

# Response ID ANON-XXXX-WAK2-D

Submitted to Central Lancashire Local Plan Regulation 19 Representation Period  
Submitted on 2025-04-15 00:00:06

## Part A: Personal Details

1 What is your title?

Mr

2 What is your first name?

First Name:

Marcus

3 What is your last name?

Last name:

Fisher

4 What is your job title? (if relevant to the representation)

Job title:

[REDACTED]

5 What is your organisation? (if relevant to the representation)

Organisation:

[REDACTED]

6 What Authority do live/work in?

[REDACTED]

7 What is your address?

Address line 1:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

8 What is your email address?

Email:

[REDACTED]

## Part B: Representation

9 Which part of the Central Lancashire Local Plan would you like to make a representation about?

Chapter 4: Balanced Housing Market (HS1-HS13)

Chapter 4: Balanced Housing Market

47 Which policy would you like to make a representation for?

HS7: Affordable Housing

HS7: Affordable Housing

60 Do you consider the Central Lancashire Local Plan is:

Spatial Vision: Soundness/legal/DtC - Legally Compliant:

Yes

Spatial Vision: Soundness/legal/DtC - Sound (If you check 'No', please also confirm below which of the 'tests' it fails to meet):

No

Spatial Vision: Soundness/legal/DtC - a) Positively prepared:

Yes

Spatial Vision: Soundness/legal/DtC - b) Justified:

No

Spatial Vision: Soundness/legal/DtC - c) Effective:

No

Spatial Vision: Soundness/legal/DtC - d) Consistent with national policy:

No

Spatial Vision: Soundness/legal/DtC - Complies with the Duty to Cooperate:

Yes

61 Please give details of why you consider the Central Lancashire Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible (i.e., if objecting on legal grounds then please quote the specific law that the Central Lancashire Local Plan does not conform with). If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Central Lancashire Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Policy HS7: Legal Compliance:

Paragraphs 1 and 2

I welcome and support the requirement for affordable housing levels proposed and for a higher proportion in the areas specified.

The requirement is for either 30% or 35% "of the total number to be provided".

- Presumably, this is the total number of homes on the development.
- While this is a commonly used measurement, it often (almost always) results in significantly less than 30% or 35% of the floor area or value of the development being delivered as affordable housing. For example, three one-bedroom flats can be provided as the affordable housing provision for seven four-bedroom houses.
- I would recommend the percentage is a measure of floor area in order to fix the quantity of affordable housing delivered on each site and to prevent the opportunity for manipulating provision to the developer's financial benefit. This removes the inconsistency seen across sites, where the value of affordable housing varies between developments and developers based on their negotiation.
- There is particular scope for relatively low provision of affordable housing where the housing needs assessment identifies a local need for smaller homes.

Paragraph 3

I believe this paragraph is vague and open to interpretation that can be used to the benefit of the developer and the detriment of the council and community.

It states that "any off-site provision must result in the delivery of at least an equivalent number of new affordable homes or be of broadly equivalent value".

- What does "broadly equivalent value" mean? Is this a reference to the market value of the homes that would have been provided on site as affordable housing? If so, does a theoretical scheme need to be submitted? Or, does it mean 30% or 35% of the value of the private homes delivered? Or, does it mean the value of the homes that would have been provided on site for their affordable housing use? If so, does a theoretical scheme need to be submitted?
- "broadly" is open to interpretation and will, inevitably, be used to a developer's advantage.

Paragraph 4

In the situation where affordable housing is to be provided off site, is the affordable housing provision to be informed by the strategic housing assessment for the subject site or the off-site provision location? It is feasible that off-site provision in an area where one-bedroom homes are in need is used to replace a location where larger homes would have been provided yet both schemes would be in compliance with paragraphs three and four.

Paragraph 5

The requirement for the tenures specified is welcome and I support it; however, there is no requirement for each tenure to be evenly provided across a range of dwelling types.

Has consideration been given to how this will be applied by developers? It is likely developers will provide the smallest, cheapest homes for social rent and the largest, most expensive for affordable home ownership.

Paragraph 6

The proposal to specify the tenure on developments where 100% of homes are provided for affordable housing will reduce the amount of affordable housing delivered and will prevent some schemes being developed at all.

In some cases, affordable home ownership is not viable because the cost of development is greater than the market value of the completed homes. This is often the case with apartment blocks in low value areas, developments for supported housing and schemes for older people. Where this scenario

exists, the only viable tenure is rent and it is not possible to provide the required percentage of homes for an affordable home ownership tenure. The policy as written would not allow these developments. As an example, most extra care schemes would not be possible, despite them being in need and serving a purpose that benefits a range of other sectors.

A number of sites that have been delivered for 100% affordable housing in Central Lancashire in recent years would not be possible with the policy as written. Most of the sites would have been secured in competition with developers of market housing.

The reason that developments of this kind (100% affordable) can compete with housebuilders is the flexibility to select the most appropriate tenures that balance a competitive land price with the tenures most in need.

- A typical development of 100% affordable housing includes 50% for rent and 50% for shared ownership. This combination of tenures can produce a site value that can compete with market housing.
- A development of 75% rent and 25% shared ownership would not provide a competitive offer in most cases. This would result in a market scheme being developed instead, producing 30% affordable housing with approximately 22% of the total for rent and 8% for shared ownership.
- Allowing flexibility to select tenures that produce a competitive price could produce 28% more rented homes and 42% more homes for shared ownership.

In summary, the policy as written is likely to produce fewer affordable homes.

#### Paragraph 9

The requirement for “any subsidy to be recycled to support affordable housing provision elsewhere in the local authority area” is unlikely to be possible in some circumstances. In this case, “subsidy” is likely to be affordable housing grant. While many Registered Providers will commit to recycling subsidy in the local authority area, for-profit Registered Providers may not be able to comply with this requirement as they are not able to recycle affordable housing grant in the same way that not-for-profit Registered Providers can. This may mean for-profit providers are unable to develop affordable homes with grant funding and it may lead to the loss of some affordable housing.

#### Paragraph 13

I don't understand the calculation and I think it will cause confusion.

- Does the calculation mean average house price (say £250,000) x 33% of open market value (say 33% x £250,000 = £82,500) x affordable housing requirement (say 30%). This would result in a payment of several billion pounds.
- If the calculation was 33% of the market value of the average house price for the locality (of indicative, applicable affordable mix) x affordable housing requirement, this would result in a payment equivalent to approximately 10% (33% x 30%) of the value of a home.
- How many homes does this apply to? Is it based on all homes or just the affordable?

What does “Average house price for locality and house type (of indicative, applicable affordable mix)” mean? Does this mean the average house price for the homes that would have been delivered had affordable housing been provided on site? If so, is an alternative, theoretical scheme required?

Paragraph 4.58 of the main document states “The Preston HNDA identifies an annual need for 130 affordable homes across Preston.” The equivalent figure in the 2022 HNDA was 395 homes. It is not feasible that the need has reduced by 265 homes per annum regardless of the delivery in recent years.

A number of elements of this policy appear to be written with developer's obligations in mind. Some elements are not appropriate for affordable housing funded by grant from Homes England. Two examples are included below to illustrate this.

- Paragraph 4.63 states that the rent charged for homes provided for Affordable Rent must not exceed Local Housing Allowance rates. I support the aim to provide homes with rents as low as possible and this can be achieved on sites where homes are provided as a result of a developer's obligation; however, it is not necessarily possible where homes are funded with grant. The grant is designed to fund the viability gap where rents are charged at 80% of the market. There is likely to be reduction in grant funded homes if this requirement is applied to all homes for Affordable Rent.
- Paragraph 4.63 states that affordable homes for ownership should provide priority to people with a local need and location connection. Grant funded homes are not able to prioritise homes for shared ownership to people with a local connection. This requirement should be applied to homes provided as a result of a developer's obligation but should not be required for grant-funded homes.

62 Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Central Lancashire Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified in the question above. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at Examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Central Lancashire Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

HS7: Modifications:

N/A

63 Do you wish to make a representations about a different section of the Plan?

No

Declaration

300 This is the final page of the Regulation 19 Consultation survey. After completing this page, your response will be submitted. If you wish to go back and make a representation on another part of the survey, please click 'go back' below.

Not Answered

301 If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

302 If you have answered 'yes' to the question above, wishing to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

why participation is necessary:

In order to explain the benefits that changes could bring to the provision of affordable homes.

303 By completing and submitting this representation, I agree to my name (and other relevant details necessary) and representation(s) being shared and made available for public viewing.

I agree to my name (and other relevant details necessary) and representation(s) being shared and made available for public viewing.

304 If you wish to be contacted further at future stages of the Local Plan process and to be added to the Central Lancashire and/or district individual consultation databases, please select the relevant option below

Future stages on the Local Plan - I wish to be contacted at future stages of the Local Plan process and added to the Local Plan Consultation database for Central Lancashire:

Yes

Future stages on the Local Plan - I wish to be contacted about Planning Policy matters and added to the Chorley Consultation database.:

Yes

Future stages on the Local Plan - I wish to be contacted about Planning Policy matters and added to the South Ribble Consultation database.:

Yes

Future stages on the Local Plan - I wish to be contacted about Planning Policy matters and added to the Preston Consultation database.:

Yes