

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIONS

Affordable Housing Provision in New Residential Developments

Main issues raised in representations and how they have been addressed in the SPD.

Name of Consultee	Summary of Comments	Proposed Response	Change to Document
HOW Planning for Morris Homes	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The SPD can only be adopted after the UDP has been adopted.2. Requirement for affordable housing should not be imposed in all areas of Borough.3. Inconsistency between affordable housing requirement in SPD and in Housing Needs Survey.4. Delete “exceptional” in paragraph 4.5.5. Clarification of definition of affordable housing required.6. Seeks variable approach to provision on different sites.7. Document should not pre-empt type of tenure.8. Document should not prescribe who delivers affordable housing with developer.9. Housing should not be built to RSL specification.10. Should not restrict the range of households who can occupy affordable housing.11. Should not require affordable housing off-site where no local affordability problem.	<p>Agree.</p> <p>No. Requirement is on all sites.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>No. Would encourage evasion.</p> <p>It doesn't.</p> <p>Agree.</p> <p>Disagree. The policy requires provision on all suitable sites.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Change to reflect latest figure.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>Reword.</p> <p>None.</p>

Broadway Malayan for Westbury Homes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support SPD but are concerned that further developer contributions would make development unviable. 2. Would like to see variation in amount of affordable housing required at different sites. 3. Object to the provision of off-site affordable housing. 	<p>Disagree. Only affordable needs as demonstrated in Needs Survey are being fulfilled.</p> <p>Disagree. Requirement is on all sites.</p> <p>Disagree. Useful aspect of SPD.</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Makes points about the need for new development to be accessible to public transport . 	Not specific to affordable housing.	None.
North West Regional Assembly	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need to qualify the extent to which design standards may be reduced. 	Agree.	Amend wording.
Government Office for the North West	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. May wish to review the thresholds for affordable housing provision in the light of consultation draft PPS3. 2. Would be helpful to relate affordable need to annual housing requirement and present supply. 3. Should not be adopted before UDP is adopted. 	<p>Do not wish to change thresholds.</p> <p>Not considered necessary and changeable over time.</p> <p>Agree.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>
Hepher Dixon for Bett Homes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Should relate to findings of Housing Need Update that more low cost market housing is required. 2. 20% provision target should vary across the Borough. 3. SPD should specify how often the needs study will be updated. 	<p>Disagree. Not feasible.</p> <p>Disagree. Not possible to be prescriptive.</p>	<p>None.</p> <p>None.</p>

	4. Inconsistency between affordable housing requirement in SPD and in Housing Needs Survey. 5. Support waiving or reduction of affordable housing requirement where there are particular costs.	Agree.	Change to reflect latest figure.
English Nature.	1. No comments.		
Environment Agency	1. No comments.		
United Utilities.	1. Need to have infrastructure capacity at sites and to check for the presence of underground services.	Not specific to affordable housing.	None.
Adactus Housing Group	Supports the SPD.		
Councillor Jim Ellis	1. Should we not give an indication of the percentage discount sought on market housing. 2. We should define what affordable is.	These are both detailed matters which it would not be appropriate to deal with in the SPD.	None.
Lancashire County Council	1. No comments.		
Manchester Airport	1. No comments.		