacant homes. Should not allow developers to let vacant buildings rot away; instead refurbish to meet community' local housing need. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through plan policy we do seek to establish a basis for securing a mix of new housing types with differing housing types integrated into developments. • We appreciate that there is consumer choice, as well, so people, notably home buyers, can select dwelling types and locations that suit them (plus many second-hand properties are available to purchase). • Policy does recognise need for smaller homes and many developers, especially volume builders, provide these as part of their normal/standard housing mix on developments. • Relevance of town centre development is noted, but also acknowledged that it is not for everyone. • We will expect high energy efficiency standards in new developments, building regulations require them. • Matters of EDDC repossessing vacant homes go beyond the powers of the local plan. • Property rental matters and challenges landlords may face go beyond the local plan.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must refurbish and insulate properly. • Encourage, not penalise, local landlords. They lose rent and incur refurbishment costs after a tenancy ends and have increasing overheads that are not reflected in rentals. Amend policy to focus more on property that is well insulated, cheaper to run, and lower rent • Self builds are a much lower priority than social housing due to more demand for this in the local community. • Concerned that including self/custom-build housing and provision for gypsies, travellers and showpeople, within larger housing allocations is not viable/deliverable due to differing interests / ownerships. Either allocate sites to meet these 2 types of needs separately from those allocations for unrestricted market housing, or allow them as unallocated exception sites outside of settlement boundaries • The Otter Valley Association support requirement for a mix of site sizes and encouragement of small builders. • Devon Wildlife Trust wants the policy to include a reference to the requirement for the enhancement of the natural environment and building to achieve net zero carbon. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social housing provisions features more significantly in plan policy requirements than policy for self builds. • In order to secure appropriate plots for self-builds, in appropriate locations, provision on large scale sites is considered desirable and deliverable. At Cranbrook gypsy sites will be delivered – policy requirements on large sites show tangible means for delivery in what can be a challenging housing type to otherwise secure delivery of. Very few call for site submitters were promoting gypsy use. • Policies around the natural environment and its enhancement sit in other parts of the local plan.
<p>Supplementary Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matters on this policy did not feature in the consultation. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No feedback is provided.
<p>Sustainability Appraisal</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation: See Sustainability Appraisal table below</p>	<p>Officer commentary in response: See Sustainability Appraisal table below</p>
<p>Habitat Regulations Assessment</p>	

No significant concerns were noted for the draft policy.	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response needed.
Commentary on policy redrafting for the Publication Plan	
Redrafted policy title: Strategic Policy HN 01 – Housing to address needs	
This policy has been subject to minor refinement to clarify application. Included amongst changes is specific text around securing housing for younger people noting their importance in the workforce.	

Strategic Policy 40 – Affordable Housing

This policy sets the standards and thresholds for securing affordable housing delivery on residential development schemes.
--

Issues and options consultation

<p>Affordable Housing Need (AHN) and Affordable Housing Supply – key issues raised were summarised as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include total affordable housing requirement in Local Plan policy Plan should Meet all Affordable Housing Need. Have mixture of house sizes and tenures Need to retain affordable housing in perpetuity to avoid loss to market On site delivery of affordable housing is preferable (otherwise need off-site contributions) Increase percentage of housing in a development that is affordable - preferably 30% plus Vary affordable housing minimum % on sites, by settlement type. Ensure it is adhered 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intent is to advise of total affordable housing needs. It would be inappropriate to seek to meet all affordable housing needs through the plan. For new provision the intent would be to retain all affordable housing in perpetuity. In site delivery is heavily favoured under policy. Final %s of affordable housing sought will be established through viability testing, this work will also establish if variable %s by settlement are viable. Affordable housing will form part of the provision to meet overall needs. We will review affordable housing need figures.
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on viability from setting site affordable housing percentage too high • What is the connection between AHN and overall Local Housing Need? • Is the Affordable Housing Need (9,220) in the 2020 ORS report calculated correctly? • Housing monitoring data needs to separate affordable housing supply achieved from development (256 last year) from other supply (64 last year) • Supporting Neighbourhood Plans/parishes' housing surveys is more effective in delivering affordable housing than higher Local Plan housing requirement • Define what is meant by affordable. Want more good quality social rented/Council housing -residents can't afford affordable rent • Prioritise low cost housing for local people • Should small sites and self build count as affordable? • Make better use of existing homes/ council houses • Impact of second homes/buy to let/holiday homes on house prices/affordability • Impact of spatial strategy and the balance between small and large sites on ability to deliver sufficient affordable housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We doo monitor sources of supply of affordable housing, but delivery numbers are of a detail that does not warrant local plan text inclusion. • We would see neighbourhood plans as complementary top local plan policies in affordable housing delivery. As very few neighbourhood plans have actively planned for housing development we would not see them as leading the way on terms of setting policy and securing delivery. • Plan policy is placing greater emphasis on social rent rather than other models of provision. • There are fiscal matters around housing markets that are highlighted, though these fall outside of the remit of planning policy and the local plan.
<p>Draft Plan consultation</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key issues raised in consultation: Many comments received from communities, developers, and registered providers. • Numerous, mixed, community concerns on the need and provision of affordable housing 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome concerns around need for affordable housing and recognise many of the considerations highlighted that inhibit delivery and current problems in respect of availability, cost and access to market housing (costing too much).

- Several responses that there is a housing crisis.
- Current stock of affordable housing is comparatively low. Limited supply of available cheaper market housing in the current housing stock
- Many residents, notably young people can't afford to buy or rent housing in East Devon. Urgent need for truly affordable housing.
- Need for affordable housing is high as house prices in East Devon are already high.
- High prices mean property is an investment. Most new houses are bought for high prices by buyers from SE, portfolio holders and BTL landlords, not Devon people.
- Large developers raise the market price by land-banking
- Private rented housing is in very short supply, and the market is very competitive.
- Buy To Let landlords charge high rents, worsening the housing crisis
- No amount of house building will significantly lower prices. Macro-economic and fiscal policy factors that drive price changes are outside the plan's control
- Study by Action for Homes reported 2867 dwellings in East Devon are second homes or long-term empty. This is unsustainable.
- Stop building to satisfy a demand for 2nd homes. It's driving up house prices making housing unaffordable and unavailable for local people. No second homes should be allowed.
- Concern over the impact on affordability and availability of housing to meet local need where housing is being used for short term lets eg holiday/business purposes

- We note concerns expressed that many home buyers come from outside of Devon. But survey evidence of new home occupiers we have – ORS work dated 2021 – shows most new homes being occupied by people previously living locally
- It is noted that there are many factors outside of planning and numbers of houses built that may inform property prices.
- Changes made to policy emphasise importance of social rent housing as the main part of the mix sought.
- It is not considered that production of a separate DPD on the matters raised in policy is needed or would be helpful. Amongst other matters it would be costly and time consuming to produce.
- Viability testing will inform final policy content and implementation.
- Plan policy sets overall policy provision, but there are going to be cases where abnormal considerations warrant application bespoke viability testing.
- At the new town, whilst viability assessment is to be concluded, the assumption is that other costs will be high so monies available for affordable housing will be less, hence percentage figures will be lower. At present the levels are in line with Cranbrook delivery.
- Further viability work may establish appropriateness for local mix, rather than across East Devon mix, percentages.
- We do not now expect to produce an SPD on the subject.
- Viability and deliverability are noted in plan policy – it is not seen as appropriate to provide scope for developers to present evidence of what is viable in the absence of local plan policy.
- Noting that affordable housing requirements can be challenged through viability assessment it is reasonable to not refer to provision being a target level

- Economic consequences eg recruitment issues if housing costs are unaffordable
- Should remove Right to Buy and cap future sale price of affordable homes, Right to Buy simply transfers social housing back to the market at higher prices for sale or for private rent at higher rental levels.
- It's not just the cost of housing. It's also important that housing is well insulated/c cheaper to run for people with lower incomes needing to rent
- The definition of affordable housing is challenged. What price of housing is affordable? Government's definition is not 'affordable'. Many local people can't afford to buy discounted market housing/First Homes
- Redefine affordable housing to mean social housing. Greatest need is in local community
- New housebuilding pushes up cost of housing. Help to buy schemes are unrealistic
- Want more genuinely affordable housing for purchase and rent aligned with local wages across the existing centres of populations
- Should focus on social housing only, for low-income people with local connection. A large proportion must be for rent, owned by not-for-profit organisations
- Want far more social rented to rectify current housing inequality for people in poorly paid or part time jobs
- Policy represents long overdue action for creating balanced and mixed communities
- One Parish Council supports this policy through Neighbourhood Plan policies

- Whilst the plan provides policy to 2042 in reality a review will come much earlier so expressing target figures for affordable housing is reasonable.
- At the new town provision will be across the development, but bespoke land equalisation work will probably be needed to ensure fair requirements apply to all undertaking development.
- Affordable housing rates will be looked at in the context of future CIL rates with the later scheduled for review.
- Whilst in policy review there is an emphasis on social housing (this responds to need evidence and the greatest need concerns) there is also flexibility over other forms of provision.
- Up to date evidence, other than the LHNA 2022, can be used under plan policy.
- Viability evidence will sit alongside the plan at Reg 19 consultation. This will provide scope for comment on both, noting engagement with the developer industry has already informed viability assessment thinking and testing.
- We do not see grounds for exempting older person housing from making contributions. But viability evidence will test this matter.
- It is noted that there was some support for affordable home ownership products, and redrafted policy allows for provision. However policy emphasis is for social rent where most need lies. Social housing also aligns with current Government emphasis.
- In redrafting we have removed explicit references to First Homes, noting diminished current Government support and also lack of enthusiasm/support more widely for this product type.
- The reason for commuted sums to be equivalent of on site provision is to ensure equity in provision. The council has been running a calculator to establish contribution sought.

- Another Parish Council is concerned that the policy is too detailed, and risks losing the point of defining just the delivery. Advocates a separate DPD on this subject, as the variations are so complicated, the Local Plan becomes just about this subject.
- Concern that policy opens the door for developers to claim that it is not viable to meet Plan requirements after site is allocated and has planning approval.
- Developers' profit should not be made by not delivering affordable housing
- Community support for a minimum affordable housing provision that is clear and robust enough to withstand the pleas of viability from developers. Perception that affordable housing secured by planning obligations in the past was then reduced/removed on viability grounds. Developers wriggle out of promised provision, and then only provide high-cost housing. Want this stopped. Want firmer control by EDDC over developers, and to hold developers accountable.
- But can't force developers to sell only to local people or at an affordable price
- Support for new approaches eg EDDC Housing Task Force, as delivery vehicle alternative to achieving affordable housing through major housing developments/ S106 agreements. Better for council to buy land and have social housing built.
- EDDC should repurpose vacant homes for housing needed by the community
- Deliver affordable homes for local families/workers on brownfield sites not greenfield

- To simplify the Policy we have removed Clause 2c as in the draft plan.
- As, drafted and redrafted, it is not considered that more details on small clusters and pepper-potting is needed. They are widely used terms and matters of detail can be addressed at application stage.
- Whilst early engagement with RSLs is a good thing, it is seen as being an accepted given and does not need explicit policy referencing.
- In terms of application and implementation of policy we would seek to work with Housing Associations (and other providers) and in policy there is flexibility to adjust affordable housing type delivered (evidence dependent) and this can take into account opportunities that arise – eg in respect of funding sources that might open up.
- It is agreed that sites in the AONBs should meet NPPF tests and support AONB objectives. But there is provision for AONB development in exceptional circumstances for qualifying major developments. Assessment will be provided in respect of major developments.

Note that where comments raised have affectively been addressed in feedback made earlier on in this report we have not sought not to provide further comment – please refer to earlier sections of this report for relevant commentary.

- Support on site provision, don't want offsite provision/contributions
- How many of the dwellings will go to young couples/local people? How will the Council stop others from acquiring multiple properties possibly subsidised by local money. How will you stop fraud?
- Devon County Council (DCC) welcome the proposed affordable housing tenure mix, highlighting the importance of providing housing for Essential Local Workers, including Social Care staff. Supports priority for key workers within the local eligibility criteria for First Homes
- DCC welcome the tenure mix but must increase/prioritise affordable housing to reflect need and protect affordable housing for local people.

Community concerns about Table 1 (mix) include:

- Wanting much higher percentage to enable young people to stay in East Devon
- Why reduce the affordable housing percentage compared to the adopted plan
- All new housing to 2040 should be affordable
- Why is the percentage in the new town so low, where is the evidence? The plan relies on the new town to deliver much growth but the low percentage of affordable housing will increase the imbalance across East Devon and make delivering much needed affordable housing more difficult. Why should other locations deliver more?
- Want more detailed, location specific mix, not a generic district-wide mix

- Will override the housing mix policies in made Neighbourhood Plans that are specifically tailored to meeting local needs, and informed by local evidence
- Want higher percentage in large developments
- Hasn't Cranbrook already met the need for affordable housing?
- Policy is very prescriptive
- Concern over how long an SPD will take to prepare/adopt

Developer concerns include:

- Some support the policy aims but some elements are overly onerous/ prescriptive, notably the prescribed tenure mix of affordable housing on qualifying sites.
- As well as need, should also take account of viability and deliverability. Unrealistic to negotiate every site on a one-by-one basis where the baseline aspiration or combination of policies is too high. This jeopardises future housing delivery
- Policy is impractical. No opportunity to reconcile differences between policy provisions and evidence of need. Should be informed by local market evidence/ sales information.
- Let developers present evidence of local needs to justify affordable tenure mix
- Size and type of affordable housing is a matter for negotiation on a site-by-site basis
- A particular affordable housing mix should not be enforced to the extent that it causes harm to other planning considerations

Developer concerns about Table 1 (mix) include:

- Only some support for reducing percentage from current 50% down to 35% across much of East Devon- it will unlock growth on small/medium sized sites
- 35% is reasonable if expressed as a target rather than a minimum
- This should be a starting point for considering suitable tenure mix

But there are many developer objections to the mix.

- Advocates a bespoke approach to address local affordable housing need – mix of types /sizes appropriate to the location of a planning application
- Fixing the mix type /tenure of affordable housing over a 20-year period is not a flexible policy approach.
- Unclear whether the mix for affordable homes in the 2nd new town needs to be deliver by each development parcel or across the whole new settlement. To provide distinct neighbourhoods policy should provide flexibility on type and size, to allow land parcels to respond to their unique characteristics and new evidence
- Lack of evidence to justify the level of affordable housing mix
- LHNA is not a viability study. No evidence on overall plan viability yet exists.
- Questions viability of delivering 35% affordable housing and tenures mix in Table 1
- Supports para. H – alternative tenures can be proposed where viability is an issue

- Table 1 should be a starting point – take account of latest available housing needs evidence, site size, capacity and suitability for house type and tenures, and practicality of long-term management by a registered provider, and overall viability
- Some reserve their position pending the viability assessment results.
- Unclear if the viability assessment will cover affordable housing percentage, or if viability is assessed on a case-by-case basis
- Should not apply to sites within the Cranbrook DPD area
- 35% is substantially above the current 25% for main towns. CIL rates applicable across East Devon were recently set based on current Local Plan policy level
- West End sites viable at 25% affordable housing (this is what has been achieved)
- New Town site developer supports target of at least 15% affordable housing – as issues eg delivery and strategic infrastructure are substantially different in a New Town compared to smaller development sites. 15% target needs to be evidenced and subject to viability assessment
- Differential percentages demonstrate viability problems of delivering 2nd new town. Large infrastructure costs mean it will deliver less affordable housing than if sites were allocated elsewhere. It also displaces those in housing need and places a strain on family ties (similar to Cranbrook meeting housing needs from Exmouth)
- Another developer advocates an alternative approach. Embrace the Lichfield evidence approach ie Enhance/speed up delivery by using higher amounts of

affordable housing, (ie 35% affordable housing at new town)

- No objection to the overall Affordable Housing target of 35% (for the majority of the district), but reservations over the tenure mix of affordable housing, as worded this indicates 64% for Social Rent and 36% for First Homes. This offers no option for Affordable Rent or other forms of affordable home ownership. It also offers no room for future initiatives towards affordability as it is very prescribed as worded. There should be flexibility to provide all forms of affordable housing as defined in Annexe 2 of the NPPF
- Under-provision of affordable rent
- Suggest that specific reference to the 2022 LHNA is removed. Broader wording should be included along the lines of mix to reflect up-to-date evidenced need and market conditions.
- Some respondents want the tenure split for the 2nd new town to apply to the rest of the district as a starting point for considering affordable housing provision on new development sites, subject to viability and up to date housing needs evidence
- Some support reduced percentages compared to the adopted plan
- Objections to policy's mix of affordable housing types. Remove table 1 (and policy on dwelling size mix). Wants policy to provide flexibility ie enable precise mix of affordable housing (size and tenure) to be determined on a site-by-site basis at the planning application stage, responding to needs at that point in time, and taking account of viability.

- Overall plan viability assessment should be publicly available for comment before the Reg 19 consultation, so that in line with PPG the plan can be informed by engagement with developers, landowners, and infrastructure and affordable housing providers.
- Detailed comments from provider of private sector specialist housing for older persons, wanting amendments. Eg exempt such housing from providing First Homes, Starter homes and Discount Market Sales on site; clarify when review mechanisms are appropriate and how/when viability is reassessed over the development's lifetime; don't apply a review mechanism to this type of housing; viability assessment should specifically assess viability of older persons housing; want consistent policies regarding thresholds for C3 use classes.

Table 1 – affordable home ownership

- Some support for at least 10% of affordable housing should be affordable home ownership products
- Queries about whether policy will delivery Government policy of 10% of all dwellings to be delivered as affordable homeownership products. Need evidence on delivery.
- Some question whether proposed tenure mix complies with Government policy on First Homes (25%) and 10% provision of affordable home ownership and local needs identified in LHNA 2022. Assert there is a significant under provision of affordable homeownership
- First homes percentage in Table 1 well exceeds national planning policy.
- High percentage of social rent will have a detrimental effect on site viability; concerns about target realism

- Under-provision of other affordable home ownership products (not First Homes)
- Selling discount open market housing is extremely challenging because of the need for a substantial deposit AND meet eligibility criteria
- Policy is not flexible – as well as national policy on first homes, the plan should allow other forms of affordable housing, informed by up-to-date local evidence.
- Some developers object to the reference that commuted sums (off site contributions) should be broadly equivalent to that required on site. They object because there is no clear reasoning setting out what the relevant calculation might be.
- Some developers object to the lack of definition of ‘small clusters’ in Clause 2d). (Relates to distribution of affordable housing across a site.) Must clarify.
- Possible contradiction between para 2a and para 2c. Question whether it is appropriate for C2/specialist accommodation to contribute towards affordable housing given they are not ‘conventional’ dwellings.
- Agreement with pepper-potting affordable housing across a development sites, and the dwellings to be tenure blind

Registered providers concerns include:

- Plan should acknowledge Housing Associations’ role in providing affordable housing
- Encourage developers to have early active engagement with Housing Associations so the latter have active role in planning/design/meeting their management needs
- Community Land Trusts have a proven track record in delivering affordable housing. Plan should acknowledge

working relationship between Housing Associations to encourage commitment in the plan to support CLTs' choice of sites

- Disappointed over the significantly reduced percentage of affordable homes required on new development. Concerned that forecast supply is only 3,551. Should plan to meet the evidenced need for 4,070 as a minimum.

Table 1

- Supports expressing percentage provision in terms of “at least”
- Housing Association planning consortium disappointed with reduction from 50% down to 35% in, given EDDC's intention to maximise the delivery of affordable housing
- Housing Association planning consortium supports the inclusion of affordable housing in the development of the second new town, which should also be as high as viably possible
- The 15% figure for the proposed New Town does not represent sustainable, inclusive development. Need to explore ways to increase this percentage to create balance community with mix of different tenures from early in the development
- Housing Association planning consortium – policy does not broaden housing choice, ie a policy contradiction. It completely cuts out affordable rented tenure, and home ownership products eg shared ownership. These overlooked tenures are widely used by Housing Associations and are successful affordable tenures. Tenure mix in Table 1 contradicts policy that ‘proposals will be supported where they broaden housing choice’

- Consortium wants flexibility in policy to allow affordable housing needs to be met across the full spectrum of tenures. Consider tenure split on a site-by-site basis, and evidenced to demonstrate local needs
- Housing Association planning consortium –has long held concerns about the introduction of First Homes and implications for delivery of traditional forms of affordable housing
- Concerned about affordable tenure mix. Do not support First Homes as a mandatory affordable tenure. Concern over the affordability of First Homes (deposit and income requirements are higher than for shared ownership). Strongly advise against excluding other affordable home ownership options
- First Homes assists some first-time buyers to enter the property market but will likely not help as many households as shared ownership currently does
- Shared ownership is more accessible, and flexible - allows household to enter home ownership with a small deposit and staircase up to full ownership over time
- Should remove references to securing affordable housing in perpetuity, other than on Exceptions sites. NPPF only refers to affordable housing in perpetuity on Rural Exception Sites. Do not support securing affordable housing in perpetuity more widely as it restricts lenders appetite to fund development; investors are discouraged if there is no prospect of realising the investment and returns
- Support for financial contributions for development of 5 to 9 dwellings in designated rural areas, they boost affordable housing delivery in the district

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> East Devon AONB Partnership. Even if there is proven need, sites in AONB should meet NPPF, be locate and designed to respect the aims and purposes of the AONB designation and include an appropriate LVIA. 	
Supplementary Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024	
Key issues raised in consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific matters were raised/consulted on. 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments are provided.
Sustainability Appraisal	
See Sustainability Appraisal table below.	
Habitat Regulations Assessment	
Key issues raised in consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No concerns highlighted. 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments
Commentary on policy redrafting for the Publication Plan	
Redrafted policy title: Policy HN 02 – Affordable Housing	
Policy has been redrafted to remove surplus text, concentrating now on key policy issues. Of greatest significance policy has been amended to remove First Home references and place a significance on Social Rent provision (this reflects need, feedback and new Government policy importance attached to this tenure type).	

Strategic Policy 41 – Housing to Meet the Needs of Older People

This policy is specifically geared around meeting the needs of older people and setting thresholds and levels at which specific older person dedicated housing is required through plan policy.

Issues and options consultation	
<p>Paragraphs 5.8 and 5.9 of the Issues and Options report sets out the reasons for building a range of homes that can accommodate different life stage or health circumstances. We asked what approach we should take to encourage this, or is it not something the local plan should deal with.</p> <p>Greatest support is for requiring housing provision for people at all stages of life (44% of response) whilst 28% supported encouraging but not requiring housing provision for people at all stages of life. Little support for not setting standard for differing types of housing provision. 7% of responses supported option 4 – they focused on the needs of a particular group</p>	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for older person provision is noted – though responses were not over whelming.
Draft Plan Consultation	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <p>Many comments received from communities, developers, and specialist housing providers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General recognition by respondents that the proportion of older people is increasing as people live longer lives. Offering older people a better choice of accommodation to suit changing needs helps them live independently for longer, feel more connected to their communities and help reduce costs to social care and health systems. <p>Community comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devon County Council (DCC) - need to strengthen this policy to support provision of a more diverse supply of housing for older people, in particular affordable rented accommodation eg extra care housing and adapted housing for people with 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that feedback, correctly, notes that people are living longer. • Discussions have taken place with the County Council in respect to policy provision and requirements, These have informed policy redrafting, though perhaps not to the degree that the County Council may have aspired to see occur. What can be agreed on, however, is seeking to secure provision come forward to address needs.

<p>specialist needs. DCC are currently updating their evidence base on the need for extra care housing within Devon. Request discussion with EDDC on how to make adequate provision for extra care housing in suitable locations in East Devon including securing the land and delivering facilities</p>	
<p>Contrasting community concerns about planning for housing for older people:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A policy on housing for older people is needed. LHNA statistics provides evidence of the scale of need for housing for older people. • However, one community group asserts the population of East Devon is not ageing due to local resident population getting older. Very recently younger families are moving into East Devon, rather than traditionally the overwhelming number of retirees. • One view is that the housing needs of East Devon lean towards retirement, adapted, and affordable smaller dwellings. Older people choose to move to East Devon “to enjoy the later years of our lives in peace and tranquillity, and in many cases downsized and would financially struggle to move anywhere else”. • An alternative view - Be realistic. Those who can afford it want suitable housing for their old age and will pay for it eg Lifetime homes mix accessibility with some space; but not tiny retirement flats with high charges. Inheritance tax discourages moves to smaller properties • Some want Policy 41 removed because it encourages further influx from other areas, causing further unnecessary over-development. • Why encourage elderly people to retire here? 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is agreed that a policy is needed, especially given the aged population of East Devon. • The data we have shows that older people do move into East Devon (and younger adults out). But also middles aged people move in and grow older here. • It is suggested that there is little that can be done, even if wanted to do so, to impact on older people and middle aged people moving into East Devon in respect of regular open-market homes that are for sale. • It is noted that retirement housing providers may well be attracted, to some degree, to certain types of locations. But there are retirement properties in a wide range of parts of East Devon and taking Exmouth as an example with an existing aging population in the town it is of no surprise that specialist providers may be attracted to the town. • Noted that some call for the removal of the policy. But to do so could prejudice the scope to secure specialist housing for those in need. • It should be noted that we have policy in the plan that provides for younger people, for example much of the affordable housing that is provided is occupied by younger people. • Policy in the plan provides for qualified village development. This can provide opportunities for downsizing by older people.

- East Devon's population is amongst the oldest in the country, many in housing not specifically designed for them.
- Natural decrease means housing is not required to meet needs of existing residents
- Policy appears to meet needs of those retiring here from elsewhere.
- Leads to in-migration of elderly people, and an increasingly elderly population and demographic imbalance.
- Puts extra pressure on stretched health service.
- Encourages specialist retirement housing developers to exploit development potential eg of popular seaside towns
- There are already too many retirement complexes in some areas (Exmouth is cited as one example), which are not serving the local community but have adverse impacts eg changing the demographics and character of the area, and low wages
- An elderly population cannot sustain the future of the economy. Must be a balance towards a more diverse age integrated population to attract the best to stay/live here
- Some want housing to meet needs of existing, ageing residents to be a priority but not those that retire here
- Some want Policy 41 removed because it is age restricted and discriminatory. The plan should focus on housing for younger people. Retirement flats do not provide affordable housing (on site or by contributions)
- If the local plan is seeking to create a market for provision of housing for the over 75s, then it should do likewise for the younger sections of the population

There is some community support for policy for housing for older people:

- One Parish Council supports policy 41 through Neighbourhood Plan policies

- It is noted that some consider that an older population might introduce economic and social strains it is also noted that others take a counter view.
- It is noted that there is a call for specific contributions for health care from older persons housing developments. This is not seen as reasonable, other than through more general health care contributions from housing development.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One respondent wants policy amended to include requirement for housing for older people wishing to downsize but stay in their village • Housing older people generates employment. Supporting small traders eg decorators/gardeners, home adaptations; personal care; and cleaners. Older people support town centre commerce. Some older people provide child-care for their working families • Some want a good mix of accommodation but needs vary. • One Parish Council wants provision of truly affordable housing for older people, not just those wanting to downsize to release capital • Some who downsize from rented family accommodation can find nothing in a central area, near family and bus routes • Many older people are still very active but require homes that create less work and have less stairs. Lack of bungalows is creating a supply chain bottleneck • Some want a more robust policy - secure developer contributions towards health costs and insist on local connection. • Some want a more permissive policy - let the market determine supply mix and percentage, so development takes place in accordance with demand. Many specialist providers of elderly homes have 100% elderly occupation, ie no 20% allocation of development for youngsters 	
<p>Range of contrasting community views on the type and location of accommodation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One view is that developers focus on a narrow part of the market – high-price/high-specification (leasehold or freehold) which attracts in-migrants who can afford them. The policy 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It noted that differing developers have different product types, but with respect to open market sale properties it is difficult to influence the development types (or at least prices charged) for schemes coming forward.

encourages ghettoised accommodation of gated and specialist communities

- Although another respondent asserts that demand for private sector age restricted housing is not strong – can take time to sell once marketing by developers is withdrawn
- There is also concern over developers' interpretation of care class uses/care accommodation. This impacts eg on contributions towards affordable housing
- One respondent asserts that the policy focus is on institutional settings and not normal dwellings. Should revise policy to take account of the thousands of older people urged to stay in their homes which are unsuitable unless adapted.
- Some want affordable housing for older people, not large retirement flat complexes
- Some want housing specifically for the elderly needs to be for those on low incomes (there are plenty of expensive retirement flats)
- Some want all new social housing to be built to cater for all ages.
- Others want more small houses for older people to downsize to in their own communities (towns and villages)
- Another view is that park homes can satisfy the needs of older people; opportunities to expand existing retirement villages eg Otter Valley Park
- There is support for new housing to be designed for whole life/ease of use by older people
- Some comments highlight a shortage of bungalows for people who want to still live independently. The plan should be explicit about providing bungalows. Others want to protect existing stock of bungalows/single level living. Concern over conversion of 2-bedroom bungalows to houses.

- We have sought in policy wording to ensure justified affordable housing contributions are secured.
- Policy in the plan does not in any way preclude existing property adaptation. But it is beyond planning powers to 'make' adaption happen. That said policy in the plan does promote new adaptable housing development.
- We do in plan policy seek affordable elements in older person housing schemes.
- The plan does not preclude park home development, but there are design considerations and other limitations on this housing type.
- Comments are noted about provision of more bungalows. However, they are not a favoured development type of many developers and they do tend to consume larger areas of ground than other forms of houses. Large land take would make costs generally higher.
- Plan policy does seek to secure provision close to facilities and services.
- Concerns around all (qualifying) sites accommodating older person housing. However in suggested plan changes the number of sites that would be 'liable' for provision is not high.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocations should locate housing for older people close to community facilities • Some want new housing for elderly people to be for those on low incomes, built near town centres on brown field sites. However, there is concern in towns eg Budleigh Salterton and Exmouth, development sites are too far for the town centre • Sidmouth Cycling Campaign want sites to be easily accessible by walking, cycling and mobility scooters – as routes incorporating steps can be an obstacle to access • Some say the policy is too prescriptive, inflexible, excessive social engineering. Housing for older people is not appropriate on all developments nor in all locations. So why 'pepper pot' elderly people as a percentage of every new development? • No mention in plan of housing for 'comfortable' retirees to move in to and downsize 	
<p>Range of developer comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some developers support the principle of appropriate housing to meet needs of older people, but only where there is evidence of such need • Housing for older people is not restricted to just traditional care homes and nursing homes. Developers are providing opportunities for a wide range of housing accommodation products designed to meet a range of needs including retirement living apartments; extra care apartments. Greater focus on independent living, as well as flexibility for moving into accommodation with care (to varying levels) and communal facilities on site • But not every site will be appropriate for older persons housing, so the policy needs to be more flexible 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It noted that there is some support for policy. Policy does not seek to be over-prescriptive of development types coming forward, though there is evidence of particular need at the more affordable end of the market, noting that open market provision and supply reflects developer commercial interests in developing. • Policy will be subject to viability testing. • Communal facility needs are noted in policy.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy needs to be subject to robust viability assessment. Cost and viability implications: • Specialist housing in Use Class C3 is age restricted general market housing, retirement living or sheltered housing and extra care housing or housing with care • C3 housing is not excluded from affordability calculation • Significant extra cost with specialist housing – need to provide adequate communal facilities, and for some schemes provide on-site staff accommodation • Concerns about viability. In any viability assessment EDDC should acknowledge that the viability of specialist older persons' housing is more finely balanced than 'general needs' housing. So, housing typologies should be robustly assessed 	
<p>Concern over the percentage in Clause 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blanket policy approach of 20% exceeds the need to meet at least 1,630 net additional specialist dwellings (by almost 1000 units). Could over deliver one form of accommodation at the expense of others that are needed. Wants a more targeted approach with flexibility embedded. • Some developers are concerned that the policy requirement local plan allocations of 20 to 199 dwellings to include at least 20% specialist older person dwelling far exceeds the lower end of identified housing needs. In combination with a 35% requirement for affordable housing this would mean less than 45% standard market housing delivery on a site (including self-build/custom build plots). Overall viability of schemes becomes doubtful. Policy is perverse. For a traditional housebuilder to deliver its market products it must deliver 60% of plots to affordable housing, older persons housing 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy threshold requirements are lessened noting concerns over quantified needs and potential delivery,. • Viability assessment work will inform final policy choices noting concerns raised over the scale of non-market traditional housing that might be sought under this and other plan policies. So policy changes may arise in redrafting.

<p>and self/custom build, and only 40% for its product. No evidence provided about the viability of the policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not apply to sites within the Cranbrook DPD area 	
<p>Concern over other clauses Provider of specialist housing for older persons comments that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To be consistent with latest PPG Amend policy ie insert new point c) at end of point 1- set plan period requirement “at least 6,224 should be specialist older persons dwellings”, based on LHNA evidence of need. Then planning applications don’t have to provide proof of need for older persons housing. • Determine planning applications for specialist housing for older people, based on Market accommodation for older people in the form of age restricted general market housing, retirement living or sheltered housing is in Use Class C3 (dws); and Extra care housing, housing with care, residential care home and nursing home accommodation (including end of life / hospice care and dementia care home accommodation) are in Use Class C2. Local Plan policies on affordable housing and Exception Sites then don’t apply to C2 element. • Another specialist provider is concerned that urgent action is needed to meet need. Supports sub-clause 5 in widening choice. Sub clause 6 is welcome, but strategic sites are often inappropriate locations. Need for older persons housing is self evident, no need for developers to provide up to date evidence of local need • Devon County Council welcomes policy but would like greater support for a more diverse supply of housing for older people, in particular affordable rented accommodation eg extra care 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide possible over-provision of this type of housing it is seen as valuable to require a needs assessment, but there is clear scope to draw on the ORS work and other work to demonstrate a case. • Use class references are noted. • Policy provides support for older person provision. In policy redraft this is clearly stated at the start of policy. • Affordable rented older person housing is supported through plan policy. Though it can be challenging to secure. • Distance threshold in policy redrafting have been addressed. • Clauses in policy more generally have been simplified and stripped back in policy redrafting (from the draft plan to new test). • There is a challenging in allocating sites specifically/just for older person housing as few are explicitly promoted on this basis. • It is noted that a large older person ‘village’ is promoted by a respondent. This however, is not backed up by an actual site promotion, the absence of which is seen as grounds (and there could well be more) for not taking this forward into local plan policy.

housing and adapted housing for people with specialist needs, in particular in main settlements of Exmouth, Honiton, Sidmouth and Seaton.

- Inconsistency between criterion 4 re. “site is within 400m” and criterion 6 re. “all development proposals for 20 to 199 or 200 or more dwellings...” - what if a development is beyond 400m of facilities? Need to clarify criterion 6.
- Clause 4. Refers to sites easily accessible by walking to town centres. Suggest this should be modified to “sites easily accessible by walking, cycling and mobility scooters” as routes incorporating steps, for instance, can be an obstacle to access.
- Clause 12a refers to Clause 8. This appears to be in error and should refer to Clause 7.

Alternative view - Some developers oppose the policy:

- Instead of properly planning for specialist accommodation for older people (i.e. allocating) the Local Plan requires specialist accommodation for older people on site allocations above site thresholds. This depends on developers to contribute towards this need. It is an additional obstacle to conventional residential development.
- Many allocations and windfall sites are not suitable/appropriate for specialist older persons housing. Insufficient for policy 41 to be ‘flexible’.
- More appropriate to identify /allocate suitable sites specifically for providing specialist older persons housing. Allocating sites for specialist housing can provide greater certainty and ability to deliver in appropriate accessible locations such as town centres
- Local plan should only identify and allocate suitable and deliverable sites specifically for providing specialist older

persons housing that meet those needs and respond effectively to demand. Want EDDC to look at evidence of need and supply across the district and engage with providers to understand operational requirements

- Another alternative view - One respondent proposes a different approach. East Devon has amongst the highest percentage of elderly people in England ranging from early-stage retirement to frail elderly in need of care. The choice of retirement housing is limited and care homes and specialised housing with care are in crisis. The proposal relates to: Horizon care village developments and satellite retirement developments
 - Ambition is for a rolling programme of construction across the country
 - Each development of approximately 500 homes comprising:
 - High density, high specification freehold service apartments for frail, elderly and people with long term health conditions
 - Extensive on-site communal facilities
 - Specialist Dementia Unit
 - Separate development of freehold family homes for families caring for family member with a long-term health condition and children caring for a disabled parent
 - Satellite developments for early-stage retirement
 - On-site care and support (day care, respite care, reablement/rehabilitation, end of life care) - caring for multiple health conditions. Actively pull residents from acute settings and reduce long term conversions to long term nursing/residential care

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Managed by Community Interest Company in consultation with residents' Commonhold Association - In process of establishing a Care Academy - extend training for care workers to include long term health 	
Supplementary Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024	
Key issues raised in consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No matters raised in consultation. 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No matters raised.
Sustainability Appraisal	
See Sustainability Appraisal table below.	
Habitat Regulations Assessment	
Key issues raised in consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No concerns highlighted. 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment.
Commentary on policy redrafting for the Publication Plan	
Redrafted policy title: Policy HN 03 – Housing to meet the needs of older people	
Policy has been substantially shorted in redrafting, establishing greater clarity and concentrating on key concerns. Site size thresholds at which provision is sought are to be clarified, but in the draft plan they were deemed to be too high a contribution level.	

Strategic Policy 42 – Accessible and Adaptable Housing	
Policy seeks to establish levels of accessible and adaptable housing that is accommodated in new developments.	
Issues and options consultation	
See General Issues above.	No specific comment highlighted.

Draft Plan Consultation	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of comments on this policy, from the community but mostly from developer, housing association and specialist housing provider respondents. Mix of views. <p>Community responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devon County Council welcome this policy due to the importance of providing for groups which may not be catered for under conventional housing (such as older people and younger adults who may have disabilities or mental health issues). • Growing need for properties to comply with Part M(2) or Part M(3) of Building Regulations • EDDC hasn't taken this approach in the past. How will it be achieved? • Town Council - policy targets will produce a very small number of accessible and adaptable homes, even on large developments. All new homes should be designed as homes for life. • All housing aimed at seniors should be accessible to avoid people having to leave their home if they become disabled • All new housing should meet those with a disability needs. Remove the word affordable as no new home will ever be affordable to those on low incomes. • All affordable and rented homes should be wheelchair accessible • Policy is useless without community facilities/services to meet the needs of these people • Policy should also cover alterations and extensions to buildings, not just new build 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for policy is welcomed. • Importance of building regulations is noted. • It is seen as impractical and could be very expensive (thus for example potentially having significant impacts on affordable housing delivery) to require all new homes to meet all specified standards. • Affordable housing is a particular housing form where policy requirements are particularly important. • Policy in the draft plan is for new build dwellings only. It would be challenging and demanding to make this a requirement on extensions. • It is not seen that the policy will encourage in-migration, this will happen regardless of policy and there is no clear way to 'target' policy to/for existing residents only.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only reflect the need of local communities as of today; do not encourage more in-migration • Not good enough in a Climate Change Crisis • Much of our housing is not suitable for wheelchair access, and cannot be altered 	
<p>Positive developer responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some developers support provision of accessible/adaptable housing. • Policy is sound. Welcome Council’s recognition that M4(3) provision is only required where supported by site suitability/viability • New housing is opportunity to improve provision; depending on implementation and SPD • Concern over how long an SPD will take to prepare/adopt 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for policy is welcomed. • It should be noted that we have dropped policy expectation for an SPD.
<p>Some developers have concerns and objections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government proposals for mandating M4(2) requirement (and M4(1) in exceptional circumstances) are subject to further consultation on technical details, to be implement through Building Regulations. M4(3) would continue to apply as now where a local plan policy is in place and where a need has been identified and evidenced. • One respondent asserts that policy breaches Government guidelines by not recommending that 5,119 households/ at least 30% of the need for adapted housing could be met • Flexibility is needed as certain standards may be difficult to achieve on certain sites and standards may evolve during the plan period • Needs to be consistent with PPG; take account of site-specific factors eg flooding, topography/engineering levels, as they make some sites less suitable for M4(2)/M4(3) dwellings particularly if step free access cannot be achieved/not viable. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to building standards considerations are noted. • It is regarded that 5,119 dwellings to be accessible is over demanding. • The policy as drafted/redrafted does provide flexibility noting the challenges that some sites can present. • The policy may have some impacts on density matters but these are not expected to be great. • The policy as currently redrafted will be subject to viability retesting. • We do have evidence on need but see merit in reviewing this. A transition period by default exists as the local plan progresses to and through Examination and to adoption.

This doesn't just apply to step-free access. Build flexibility into the policy -allow developers to demonstrate in some cases why this level of M4(2) may not be achievable

- Some developers object as policy requires 100% of all homes to be delivered to these standards. LHNA evidence is 30% of need to be M4(2) and M4(3) Goes beyond Building Regulation requirements, Part M4(2) and M4(3) are not mandatory. No evidence to demonstrate this is necessary/justified. Viability not tested
- Concern over the size of properties this policy will necessitate, and on delivering a mix of homes on site, how this affects density requirements and impacts on viability
- Policy should be subject to robust viability assessment
- Inability to scrutinise Reg 18 plan viability, will necessitate further consultation as part of iterative process in drafting policies before reg 19 stage:
- If EDDC wishes to adopt the higher option standards for accessible, adaptable and wheelchair homes it should only do so by applying the criteria in PPG. Need local assessment evidencing the specific case for East Devon. And need a transition period
- Should not apply to sites within the Cranbrook DPD area – where development of the new town proposals are subject to a separate recently adopted DPD. Policy 42 will impact of development already progressing through the development management process
- Need to consider future market demand
- The proposed requirements need to be justified with evidence. If higher accessibility standards are justified, transitional arrangements are needed to allow developers to adapt to the new requirements, which will have implications in terms of additional floorspace required and associated cost.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Housing Association planning consortium supports the policy direction, but reminds the Council how the increased delivery of such properties may affect viability and overall affordable housing delivery in East Devon. 	
<p>Comments from specialist housing providers raise concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One provider of specialist housing for older persons wants clauses b and c deleted from policy. Policy must be properly assessed within the forthcoming viability assessment, including a proper assessment of viability of older person’s housing. Asserts that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy confuses older person’s housing with wheelchair accessible housing. - M4(3) standard housing may institutionalise an older persons scheme reducing independence contrary to the ethos of older persons; notably extra care housing. - M4 3 Housing has a cost implication and may reduce the number of apartments that can be provided on an older person’s housing scheme further reducing viability - Difficult for EDDC to justify the policy approach in absence of a viability study. - A 10% M4 (3) requirement for older people’s housing would be justified (ORS para 7.56) and more viable rather than 100% requirement (ORS study para 7.57) in that would make sites unviable and result in a poor delivery of older people's housing. - People with a long-term disability or illness that requires wheelchair adaptable housing will not meet the age threshold for older person’s housing. This further justifies disaggregating M4 (3) housing from older person’s housing • Another specialist provider asserts that the housing sector is increasingly challenging 100% requirement policy at 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to building standards considerations are noted. • Confusing in policy is not considered to exist, the older person reference is very specific to specialist accommodation for them. • M3 standards do not dictate who occupies a property and their needs, rather it ensures flexibility. • It is noted that policy may have cost implications – this is to be viability tested. • Whilst need for viability testing exists there is a preferable case for 100% M4 provision on older person housing. • Concerns around people with a long-term disability or illness that requires wheelchair adaptable housing are noted. Though housing suited for them can come forward outside of this policy through specialist provision. • It is noted that many occupiers of retirement apartments do nit use a wheelchair. Policy requirements, however, provide flexibility both for residents and visitors. • The caselaw point is noted, but policy does not seek mandate sales matters.

<p>Examinations and Appeal. Justification for 100% M4(3) requirement for wheelchair adaptations is based on flawed assumptions, and not sound.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the provider’s development there is no need for apartments to meet M4(3) requirements with less than 1% of occupiers using a wheelchair full time. (eg where specialist housing is for the active elderly) • Long term wheelchair users will have moved into suitably adapted homes earlier in their lives, and likely to remain there. • Those in retirement living apartments with short term wheelchair use, can do so in home built to M4(2). • Residential care/nursing homes are more appropriate for those needing permanent wheelchair use and greater care • People with long term mobility disabilities would be in a different setting; not occupy an independent living retirement development. • Cost of M4(3) provision is unjustified • Caselaw - no policy requirement or control that LPA can impose over open market private apartments that could mandate that they must be sold to a wheelchair user 	
<p>Supplementary Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific concerns noted or highlighted. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments raised.
<p>Sustainability Appraisal</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation: See Sustainability Appraisal table below</p>	<p>Key issues raised in consultation: See Sustainability Appraisal below</p>
<p>Habitat Regulations Assessment</p>	

Key issues raised in consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No concerns noted. 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No matters raised.
Commentary on policy redrafting for the Publication Plan	
Redrafted policy title: Policy HN 03 – Accessible and Adaptable housing	
This policy has been redrafted to seek to simplify use and applications. The standards/requirements in a first redraft of policy have been lowered though they are to be viability tested and sense checked.	

Strategic Policy 43 – Market Housing Mix

This policy in the draft plan sought, primarily, to specify the mix of property size accommodated on development sites. It should be noted that in the draft plan it is, however, proposed for deletion.

Issues and options consultation

See General Issues above.

Draft Plan Consultation

Key issues raised in consultation: Several comments on this policy, mostly from developers. There are a few comments from communities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parish Council expressed support through Neighbourhood Plan policies 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst qualified support for policy is noted it is not seen as an especially useful or appropriate policy for inclusion in the plan. Some parts of the draft plan policy replicate themes more appropriately addressed through other plan policies. More importantly the mix of housing sizes specified is more a reflection of static outputs from the needs assessment study,
---	---

- Another Parish Council considers the policy has too many caveats, so needs tightening
- EDDC hasn't taken this approach in the past. How will it be achieved?
- Town Council- supportive, but implementation details will be important. Await SPD
- How will the housing need evidence be gathered?
- Policy will need 'teeth' otherwise anticipate developers will object and appeal
- Need less 4 bed dwellings and more 2 bed dwellings, eg for younger, local people.
- Not just about number of bedrooms. It's also need sufficient living space including for home working.
- Should concentrate upon densities and room sizes. Create accommodation in roof spaces
- Absurdly prescriptive. It supposes we can predict bedroom requirements to 2040.
- Inflexible, compared to market delivery. Won't housebuilders provide for/adapt to market?

Most comments are from developers:

- Some developer/housebuilder respondents support objective of policy to provide mix of house types and property sizes in locations consistent with spatial strategy
- Acknowledge policy includes acceptable circumstances where a proposals departure from the required housing mix is justified. Retain this in future iterations of the plan

However most developer comments are concerned that the policy is too prescriptive:

based on modelling projections, rather than a reflection of planning outcomes that may be desired to be seen.

- The mix specified (somewhat perversely) may be seen to over-emphasise relevance of larger rather than smaller housing delivery – this has a relevance noting that many plan respondents have called for more smaller houses to be built (a respondent makes this point)
- It should be noted that space standards for new homes feature in policy elsewhere in the plan.
- It is agreed that policy is overly prescriptive and as such inflexible.
- It is recognised that the housing market will have a good understanding of needs and wants – noting many volume builder scheme will often provide for more smaller homes than policy may expect.
- Market choice and preferences of buyers are also recognised as factors that will determine what developers provide.
- Concerns around desirability, and therefore policy reference, to one bed dwellings are noted.
- It is not regarded as necessary to include a policy reference specifically seeking or requiring bungalow development.
-

- Some assert the policy is misguided and unnecessary Let the housing market determine if Market mix is most appropriately left to the developers to determine. Policy should be deleted.
- Should not have a table with suggested mix based on 2022 needs in the Policy for the plan period up to 2040
- Can't implement policy based on the number of properties for sale. Outside EDDC control
- Households are free to choose what open market housing they want and can afford. Including demand for housing larger than they need
- If there is the need for the size of property then, developers respond to that demand.
- Plan should take a proportionate approach, not try to control every element of a scheme. Putting ever increasing levels of detail and ratcheting up requirements will not aid delivery of housing
- Housing needs change over time and differ across District.
- Decide on a site-by-site basis
- Others want Policy 43 to state that the mix of property sizes for market housing shown in the East Devon Local Housing Need Assessment 2022 is a starting point
- Some broad support for policy but needs to avoid being overly prescriptive so development can respond to local character and setting
- Want a flexible approach towards housing mix which recognises that needs and demand vary from area to area and site to site; ensures that the scheme is viable; and provides an appropriate mix for the location and market

- Policy should refer to demand. to reflect that people generally express a demand for a property that is bigger than they specifically need
- New housing doesn't just cater for net household growth. It is a means for people to move around within the market, freeing up properties along the housing ladder, eg enabling households to upsize
- Policy should refer to trend for homeworking many reasons why people want more space for this
- Some object to the percentages in the table in the policy, as they are based on the Local Housing Needs Assessment 2022 The LHNA is a starting point, - the mix should also have regard to local evidence, site specific consideration and viability
- Conflict between 2022 LHNA data and local up to date evidence of parish housing need
- Some suggest that specific reference to the 2022 LHNA is removed. Broader wording needed eg mix to reflect up-to-date date evidenced need and market conditions.
- EDDC should work with local communities to carry out local housing needs assessments
- 1 bed market housing is not typically desirable/viable. Combine 1 and 2 bedroom figures
- Policy should refer to different types, not just sizes LHNA does not consider need for bungalows. These have an important role in meeting needs. Add reference to different types of accommodation, specifically bungalows.
- Concerns that this should not be a blanket policy: across all sites:

- Should only apply to larger sites and/or take account of local character/density.
- EDDC should work with local communities, and carry out local housing need assessments to inform a case-by-case assessment of appropriate housing mix, for housing delivery to meet identified need.
- Want flexible policy, as housing needs change over time and differ across district.
- Should decide housing mix on a site-by-site basis at the planning application/ reserved matters state, taking account of up-to-date evidence on need, supply, demand and location. Control mix by planning conditions.
- Should not apply to sites within the Cranbrook DPD area.
- Example of departures is very detailed. They could be broader. Market conditions should be an example of where a departure from 2022 LHNA may be appropriate
- Amend sub-clause 4 to exempt specialist forms of development e.g. specialist older persons or student housing
- Paragraph 5 should be deleted as unclear what it will require in practice, given the policy already accepts the need for flexibility (in paragraph 4).
- Clause 5 only allows different open market mix in exceptional circumstances. This does not provide sufficient flexibility as required by NPPF
- Unclear what is meant by market conditions evidence demonstrating lack of marketability' and what is required. Should delete.

Supplementary Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024

Key issues raised in consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific concerns noted. 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments.
Sustainability Appraisal	
See Sustainability Appraisal table below.	
Habitat Regulations Assessment	
Key issues raised in consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No specific concerns noted. 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments.
Commentary on policy redrafting for the Publication Plan	
Redrafted policy title: Not applicable as policy is proposed for deletion.	
This policy is proposed for deletion in reasoning set out in the policy assessment work above.	

Strategic Policy 44 – Self Build and Custom Housing	
This policy seeks provision of self/custom build plots on qualifying housing development sites.	
Issues and options consultation	
See General Issues above.	
Draft Plan Consultation	
Key issues raised in consultation: Several comments from community and developer respondents, with a range of views.	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for policy is noted and welcomed.

<p>Community comments are mixed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parish Council supports through Neighbourhood Plan policies • Another Parish Council questions the need for the policy during a housing crisis. Would someone working in a low paid job ever consider this option? • Proportion of selfbuild in UK is too low. Big developers' schemes/national designs dominate, resulting in identical looking estates. Lacking in vernacular look. • Doesn't really promote selfbuild. EDDC should take selfbuild seriously. Opportunity for high quality homes at affordable price. Help local people build their own affordable home. • No selfbuild units built in last 6 years. Misleading to compare windfall sites to the selfbuild register. Only a small percentage of windfalls come on to the open market. • Supports promoting self-build, especially truly affordable, smaller units • Supports encouraging Neighbourhood Plans allocating suitable sites • Town Council – viability consequences when combined with affordable housing policies? • Selfbuild should be lower priority than social housing • Policy is irrelevant. Not a priority. • Do not permit grandiose designs unless the selfbuilder has the funds • Avoid inappropriate development eg in AONB, CAs, SACs • Self-builds should reduce embodied carbon, use sustainable energy, limit car spaces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is noted, as alluded to in submission, that it is a however a housing type that will be beyond many peoples realistic hopes for securing a home to live in. • It is recognised that self-build can make for good designs, avoiding standardised patterns book houses that are often developed. • Many windfall developments, of a small scale, especially single dwellings, will be self-builds. • There is a real concerns around the degree to whether self-builds can contribute to affordable housing provision and delivery – at best it is niche sector for provision. • The policy will ned viability testing and this may refine wording used. • It should be noted that usual restraint policies, eg development in AONBs, will apply to consideration of proposals. Though it should be noted this policy is applicable to provision on 'regular' housing sites so tests will be met/addressed through overarching application determination anyway.
<p>Most comments are from developers, with a mix of views:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some developers/builders oppose policy for delivering self/custom build as a percentage of larger sites. Potential 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p>

<p>conflict: between housebuilder and selfbuilder; and in managing communal areas. Advocate small bespoke allocations for selfbuild or just policy support for such housing on exceptions sites in/adjacent to settlements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy is onerous, not justified and not achievable. Will delay delivering housing • Policy is not market-facing to provide It would be more effective to have an exception site policy that allows self-build or custom-build on a case-by-case basis. • Question whether self/custom builders want to build on a larger housing scheme. • PPG sets out how LPAs can increase the number of permissions that are suitable for self and custom build housing. Possible alternative policy mechanisms to delivery opportunities for self/custom build eg small /medium size sites specifically for this purpose, or policy allowing them outside but adjacent to settlement boundaries • EDDC does not have appropriate evidence to justify site threshold and percentage of self- build housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is recognised that there can be on site conflicts between housebuilders and self builders. Though these should not be insurmountable. • There are challenges to policy, but such policies have worked elsewhere. • An exceptions site policy to provide for self-building is not seen as desirable as it would invariably place pressure for development in areas where development would not typically allowed. Noting that anyway someone can submit a planning application and argue their case for why it should be allowed, self-build or not. There is no over-riding consideration that establishes why a self-builder should have a ‘policy advantage’ over a non-self-builder in such circumstances. • We will look again before final plan redrafting at the policy threshold – noting it is quite low and there is a consideration around discounting affordable houses form calculations.
<p>Some developers have concerns and some want the policy reworded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy should be worded with the ability for appropriate triggers to be negotiated on a site by site basis. • Unclear whether there is a demand from custom and self-builders to live on site within larger developments • Only require self/custom build plots where clear market demand for them on developments. Where there is no demand, the developer should not be penalised for not delivering specialised dwellings on new developments • Concerns about: mixing styles/materials; site safety/security. How will EDDC control this? 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not seen that policy should explicitly allow for non-provision of the self-build housing. Noting that this could be argued through application anyway and policy does allow for non-development after a two year marketing period. • We have seen cases from elsewhere of on-site development occurring. • Careful site layout can address different development style potential problems at the initial site design stages. Though we recognise this will require some work, though and attention.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers’ reluctant to offer selfbuild plots within larger areas potential conflict eg from styles and design/ management of communal areas/plots that are unfinished • Health and safety concerns about enabling access to plots within active construction site • The inclusion of affordable plots will have viability and delivery constraints. Lack of cost assessment and viability evidence to justify policy • Should not encourage selfbuild at the expense of small builders. Instead, develop smaller sites/ encourage local building businesses to prosper/employ local people • Should not apply to sites within the Cranbrook DPD area • Provider of specialist housing for older persons wants new clause – ‘Older person’s housing schemes are exempt from the above requirement’. Such schemes are often on brownfield sites, need to be high density, minimum of 35 to 40 flats and already marginal viability. Threshold is impractical/not suitable. No room for self-build plots. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Careful site operation should overcome health and safety concerns. • The affordable housing requirements of policy are intentionally loosely worded and viability assessment is referenced in policy wording. • It is not considered that self-build developments under policy will be to the detriment of self-builders. Many such builders may actual do the actual building work. • Need to look at exclusion from policy of specialist providers. Point is noted.
<p>More specific comments from developers on Clause 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5% requirement should only apply to the market housing, not the whole site capacity • What is the evidence to justify the percentage and size thresholds? • Amend Clause 1a to ‘6 to 12 months’ for marketing; remove ‘from being fully serviced and developable’ as it’s unnecessary/causes delay • One respondent wants marketing period of 6 months (maximum of 12). A developer suggests a marketing period of 12 months (not 24 months) as more appropriate. • Clause 1a - 24 months window doesn’t help self-builders. Developer only sells the plot if retained as the builder. No 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only applying to market housing point is noted and will be reviewed. • Work will also be need on site size / percentages and justification. • A 2 year marketing period is deemed reasonable. Noting many housing sites will take much longer than this to move from permission to being built out. • It is not considered that ‘early stage’ needs defining as it gives a clear steer as worded and all sites will differ. • The 50% requirement around plots being made available has been removed noting the challenges it raises. Bes[poke agreements can now be reached on release on a site by site basis.

price advantage, which puts off self-builders. Developer builds rest of site in the 2 years then claims self-build plot not sold

- Site could be developed within 24 months which would require developers to pause building on a development. 12 Months is more appropriate
- Clarify Clause 1b – Define ‘early stage’. Access/services can be conditioned
- Impractical to provide road access on large, phased strategic sites at an early stage of the development or to make the self-build provision available for sale before 50% of the dwellings on the site have been commenced. Instead, require developer to make available the self and custom housebuilding for sale before 50% of the dwellings had commenced in a phase containing self and custom build housing Amend 1b to be accessible for pedestrians as well as vehicles
- Clause 1b - policy could be worded with the ability for appropriate triggers to be negotiated on a site by site basis
- Delete Clause 1c – no justification for requiring the self/custom build plots to all be made available before 50% of the dwellings have been commenced. Instead control through conditions
- Developer states not possible to make custom and self-build plots for sale before 50% of dwellings on site have been completed as would mean significant health and safety concerns with enabling access to plots on an active construction site
- Clause 1c - policy could be worded with the ability for appropriate triggers to be negotiated on a site by site basis
- 1e Wording is not accepted - impossible to commit to such wording at an early stage due to factors which may impact on

- In terms of being offered for sale with no legal or physical restrictions – it is appreciated this may not in every case be possible but it is still seen as reasonable to retain policy, even if exceptions arise where the clause cannot be implemented.
- To secure affordable housing it is regarded as reasonable and credible to retain requirements.
- Referencing to design codes has been simplified – merging previous clauses 1g and 1h.
- Clause i. has been removed.
- For specialist forms of accommodation it is recognised that policy may not be applicable, but this can be addressed through negotiations.

<p>development implementation eg fundamental health and safety implications during construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clause 1f - affordable plots will have viability and delivery constraints. having a policy that requires affordable plots, adds an extra layer of complexity • Combine clauses 1g and 1h and clarify to ensure any potential design code/ passport relates to the self or custom build dwellings and not conventional dwelling • Delete Clause 1i is unreasonable. No legislative or policy basis to impose a requirement for any obligation for developments to be delivered and completed within a set timeframe. No lawful means to implement – cannot be reasonably enforced or conditioned. 3 years is too short for completion. Policy could lower interest in self/custom build. • In law, it is the responsibility of the Council, not landowners or developers, to ensure that sufficient permissions are given to meet demand • Thresholds are impractical and unsuitable for specialist forms of accommodation such as retirement living apartments for the elderly. They are high density accommodation and there is insufficient room to accommodate self/custom build plots on the site <p>Thresholds are incompatible with other specialist housing eg flatted development</p>	
Supplementary Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No matters raised 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments.
Sustainability Appraisal	
See Sustainability Appraisal table below.	

Habitat Regulations Assessment	
Key issues raised in consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No concerns raised. 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No concerns raised.
Commentary on policy redrafting for the Publication Plan	
Redrafted policy title: Policy HN 05 – Self build and custom housing	
Policy has been redrafted to make it simpler and to removed matters of detail that did not add critical matters but raised implementation concerns.	

Strategic Policy 45 – Residential Subdivision of Existing Dwellings and Buildings and Replacement of Existing Dwellings	
Policy seeks to address matters relevant to subdivision of existing dwellings and buildings and their replacement.	
Issues and options consultation	
See General Issues above.	
Draft Plan Consultation	
Key issues raised in consultation: Only a few respondents commented on this policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Environment Agency state that this policy represents an opportunity to embed within the plan their local flood risk standing advice for changes of use to residential and replacement dwellings in areas at risk of flooding. This would help provide certainty and consistent expectations for 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refence to flooding considerations are noted but this is seen as more a generic policy matter rather than an issue that needs specific attention in this policy wording. The use of the term adequate is seen as reasonable given the broad coverage of policy and the many differing types of proposals that will be considered under it.

<p>applicants, simplify decision-making for planning officers, and ensure such proposals result in more resilient buildings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Parish Council supports through Neighbourhood Plan policy• Town Council - Policy is subjective. How to define 'adequate'?• Some community support for policy. Easy to subdivide older properties to produce more dwellings density and without unduly changing street character. Subdivision is an opportunity to save older historical buildings as part of the area and to retain original fixtures/fittings• Subdivision must be in keeping with the property and surrounding area; meet standards.• Supports retaining existing buildings. It reduces the amount of building materials required and reduces waste to be disposed of• Supports minimising hard surfaces in front gardens• Supports adequate parking provision• Every development needs off street parking but without hard surface on front garden• Wants requirement for covered storage in the development.• Does not support rebuilding/replacing smaller homes with larger homes• Concern about subdivision impacts ie out of character, loss of gardens, overbearing, noise• Policy is too specific/over the top. Is it necessary?• Embedded carbon policy is too prescriptive/complicated/too wordy. Environmental benefits unclear. New buildings are built to higher standard/deliver more dwellings than replaced.• Adverse impact on the sustainability of smaller villages. Policy does not support villages to attract future generations. Does not provide comfort for anyone considering investing money in purchasing a property in smaller villages not in the	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support for policy noted, esp. references to sub-division of older buildings and the benefits that can be gained, recognising importance of being undertaken sympathetically.• Benefits of retaining existing buildings is also noted and avoidance of hard surfaces and parking provision (noting plan policy elsewhere for parking).• Explicit wording on coverage storage requirement seen to be too much detail for policy.• Policy seeks to qualify scope for replacement of smaller dwellings with bigger ones but it is not deemed reasonable to prevent any enlargement.• Embedded carbon policy is covered elsewhere in the plan.• In villages, or elsewhere, policy does not prevent sub-division or replacement, but it does qualify it. This policy does not prevent extensions to properties or improvements.
---	---

settlement hierarchy tiers that they will be able to later reasonably develop them further so that growing families are not forced to move to find housing appropriate to their needs	
Supplementary Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024	
Key issues raised in consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No matter noted. 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments
Sustainability Appraisal	
See Sustainability Appraisal table below.	
Habitat Regulations Assessment	
Key issues raised in consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues raised. 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments.
Commentary on policy redrafting for the Publication Plan	
Redrafted policy title: Policy HN 06 - Residential Subdivision of Existing Dwellings and Buildings and Replacement of Existing Dwellings	
Policy remains as drafted, with removal of reference to Supplementary Planning Document deletion.	

Strategic Policy 46 – Householder Annexes, Extensions, Alterations and Outbuildings	
Policy provides for extensions and alterations to existing buildings.	
Issues and options consultation	
No specific matters are noted.	No feedback provided.
Draft Plan Consultation	
Key issues raised in consultation:	Officer commentary in response:

- One Parish Council supports through Neighbourhood Plan policies
- Another Parish Council considers this policy is not justified. It could restrict farmers' ability to meet the changing needs of their family. These properties would enjoy PD rights. Policy 46 is inconsistent with Policy 50 which allows minor works without reassessment of need.
- Town Council – what is the justification for limiting GIA increase to 30%?
- Concern that alterations tend to make houses bigger, reducing the stock of smaller houses for people to down-size to or use as starter homes
- Policy is correct, but the problem is that the policy is not applied. Need stronger monitoring of policies otherwise policy is ineffective
- PD rights are more stringent in AONB, particularly loft conversion. Wants para 8.99 amended to exclude loft conversions in AONB where design is acceptable
- Considers that annexes and extensions and outbuildings must not have a detrimental visual, amenity and privacy impact on neighbouring properties
- Proposals must take account of neighbours' views
- Extensions need to be in keeping with main building; should meet housing standards
- Agrees annexes, extensions, outbuildings should be integral or linked to the main dwelling
- Town Council - must condition annexes so they are ancillary to main dwellings AND not AirBnB accommodation. Concern about enforcement
- One respondent takes a contrary view. Wants annexes to be able to be used for social housing when their need by the

- Support for policy is noted.
- It is not regarded that policy is inconsistent with agricultural dwellings policy as the latter is specific to a category of applicant whereas this is general policy widely applied.
- The 30% increase figure is pragmatically based on allowing some but not substantive increases. In part this figure seeks to resist excessive increases in dwelling sizes.
- Specific reference to loft conversions, given it's a matter of detail, is not seen as needed.
- Some matters around detail of development management and impacts of development are noted but are not seen to justify policy changes.
- Policy wording advises of annexes being ancillary.
- It would only be in very exceptional circumstances where an annex may be promoted for social housing. Should the situation arise then an application could be determined on its own merits.
- Policy does not seek to ban improvements, rather it seeks to set an acceptable balance for extensions and expansion.
-

<p>family in the main building has ceased. Why have an empty property that could instead meet other people’s needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensions/alterations are concreting over gardens, and reducing on-site parking • How to manage increased drainage pressure? Or protect against loss of flora? • Concern over impacts on neighbours from extensions built too close to site boundary • Extensions e.g. to create bedroom(s) can turn into AirBnBs. Need to take enforcement • Adverse impact on the sustainability of smaller villages. Policy does not support villages to attract future generations. Does not provide comfort for anyone considering investing money in purchasing a property in smaller villages not in the settlement hierarchy tiers that they will be able to later reasonably develop them further.so that growing families are not forced to move to find housing appropriate to their needs • Disagrees with ban on improvements to affordable house or agricultural worker’s dwelling. • Why restrict buildings’ potential? Why treat affordable and market housing differently? • Reduce or remove policy. It is too prescriptive/arrogant/overdone. Planning controls on extensions are already sufficient, don’t need more controls • Should focus on existing old/abandoned properties that can be regenerated to provide dwelling(s). Regenerating brownfield sites should be the priority, not new-build. 	
<p>Supplementary Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific concerns noted. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments.

Sustainability Appraisal	
See Sustainability Appraisal table below.	
Habitat Regulations Assessment	
Key issues raised in consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No concerns raised. 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments raised.
Commentary on policy redrafting for the Publication Plan	
Redrafted policy title: Policy HN 07 - Householder Annexes, Extensions, Alterations and Outbuildings	
Policy has remain unaltered from that in the draft plan	

Strategic Policy 47 – Hostels and Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)	
Policy provides for properties in multiple occupation.	
Issues and options consultation	
See General Issues above.	
Draft Plan Consultation	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some support for policy • HMOs should not be used to house young families. HMOs only appropriate of young single people, not the norm for older adults (except by choice) • No mention I plan of better use of existing housing by encouraging the conversion of large houses to multiple occupancy • Concern over poor HMO provision in Exeter, apart from student lets • Overly prescriptive. But problems can occur, warranting close scrutiny of applications • Clause 2 - Provide more parking spaces on site to avoid on street parking. • Size of parking spaces/garages needs to be realistic, mindful of modern car sizes • Objects to Clause 2 not requiring cycle storage if site has access to public transport or is within 800m walking distance of town centre. Cycling is an attractive mode at that distance 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for policy noted. • Policy does not seek to determine who should live in HMOs, though noted that they are frequential occupied by younger adults. • Policy elsewhere in the plan does allow for conversion of larger buildings. • We would not be in a position to comment about HMOs in Exeter. • Policy seeks to be quite prescriptive to avoid adverse outcomes given that nature of the accommodation type and negative impacts that can arise from poor development. • Car parking references are deemed appropriate, given parking policy elsewhere in the plan and need for flexibility given varying nature and location of proposals that may come forward under policy (though many maybe in town centre locations where public transport services can be good). • Cycling storage is required under policy. • Building standards in developments will be covered by Building Regulations.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clause 2 – concern if provision is not made for parking. On-going cuts to bus services mean that cars will be needed even in town centres. Need electric car charging • Clause 4 Town council supports the policy but internal standards need higher specification • Clause 5 Sensible policy for careful subdivision of large houses which can help meet need • Must maintain HMOs to high standard. And retain character. Use suitable insulation to avoid damp. Need for soundproofing. 	
<p>Supplementary Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific issues raised. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments.
<p>Sustainability Appraisal</p>	
<p>See Sustainability Appraisal table below.</p>	
<p>Habitat Regulations Assessment</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No concerns highlighted. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments.
<p>Commentary on policy redrafting for the Publication Plan</p>	
<p>Redrafted policy title: Strategic Policy HN 08 - Hostels and Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)</p>	
<p>Policy amended to remove reference to Supplementary Planning Document production.</p>	

Strategic Policy 48 – Provision for Gypsy and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople Sites	
<p>This Policy ensures that sufficient pitches or plots are provided to meet the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople during the life of the Plan. Policy identifies sufficient pitches on allocated sites to meet the predicted need in full but also contains a windfall policy which can be applied to applications which come forward on other sites ensuring that additional need can be met and family expansion can be accommodated.</p>	
Issues and options consultation	
<p>See General Issues above.</p>	
Draft Plan Consultation	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Environment Agency are pleased that this policy includes a requirement for these proposals to ‘avoid sites vulnerable to flooding or affected by any other environmental hazards that may affect the residents’ health and welfare’. This is essential because such developments are considered highly vulnerable and should not be permitted in areas at risk of flooding. • Sites must support the needs of the travelling community. • Supports need to make adequate provision • No evidence to justify quantum of pitches at proposed new town • Town Council questions EDDC plans for vanlifers. How will plan differentiate legally between travellers, showpeople and vanlifers? • Sites must have access to utilities (water, sewerage & water disposal, drainage) • Sites for small groups only 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy makes appropriate provision to meet the need identified in the GTAA which is considered robust. • Allocated sites have been assessed (or will be, in the case of the new town) using the same methodology as was used for housing and employment sites to ensure that they are appropriate and sustainably located and will not have an unacceptable impact upon landscape, heritage, ecology, highways or other interests. • Policy makes provision for windfalls and sets out the criteria that will apply. • Vanlifers will not be treated as Gypsies or Travellers unless they meet the planning definition or can demonstrate that they are cultural Gypsies covered by the Equalities Act.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites should not affect residents of the area. • Sites should not tolerate antisocial behaviour • Doubts that the new settlement would be suitable • Proposed LP allocation is next to M5. Contrary to WHO’s health requirements – noise/pollution impacts • For countryside sites -wants evidence that needs cannot be met elsewhere in district • Approved provision in Hawkchurch is used for social housing (static caravans and touring pitches). No further need in Hawkchurch. Look elsewhere rather than change use once approved 	
<p>Supplementary Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This policy was not the subject of this consultation. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A small number of comments were received in respect of a proposed Gypsy and Traveller allocation at Langaton Lane (although this was not subject of this consultation). These mostly objected to the allocation on the grounds of conflict with other nearby uses (housing, scout hut and rifle range), impact on future residents (from the railway and M5), flooding and increased traffic on a no through road. These points were noted.
<p>Sustainability Appraisal</p>	
<p>See Sustainability Appraisal table below.</p>	
<p>Habitat Regulations Assessment</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific concerns raised. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment in feedback.
<p>Commentary on policy redrafting for the Publication Plan</p>	
<p>Redrafted policy title:</p>	

Policy HN 09 - Provision for Gypsy and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople Sites

Policy reflects the findings of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment and sets pitch requirements accordingly. It explains how many pitches/plots are required, their permanent or transit status and the partnership working that the Council will engage in to meet any transit requirement. Three sites are allocated through other policies but are referenced in this strategic policy to demonstrate how the requirements will be met.

The Policy ensures the likely needs of all Gypsies and Travellers are met through the Plan period and that, by allocating sufficient pitches for this total need, Gypsies who have a cultural need for a pitch (rather than a bricks and mortar house) but do not meet the planning definition will still be accommodated appropriately. If the undetermined need and those who don't meet the planning definition are not planned for through allocations, experience in East Devon suggests that their needs are unlikely to be met through general housing policies unless they can afford to purchase and layout their own pitches. Experience and consultation with the households suggests that most can't afford to, can't take the risk of purchasing land speculatively or don't understand/trust the process so very few pitches will be delivered as windfalls.

That said, this policy also sets out criteria for windfalls/non-allocated sites to be considered against. It is considered that this approach is comprehensive and ensures that the Council meets not only it's planning duties but also it's responsibility under the Equalities legislation.

Strategic Policy 49 – Rural Exception Sites and First Homes Exception Sites	
Policy provides for development of rural exceptions homes. These are primarily homes in countryside locations (beyond development boundaries) designed to secure development of affordable housing to meet local needs.	
Issues and options consultation	
See general Issues above.	
Draft Plan Consultation	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <p>Most comments on this policy were from communities and a Housing Association Consortium.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Parish Council advocates a separate Affordable Housing DPD, to include this policy. Exception sites in rural villages are very sensitive. Should be aimed at ‘Social Rents’ and not affordable rents • Some broad support for policy. Part of strategy to deliver affordable housing. • Should encourage every village to bring forward schemes under this policy. It’s the best way at present of producing homes badly needed for natural growth in communities deemed ‘unsustainable’ as shops, pubs and schools shut due to lack of customers/ pupils • CLT comment is that Rural Exception sites offer CLT a more appropriate planning method to secure affordable housing sites that will have community support. This contrasts with reintroducing settlement boundary which frustrates CLT in trying to secure land for the building of affordable housing. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not seen as needed, and would be excessive, to do a separate affordable housing DPD. • Policy as redrafted does not specific social rent provision but this is the thrust of affordable housing provision elsewhere in the plan (and accords with NPPF redrafting in summer 2024). • The Council are supporting of exceptions schemes coming forward. • Support for CLT housing is expressed, but it is unclear how settlement boundaries will frustrate delivery via a CLT route. In many respects boundaries are helpful as they provide clarity around where market housing will not be allowed and as such open up scope for exceptions sites to be identified and come forward. • The allowance for market homes on sites is for viability reasons and allow for cross-subsidy from market to affordable housing provision. Without the market housing element the concern is that many schemes would not generate funds to pay for affordable housing delivery. • Whilst policy expectation remains for smaller scale development specific size thresholds are removed to provide greater flexibility.

- Why not 100% as affordable housing?
- Housing Association Planning Consortium supports the policy proposal for a small element of market housing to provide sufficient cross-subsidy. Affordable housing delivery can be fast-tracked when there is no grant funding available
- Consortium emphasises that NPPF/PPG do not define small. Local Plan's definition for this policy is too prescriptive, will inhibit the ability to maximise affordable housing opportunities on Rural Exception sites
- Rural exception sites should encompass self-build.
- EDDC will need 'teeth' to implement the policies. Need more detail on implementation
- Any guarantee that dwellings approved would not be sold on to the open market for profit, and to outsiders? How would this be implemented?
- Should protect AONB from development. Policy could lead to development in the AONB. Inconsistency between policies. New starter type homes are not allowed AONB by this policy. So should reject sites eg Exmouth 17, Littleham fields of 410 houses in the AONB.
- Policy should not be justified on a District wide basis; housing need should relate to settlement.
- Housing Association Planning Consortium considers that as well as the LHNA, plan should recognise the East Devon Housing Register as another key evidence based to inform Rural Exception Site proposals
- Query raised about relying only on East Devon Local Housing Needs Assessment to justify exception scheme in a small village of under 3000 people. This is contrary to PPG-which requires proven need in relation to the local community. Need to amend policy

- Self-build can come forward under this policy, specific wording reference is not needed.
- Policy does and should apply in the AONB, noting that specific considerations applicable to AONBs are set out elsewhere in the plan.
- Homes come forward under this policy will need to be supported by evidence of local rather than district wide need.
- The council will need to review evidence of need considerations, including use of waiting lists.
- Whilst gypsy and traveller schemes could come forward under policy there is also specific policy reference for development for this community in the plan.
- Concerns around 'development creep' are noted the policy has safeguards in place in respect of what can be built, policy provides for a particular housing need and in reality limited numbers of exceptions sites are granted planning permission.
- Second homes and other properties not fully occupied largely fall outside of the planning regime – notably homes purchased on the resale/second-hand market.

- 2 comments about Rural Exception Sites and First Homes Exception Site clause 2 ('A small element of market housing...')
- A Town Council considers the percentage of market value housing to be high.
- A Community Led Housing CIC considers clause 2 is impractical. Rural communities seek 100% affordable housing on RESs. Landowners will require the open market plots, which are then unavailable to CLT/HA for cross subsidy. Landowners dispose of land for affordable plots at £1, but it's not enough cross subsidy to deliver affordable housing without grant. Homes England can regard the landowner as benefitting too greatly and refuse to allocate grant. CIC consider that enough landowners are willing to bring sites forward at 100% affordable housing. Under NPPF the opportunity for market homes on RESs is at the LPA's discretion
- Devon County Council query whether the last paragraph would include Gypsy and Traveller community who are already residing on a particular site. They highlight the adverse issues with this, and that it would be severely limiting for families
- Support for SPD to provide further guidance
- Occasionally this type of development is justified but only rarely, ie 'exceptional'
- Keep Exception sites to an absolute minimum. They cause settlement boundary creep. Keep development within the settlement boundaries and housing plans being proposed. Apply this approach to the development plan before any exception sites are considered.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy could be unnecessary if more restrictions were placed on second homes, Airbnbs, buying to rent. Or if more affordable housing were built. • Policy approach is second best. It doesn't apply rigour to strategic planning • Should not allow this type of development if it is on sites rejected under the Local Plan. Instead seek more affordable housing when site allocations are being developed. 	
Supplementary Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No matters raised. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments.
Sustainability Appraisal	
See Sustainability Appraisal table below.	
Habitat Regulations Assessment	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No concerns highlighted 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments.
Commentary on policy redrafting for the Publication Plan	
<p>Redrafted policy title: Strategic Policy HN 10 - Rural Exception Sites and First Homes Exception Sites</p>	
<p>In redrafting we have sought to much simplify this policy. In particular reference to First Homes has been removed noting that these are no seen as a favourable model of affordable housing delivery.</p>	

Strategic Policy 50 - Housing for Rural Workers	
This policy provides for new housing development for rural workers where there is an operational need to live in a given location (a location where housing would not otherwise be permitted under plan policy).	
Issues and options consultation	
See General Issues above.	
Draft Plan Consultation	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only a few respondents commented on this policy: • Parish Council supports through Neighbourhood Plan policies • National Farmers Union support the specific provision for rural workers to allow the provision of a suitable property (either conversion or new build) on a farm business where a need can be clearly shown. • Must look after the Farming and Agriculture Community. Need to maintain our agricultural industry and support those that work in it notably those with a local connection • Concern that many agricultural workers dwellings have been lost over the last 20 years • Policy is necessary to solve the problems caused by the recent lack of migrant workers • Support for stringent requirements being placed on rural businesses. This compares with very poor enforcement of illegal development in the countryside, that's led to retrospective applications and time-related confirmations of planning status. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for policy is noted and welcomed. • It is recognised that policy seeks to provide for housing where operationally needed. • It is noted that agriculture workers dwellings have been/are lost – policy wording seeks to resist loss to non-rural worker occupancy. • It is not seen as needed for policy to require the dwelling to be on the actual holding, though this is typically the case and policy does provide for a clear steer on locational matters. • Policy is for a very specific use (not holiday use) and as such is deemed as appropriate as worded. Being prescriptive is appropriate as in being so it will resist 'policy abuse'. • It is seen as essential that there should be a need set out in policy (though noting that there is provision for temporary accommodation for new enterprises). • • Visual impact considerations in respect of development are seen as reasonably worded.

- Any dwelling should be linked to the rural occupation on site and not located elsewhere within the vicinity. ie farm workers on farms
- Policy should never be used by businesses that are not proper rural businesses
- Town Council - policy might be open to abuse at the cost of the countryside. It could have unforeseen consequences when change of use applications result in rural properties being used as holiday accommodation. Policy 50 is at odds with the diversification policy.
- Policy is more prescriptive than last plan. More appropriate if policy aligned with wider sustainability /policy goals (eg local facilities and employment) than being prescriptive.

Specific comments on clauses:

- Clause 1a. One respondent does not support the word 'existing need' as applied to rural businesses. It's self-defeating, unnecessary and could be interpreted as meaning they already live on site. Meeting the test of 'essential need' to be resident on site is sufficient
- Clause 1d. Unclear if policy means that a greater visual/environmental impact next to an existing building is preferable compared to a lower impact of an alternative location. Wants more concise text eg just minimise the visual and environmental impact.
- Clause 1e. One respondent considers 150sqm is excessively large compared to standard sized accommodation. Another considers that a 'one size fits all' approach to floorspace is not appropriate. A specific floorspace figure could be discriminatory. Floorspace should be commensurate with the functional need
- Clause 3 – Clarify the phrase 'need is unproven' ie say 'financial' need is unproven.

- The floorspace figure is seen as reasonable given that it gives clarity about the scale of what will be allowed in what is a reasonably sized family property (noting the rural workers may need boot rooms/extra washing accommodation and office space).
- As drafted clause 3 is regarded as providing reasonable clarity and precision.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Devon County Council suggest a time clause for the review of an occupancy condition should be added to clause 3 in the policy. 	
Supplementary Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024	
Key issues raised in consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No issues raised. 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments.
Sustainability Appraisal	
See Sustainability Appraisal table below.	
Habitat Regulations Assessment	
Key issues raised in consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No concerns raised. 	Officer commentary in response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comments.
Commentary on policy redrafting for the Publication Plan	
Redrafted policy title: Strategic Policy HN 11 - Housing for Rural Workers	
Policy remains as drafted, minus reference to Supplementary Planning Document production.	

Policy omissions from Chapter 8	
This section of this report references matters where respondents saw policy omissions from the plan.	
Issues and options consultation	
See General issues above.	
Draft Plan consultation	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation: There were calls for policy on or related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that housing should be for local need/people and not holiday or 2nd homes. Call for policy around restricting 2nd holiday homes, and short term lets • Include a principal residence policy. Could a covenant be used to protect affordable housing from being purchased from outside the District? • Should recognise the results of the Letwin Review on housing buildout. The housing market controlled by the big 4 builders was broken. Support proposals to require rapid build out once Planning Permission has been granted, rather than slow build out to maintain high prices and profitability • Devon County Council state the influence of second homes needs to be adequately addressed in relation to sustainability and affordable housing. • The Sid Valley Biodiversity Group – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcomes the inclusion of references in the draft Local Plan to permeable areas for gardens at Policy 45 – although there could be more robust recommendation 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not see justifiable evidence seeking policy 2nd homes or holiday homes and at present lack planning powers around short term let issues. East Devon does not have the 2nd/holiday home numbers or concentrations that are found in some areas, specifically where development plan documents may have sought/introduced such policies. • We have limited controls over speed of development, though for commercial reasons developers will want to build in a timely manner once started, though they will also be conscious of market demands and sale projections. • Flooding matters are seen as matters of detail that are addressed through existing/refined plan policies elsewhere in the plan.

<p>for 'rain gardens' to be provided to ensure the same policy outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainable Drainage Systems: It is disappointing that there is no insistence in the draft Local Plan to the use of SUDS schemes, in particular for new developments. 	
<p>Supplementary Regulation 18 consultation Spring 2024</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No concerns noted. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments.
<p>Sustainability Appraisal</p>	
<p>See Sustainability Appraisal table below.</p>	
<p>Habitat Regulations Assessment</p>	
<p>Key issues raised in consultation:</p> <p>No concerns noted.</p>	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <p>No comments.</p>
<p>Commentary on policy redrafting for the Publication Plan</p>	
<p>No additional policies are added to the housing chapter.</p>	

<p>Sustainability Appraisal</p>	
<p>Policy numbers/titles:</p> <p>39. Strategic Policy – Housing needs for all</p> <p>40. Policy – Affordable Housing</p> <p>41. Policy – Housing to meet the needs of older people</p> <p>42. Accessible and adaptable housing</p> <p>43. Policy – Market housing mix</p> <p>44. Policy – Self-build and Custom-build housing</p> <p>45. Policy – Residential Sub-division of existing dwellings and buildings and replacement of existing dwellings</p>	

<p>46. Policy – Householder Annexes, extensions, alterations and out-buildings. 47. Policy – Policy – Hostels and Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOS) 48. Strategic Policy – Provision for Gypsy and Travellers, and Travelling Showpeople Sites 49. Policy – Rural Exception Sites and First Homes Exception Sites 50. Policy – Housing for rural workers</p>	
<p>Outcome of sustainability appraisal:</p> <p>Preferred alternative: Policies 39 – 50</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasons for alternatives being preferred or rejected: • The preferred policies (39 – 50) are likely to have major positive effects on meeting housing needs, with minor positive effects on supporting healthy and safe communities and social deprivation. • 40A. Provide higher levels of affordable housing – this would better meet needs for affordable housing, but the additional cost of doing so is likely to limit the provision of services, facilities, and could have negative impacts upon the design of homes. Therefore, this alternative is rejected. • 40B. Provide lower levels of affordable housing – whilst this could make the delivery of facilities and services more viable, this would limit the potential to meet affordable housing need and so is rejected. • 41A. Require a higher proportion of older persons housing on larger sites – this would have benefits for the housing mix, but as older persons housing is generally more costly to construct it may ‘skew’ the remaining housing mix to larger, more profitable housing, and also could limit the provision of services and facilities. Therefore, this alternative is rejected. • 41B. Restrict older persons housing in locations that are less accessible by public transport and with fewer services and facilities – whilst this would have positive effects on access to services and facilities, it would limit the ability to meet older persons housing needs in rural areas, so is rejected. 	<p>Officer commentary in response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The positive endorsement of polices is noted. •

- 43A. Do not have a policy and allow the market to decide the mix of market housing – this approach is rejected as it offers less potential to meet local housing needs, so would have less positive effects on the housing objective.
- 44A. Lower self-build threshold – this could make development unviable and therefore not deliverable as small sites are less able to benefit from economies of scale, and/or mean there are less able to contribute to services, facilities and affordable housing. So this alternative is rejected as viability issues will mean less potential to meeting housing need.
- 44B. Higher percentage of self-build plots – this would reduce the potential to deliver other types of market and affordable housing on the site, so would perform less well on the housing objective. An over-supply of plots could also leave sites unfinished. Therefore, this alternative is rejected.
- 45A. Do not restrict dwelling size increase – this alternative is rejected as it would reduce the number of smaller homes, so there is less potential to meet local need for smaller homes.
- 45B. Do not support conversions/sub-divisions outside of settlement boundaries – this would constrain the amount of housing in the countryside, thereby reducing environmental impact from travel and carbon emissions, but it could lead to vacant and derelict housing if existing dwellings are not able to be altered/extended, and additional housing elsewhere would be required to replace the loss of dwelling stock. Therefore, this alternative is rejected.
- 46A. Do not have a policy on householder annexes, extensions, alterations and out-buildings – this approach would rely on other policies in the Local Plan relating to design to manage these types of development, but this would not address circumstances where the principal of creating additional dwellings, and the need to restrict occupancy, is not acceptable. Therefore, this alternative is likely to have negative effects on the built environment and meeting housing need, so is rejected.

- 47A. Do not have a policy on hostels and houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) – this approach would rely on other policies in the Local Plan relating to design, however this would not provide sufficient policy detail to address management issues and avoid over-concentration of HMOs in particular locations, leading to negative effects on housing mix, so is rejected.
- 48A. Release land for affordable traveller sites (exception sites) – Government policy allows this where there is a lack of affordable land to meet local traveller needs. At the current time, there is a lack of evidence that this is justified, so this alternative performs less well on meeting East Devon’s needs. Therefore, this alternative is rejected.
- 49A. Higher percentage of affordable housing on Rural/First Homes Exception Sites – in theory this could deliver more affordable housing, better meeting East Devon’s needs, but viability issues may prevent development from coming forward altogether. So overall, a less positive effect on the housing objective, meaning this alternative is rejected.
- 49B. Lower percentage of affordable housing on Rural/First Homes Exception Sites – this would deliver fewer affordable homes, so would perform less well on the housing objective, meaning this alternative is rejected.
- 50A. Rural business succession – this would allow a new dwelling for occupation by the ‘next generation’ on the rural business. Although this will have economic benefits by supporting rural business succession, it is likely to lead to incremental growth in the countryside, and associated negative effects on the environment and carbon emissions associated with travel. Therefore, this alternative is rejected.
- 50B. Low impact residential development – this would be categorised as a type of housing for rural workers. Although the environmental impact from the design is assumed to be limited, the rural locations means that environmental harm remains likely, and it would increase carbon emissions from travel to facilities and services. Therefore, this alternative is rejected.

11 Conclusions

11.1 Policy redrafting has been made in the Publication, Regulation 19, Local plan.