RICHMONDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Richmondshire District Council
Local Plan Core Strategy
Proposed Submission
August 2012

Representations Form

Please read the guidance notes before completing this form

This form comprises two parts:
Part A - Personal details
Part B - Your representation(s)

Both Part A and Part B of this form need to be completed in order for your representation(s) to be valid. Please complete a separate sheet (Part B) for each representation you wish to make. Further copies of this form can be downloaded from www.richmondshire.gov.uk/localplan.aspx
You do not need to fill out Part A for each representation, provided that all representations made are securely attached.

Your completed form must be returned to the following address to reach us no later than 4pm on Friday 14 September 2012:

Planning Policy
Richmondshire District Council
Swale House
Frenchgate
Richmond
DL10 4JE

Alternatively, you can email localplan@richmondshire.gov.uk and submit this form as an attachment.

Please note, all representations will be made available for public inspection on our website www.richmondshire.gov.uk/localplan.aspx with personal details (i.e. email address, telephone number and signature) removed.

PART A - Personal details

	YOUR DETAILS	AGENT'S DETAILS
Title	Cllr	
First name	Fleur	
Last name	Butler	
Job title (if applicable)		
Work/Organisation (if applicable)		
Address	Southwick Grange, Finghall Leyburn	
Postcode	DL8 5NB	
Telephone no		
Email address	Cllr.F.Butler@Richmondshire.gov.uk	

PART B - Your representation(s)
Please use a separate form for each representation

Name/Organisation: Fleur Butler

Q1 To which part of the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document does this representation relate? (Spatial Principle, Sub Area Strategy or Core Policy)

Policy number (e.g. SP2, CRSS or CP8) CP 6

Page/paragraph number(s) P 66-67 up to 4.6.11

Please Note: Your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to fully support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

Q2 Do you consider the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document is ...?

	Yes	*No*	*Don't know*
(a) Legally compliant	☐	☒	☐
(b) Sound	☐	☒	☐

If you answered '*No*' to (a) or (b) above, please continue to Q3, otherwise continue to Q5

Q3 Do you consider the Core Strategy unsound because it is NOT...? ***(please refer to guidance notes)***

- ☒ *Justified*
- ☒ *Effective*
- ☒ *Consistent with national policy*
- ☒ *Positively prepared*

Please give details of why you consider the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible:

see attached sheet.

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Q 3, continuation:
Please give details of why you consider the core strategy proposed submission document is not legally compliant or is unsound.

I have fully supported the LDF process and, until September 2011, had no concerns about its soundness. I have since felt increasing disquiet, and welcome the opportunity to explain.

- There have been huge changes to CP6 introduced by the back door since Sept 2011, and with out proper scrutiny. The effect is to make a policy that is unjustified, ineffective, inconsistent with national policy, and negatively prepared with a partisan approach to facts and figures.
- The LDF document is about planning and site allocations, not about taxation. It is unsound and open to legal challenge to use the LDF process as a method of taxation. To conflate the debate on affordable site allocations, with a cash payment with no link to further affordable sites being identified is pure sophistry. And to hide the two different objectives as a single policy shows a lack of willingness to be open and transparent with the community.
- The contradictory use of figures in the New CP6 leaves the document easily challenged. Further contradictions appear where the 2 most rural areas in Richmondshire are picked for the new Development Tax. This contradicts the aims of CP8 Achieving Rural Sustainability, and CP7 Promoting a Sustainable Economy, and CP5 Achieving a housing mix.

See below for a detailed analysis of where there is evidence of lack of public engagement, and misuse and contradictory use of figures. At present it is wide open to legal challenge.

Lack of meaningful consultation. Consultation with the public on the huge changes in the Autumn 2011 to CP6 (affordable housing) have all but been non existent. All prior consultation drafts on affordable housing policy, prior to the final document, were based on lowering the threshold of site provision of 40% to 4 dwellings (eg 1. Preferred Strategy June 2010, 2. Local development frame work core strategy, Feb 2011. John Hyles will provide these).
All responses were based on the old 2008 policy. The new policy change was not informed by 5 years of public responses or requests by councillors. All public consultations with feed back were completed before officers pushed through the new idea of a cash levy of 40% of the value of an affordable home on single houses at an LDF group in the autumn of 2011.
Since then there has been no proper public engagement. The last minute policy change is therefore unsound. Even the changes in the final consultation were not identified to the public when the final draft went out. Hidden on p66 of the 114 page appendix to an agenda item stated merely as Item 9, “SB26”. (see council agenda 24th July 2012) So no members of the public could have identified an important debate was coming up. Only an eagled eyed reader who compared the old draft with the new, line for line, might have noticed the change. The public do not know about (except by my own press release in

the local paper), and have not had a chance to consider the major policy change in detail. This shows a lack of trust for public opinion.

Officers did not give members the information they needed to inform their decision. The negative, and unsound use of evidence in the last minute change to the LDF, rushed in with out proper scrutiny or proper consultation leaves the document open to challenge

1. **Economic evidence lacking**. The evidence of the economic effects of a tax levy was faulty as it only looked at the economic viability based on resale value (eg Annex 3, LDF meeting, 23rd February 2012). No study of the economic impact, or the impact on house building in the 2 rural areas affected was undertaken despite CP7 (promoting a sustainable economy) and CP8 (achieving Rural sustainability), and CP5 (Providing a housing mix).
The building trade is the largest form of private employment in the area after working in the public sector (local government and for the army). Only larger scale developers have been consulted. There is no evidence of consultation with the small village builders who develop single house sites, nor with self builders. Village builders who build single village houses were not asked if the build costs were realistic in a rural area, nor asked what the economic effects on them of a 40% tax would be. No local trades people, or building suppliers were questioned. No estate agent or land agent was asked what introducing a tax on single new builds might mean to local sales, or the development of the private rental market. The claim "there is no evidence" was based on the fact that no evidence was looked for.

There is no economies of scale undertaken. Such faulty reasoning makes the document unsound and subject to legal challenge

.

2. **Differing and contradictory costs used to justify the new CP6.** The viability study of February 23rd (see annex 3,) justifies its results using arbitary and prejudiced figures. These keep changing over time depending what argument is being made. Even worse, one of the two sets of figures in circulation came out duing the final consultation process. (see annex 3, Feb 2011, and slides for the workshop, April 17 page 6 for one set of figures. Compare these to the letter sent 28th August "letter to all parishes"). The first were higher tax figure, given to inform the members vote at full council on the policy. This figure quotes £44,000 as the tax levy. It is used to justification why only the 2 rural areas should have to pay a single house development tax, as the other areas cannot afford it.
The second set of figures tries to show that the tax isn't that high any way. On August 28th a letter was sent out quoting £10 to 20,000.
If the second figure was used it would remove the justification for choosing just the high value rural areas to pay the tax.
This would make CP6 subject to challenge as the reasoned evidence for only the rural areas to have the tax, longer adds up. Either Members were misled before their vote in July, or the public are being misled now in the final consultation. Which is it? Making policy on the hoof with out public consultation and in the middle of a

Consultation process is unsound practice, and changes the logic and reasoning previously given to justify the new CP6.

Unsound logic used to hide a new tax as an old policy on site allocations
Further weakness which leaves the policy unsound is in the conflation of the old policy objective of 40% of site allocation with in builds down to 4 houses, with a new objective of a tax on single builds. They are different elements, and serve different aims. One is about the need for more sites, the other is about raising tax for a social need. Just because the same percentage appears. It does not make it the same policy.

The arbitrary nature of 40%
Nor does it mean that just because the same figure of 40% is used that the economic calculations behind the 2 different objects are the same. One set of developers are paying out of their profits to allow 40% of units built to be given to social landlords (or less, with negotiation). The others, the home builders, are paying a tax, not based on the profitability or other wise of their build, but on a new cash figure determined by the average cost of an affordable home.
The discrepancy is the land value is excluded in the 40% of a site for affordable homes, but included in the value of an social home when 40% is then chosen as a figure to charge new single home builders (see para 2.4 in appendix 3, 23rd February). Why should land values come and go according to different valuations? The figure is arbitrary and is merely a way to calculate a new tax. The officers could just of easily chosen 20% or 60% of the value of an affordable home? The change is introducing a totally new policy of taxation, not just widening an existing policy
The unsoundness of this last minute change to CP6 is clear. To conflate a tax levy to pay for a social need with site identification to provide infrastructure projects including social homes is to misuse the LDF planning process. This makes the document unsound, and possibly illegal and open to challenge.

Use of partial evidence: Councillors were left waiting after the 29th September 2011 for information on how the only 3 other councils quoted as having a single threshold had managed (S.Hams, New Forest and Cheshire). The rates of payment at the other councils were never mentioned, and no examples in action were given, despite requests. If officers had made a simple phone call councillors would have been given such evidence as the cost paid on average for a tax on a typical single builds of 100sqm in the New Forest was around 10k. This is far from the proposed £44k suggested by officers in RDC, which is the highest development tax on family homes in the country. Why did they not let members know this, and give other examples of how such a tax was used.

National debates ignored.
Other evidence also did not come forward despite being easily available. Evidence on national changes were not given. EG. York City council has voted to remove its 40%

target as it was failing to deliver any housing. 40% of nothing is nothing. Harrogate voted to reject the new cash tax on single builds, as punishing the wrong people, single home owners, and forcing a minority to pay for a social need that all should contribute to (see debates of Harrogate Council over the summer).

Other easy to find facts were hidden. The tax level of 40% of the cost of an affordable home is one of the highest levels of development tax on average family homes in the country. At no time did the officers explain why RDC needed the highest tax level, or how this would encourage the building of family homes in the rural areas which needed them (see below ref CP5).

The negative preparation of CP6 can further be seen in the way figures have been manipulated or ignored altogether. All evidence in CP6 is for the affordable housing need only, based on the SHMA. Only SHMA statistics are used for CP6. Other statistics are ignored. The facts contradict the offices claim that Richmondshire had a problem with reaching its affordable housing targets of 40% of all build. RDC is already hitting this target. This was not explained to the public or to members. The large majority of house building taking place in RDC is Affordable homes based on grants. There is no shortage of affordable homes being built, and RDC is on target for this type of home. In the past 2 years affordable house builds have far outstripped private builds. In this year (2012/13) there will be 100 new affordable housing units, but a mere 20 private housing units. (see for instance Council performance report 2012/13, quarter 1, appendix 4)

Serious levels of contradiction leave the policy open to challenge. No consideration of CP5 (Providing a housing mix) has been undertaken to get a balance. In developing CP5, The highly rural Lower Wensleydale was identified having a shortage of family homes in the housing assessment undertaken for the LDF. CP6 chooses to explicitly tax this type of new home in its area. One policy directly contradicts the other. This is unsound and could lead to challenge by developers. This was never pointed out to members

It could be argued that the evidence actually shows that since the introduction of 40% on large developments in 2008, private housing has almost ground to a halt, except single builds. That is why only single builds are taking place in RDC at present. The evidence was never given to members, they were told merely about the affordable housing need, not about the failure to meet CP5s aim of a mix of housing. The failure to deliver private housing, is a far greater problem for Richmondshire Why was this information hidden

Why widen CP6 further. Officers did not tell the members that the policy of 40% of a development for affordable homes has so far failed to bring in a single affordable home. Only one negotiation is complete since its introduction in 2008, and that is for 30%. There is no evidence that 40% of a site for affordable homes works even in its original state. As I have said earlier 40% of nothing is nothing. This was ignored by officers.

Why did none of this evidence, easily found in the council's own figures, come forward to inform the debate on whether it was a good idea to introduce a new tax to pay for an

affordable housing pot? The partisan use of evidence leaves the policy unsound and subject to legal challenge.

National debate for the past 2 years has been about the damage done to the ability to house people in the private sector by the over focus on affordable homes. No officer reflected any of this to members despite it being widely available and a part of national debate at exactly the same time they decided to alter CP6 and widen the net to catch more money from private house builders. The LDF process should not respond in a knee jerk reaction to every new idea, but neither should it try to shoe horn a change in direction at the last minute and with disregard to all national discussion. Where all councils in Yorkshire use the same consultants for affordable housing viability, it should come as no surprise to have a similarity of approach. A national view is therefore vital to counterweight any last minute changes.

There was no mention at any time of the Community Infrastructure Levy, and the possibility of bringing in a tax based on meter sq built of all new building work. Since this would be a far clearer and more honest way of bringing in taxation clearly and openly for all to see, , it is odd that officers chose not to give members the choice to let CP6 stand as it was in September. In September 2011 CP6 was fully consulted and fully agreed with across by council members with an agreed policy since 2008. Why change it?

The LDF document is about planning and site allocations, not about taxation. The huge need for both private and affordable housing has been well evidenced in local statistics and performance figures. At no point in any of the consultation documents were the public asked if they supported a cash based levy on single new private homes to pay for affordable housing. All evidence and debate in the LDF has been of a shortage of sites not of shortage of money to build affordable housing.

That the cash levy is a tax and not a planning policy can be seen clearly. Not a single new site will be identified through lowering the threshold down to single sites and demanding a cash payment. It is impossible for a community where the tax is paid to gain an affordable house because of the tax levy. There is no link. This is not the case for larger developments where an affordable house site threshold is negotiated and units guaranteed on the same location.
I consider this misuse of the planning process is at the core of its unsoundness.

Q4 Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q3 where this relates to soundness. You need to say why this change will make the Core Strategy 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:

see attached.

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Q4 continuation:
Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the strategy legally compliant or sound.

A. The last minute and new changes to CP6 have not followed legal process, have not been evidenced fairly and clearly, and make the document unsound and open to legal challenge. Until the changes were pushed through I fully supported the integrity of RDC's LDF.

The quickest solution is for CP6 needs to revert back to its September 2011 intention of lowering the thresholds for affordable housing to every 4 houses built. From 4.6.12 there should be no changes to CP6 (policy on exception sites) which should stay the same, as fully consulted on with a wide range of support.

B If the inspector considers CP6 might be viable, the planning document would need further time to make it sound and several issues discussed previously re examined. For the current new changes to be considered lawful there needs to be a far wider consultation and honest use of the evidence.
Changing the evidence, as has been done in the August 28th letter, half way through the final consultation shows a lack of honesty in dealing with the public.

There needs to be a clear evidence of a failure to deliver affordable sites to show why there is a need to change the September 2011 version supported by public consultation. This does not exist.
Officers need to show more evidence for support for a tax on single homes in the rural areas from the public. They need to show that people think it will deliver more affordable homes with out harming delivery of private ones. There is no such evidence at present as no meaningful public consultation has been undertaken.
The reasoning behind why only the rural areas should pay needs to re examined due to the contradiction in figures. The discrepancy in information and facts coming out to both members and the public needs to be explained. (see again the difference between the 28th August communications, and the 23rd February evidence to members)

To penalise private housing at a time of enormous short fall and with no evidence of failing to meet existing social targets, and using selective evidence only, makes the document unjust, ineffective, inconsistent with national policy and negatively prepared. Forcing such a huge change at the end of a long process smacks of a negative approach to open government. At present it is widely open to challenge on a number of points.

By removing the new changes to CP6, the risk would be removed. Otherwise the document needs to go back and re consult and clear up the discrepancys which are so glaring at present.

Q5 If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document, please use the space below to set out your comments:

continue on a separate sheet if necessary

If your representation is seeking a change to the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

- [ ] *No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination*
- [x] *Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination*

If you have selected '*No*', your representation(s) will still be considered by the independent Planning Inspector by way of written representations.

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Verbal evidence can explain any
Confusion over the evidence provided

If you wish to be notified of future stages of plan preparation, please tick the appropriate box(es) below:

- [x] *Submission for Examination*
- [x] *Inspector's Report Publication*
- [ ] *Adoption*

Please notify me by:

- [x] *Post*
- [x] *Email*

Please Note: The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

Signature: [ ] **Date:** 13/Sept 2012.

2/5th
1/5th = 30%
(P11)
43 people

Annex 3 : Residual Value Calculations

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The conventional approach to assessing the financial viability of a development proposal, whether for a single dwelling or a large site is to calculate its residual value. In simple terms, the residual value describes the 'true' worth of land once all the costs of development are subtracted from the anticipated sale price. These costs include:

- build cost;
- a reasonable profit margin for a developer
- the cost of a plot for a self builder
- s106 or CIL contributions, including those for affordable housing, required by the planning authority to meet local needs.

1.2 The residual value figure provides an indication to the developer whether or not the proposed development is sufficiently viable, either in terms of investment return or cost of borrowing, to pursue the scheme. Generally, the residual value should be in excess of the existing use value.

1.3 The following examples illustrate the effect of affordable housing contributions on scheme viability on a selection of single dwelling proposals across the plan area. The figures used in the calculations are based on the assumptions about sale prices and build costs made in the Affordable Housing Viability Study (Three Dragons, September 2011).

2.0 Calculating Residual Value of Single Dwellings

2.1 These examples are based on the construction of a new three bedroomed home in three different locations in Richmondshire. The residual value is based on the expected sale price of this dwelling after construction costs and affordable housing contributions have been met. They provide a guide to the capacity of single dwelling proposals to meet the proposed costs of Core Policy CP6 affordable housing contributions. Local variations are also considered.

The size of the affordable dwelling

2.2 The affordable housing contribution is based on the cost of providing the maximum sized affordable home the Council would expect to provide. The Council would pay regard to the dwelling type needed in a particular area evidenced in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (NYSHMA 2011). The size of affordable homes will therefore vary dependent on local needs and as a result affordable housing contributions could be lower than the value in the worked examples increasing the viability of the scheme.

Construction cost of the market dwelling

2.3 The maximum size is also used as the basis for calculating the construction cost of the market dwelling. It will assist the developer to design a house which can accommodate the needs of the market while balancing this requirement with the need to provide an affordable housing contribution. In

diff policy seek local housing need only - Different Policy

No people to solve a huge problem that should there

effect it will provide an additional check on proposals for larger dwellings as a means of avoiding policy requirements.

Calculating the cost of the affordable home.

2.4 Taking an average build cost of £900 /m^2 (the figure excludes conversions which generally prove more costly than new-build) and a maximum gross external floor area of 100 m^2, the cost of constructing an affordable dwelling to Code 3 Sustainable Homes and HCA (Homes and Communities Agency) Standards is say £90,000. The AHVS also cites land values to be up to £650,000 per hectare, which at 30 dwellings per hectare equates to a plot value of approximately £22,000. Therefore the total development cost of an affordable home is approximately £112,000. It is this total development cost which is presented with the 30/40% multiplier to calculate the affordable housing contribution.

Local variations

2.5 There are other geographical variations to the calculation. Sale prices of dwellings show substantial differences: those in the Garrison Area are considerably lower than those in the remainder of the Central Area, Lower Wensleydale and North Richmondshire. Variations in build costs have been standardised for this calculation as the actual differences are slight as evidenced by the Building Costs Information Service (BCIS). The three examples below show how these differences across the Plan area affect development.

Only high value sold

Lower Wensleydale (Constable Burton)

Sale price of a new-build three-bedroom house	£229,000
Construction cost (excl land) (100m2 x £900)	£90,000
Affordable housing contribution@ 40% of the cost of provision (0.4 x £112,000)	£44,800
Residual site value	**£94,200**

15% profit

North Richmondshire (Melsonby)

Sale price of a new-build three-bedroom house	£212,000
Construction cost (excl land) (100m2 x 900)	£90,000
Affordable housing contribution@ 30% of the cost of provision (0.3 x £112,000)	£33,600
Residual site value	**£88,400**

Central Area (Catterick Garrison)

Sale price of a new-build three-bedroom house	£140,000
Construction cost (excl land) (100m2 x 900)	£90,000
Affordable housing contribution@ 40% of the cost of provision (0.4 x £112,000)	£44,800
Residual site value	**£5,200**

Other Contributions

2.6 The worked examples do not include scope for other contributions. The main elements of these could be the provision of school places and transport improvements, where need is identified. They have not been included in the basic calculation because need varies across the district. Current estimates

Tide Tithe houses stuck

TAX on rural areas

Control of private property or private decisions.

Our Ref: JB/CLT

28 August 2012

RICHMONDSHIRE
DISTRICT COUNCIL

LETTER TO ALL PARISH COUNCILS

Please ask for Mark Robson
Tel: 01748 829100 extension 7021
E-mail: mark.robson@richmondshire.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Response to Questions about Local Plan Core Strategy
Core Policy CP6 Affordable Housing

The new Local Plan Core Strategy is designed to stimulate growth in Richmondshire, outside of the National Park, to the benefit of local communities and has been drafted in compliance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It is an integrated package of measures that need to be read as a whole, alongside all of its supporting evidence to fully understand how it does enable development. Looking at a policy like CP6 in isolation can lead to a misunderstanding of its purpose and value.

There are over 260 people each year who can't afford to either rent or buy in the market (NYSHMA 2011). The Council has made it a priority to address this inequality and ensure every resident has the opportunity to live in a decent home. Long term measures introduced in the Core Strategy, including CP4 and CP6, provide the tools to achieve this outcome.

Planning consent is not a right. Part of its purpose is to ensure the right type of development in the right place at the right time. It is the Council's grant of planning permission which gives land a value and without it a freeholder merely has a field, a barn or other land or buildings and not a building plot.

Planning obligations assist in providing sympathetic development, which gives something back to the local communities, including homes for those who can't afford one because of the rapid rise in land and house prices that has excluded them from the market.

Core Policy CP6 merely asks that unrestricted market developments provide something in return to local communities, where financially viable. The resources collected could help the Council achieve its priority of providing the opportunity for local people to stay in the area along with associated social and economic benefits including additional work for local building companies.

Swale House, Frenchgate, Richmond
North Yorkshire DL10 4JE

Tel: **01748 829100**
ricmondshire.gov.uk

In addition, those wishing to help themselves resolve a local affordable housing need may, in fact, be supported in doing so through the use of some of these contributions. This is based on the long-established powers the Council has to seek planning obligations

Calculating the Contribution

Legal precedent requires that any contributions may only be collected where it is financially viable to do so and this principle is also central to the National Planning Policy Framework. In the Core Strategy, the proposed policy is simply worded that all development should contribute where this is financially viable. The detail of the policy will be developed in a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which will set any charging scheme and detail necessary exceptions to contributions.

The assessment of financial viability starts from the residual method to calculate the price that can be paid for a piece of land cited in Land Valuation textbooks and used routinely in development appraisal. The residual value is in effect the value of the completed home minus what it costs to build (including any planning obligations and developer profits).

When a developer is required to provide affordable housing a proportion of houses are sold to a housing association at a price set by the Council. This 'transfer price' is based on a multiplier of rental income over a term of years and is in effect what the housing association can afford to pay while still keeping the dwellings affordable. The impact of this is that the actual cost of providing an affordable home is its build cost less the amount paid for it by the housing association.

On smaller sites it is impractical to ask for a proportion of homes on site and therefore a financial contribution will be sought instead. This can be illustrated in a worked example for a single dwelling, although it should be stressed that the actual development appraisal calculation is much more complex. The table below provides an example of how a contribution may be calculated and the numbers used are for guidance only and do not represent an actual development. Further detail will be presented in the SPD.

In an area where a 40% contribution is sought:

Build cost	£120,000
Gross value of contribution is 40% of build cost	£48,000
Less	
Transfer price paid by Housing association	£65,000
40% of transfer cost	£26,000
Net developer contribution	**£22,000**

Standard practice in all development appraisals requires this net contribution to be factored into the total development cost of a scheme. In purely residual terms this would equate to a reduction in land price of £22,000 or the proposed scheme could be redesigned to accommodate the extra cost or a combination of both could be used to spread the burden. In the highest value areas this would see a reduction from £140,000 to £120,000 for a plot. This is not considered excessive when without the Council's grant of planning permission that land may only have an agricultural value of say, £5,000 per acre.

Exclusions to making contributions

The capacity for contributions to be borne by all development is based on consideration of development for commercial reasons. The need to identify exclusions to this has been recognised throughout the preparation of Core Policy CP6 and a range of possible approaches were presented to Local Plan Working Group at its meeting in February 2012 and at the subsequent training session.

Put simply any home that is built for a genuine affordable housing need or as an agricultural workers dwelling would not attract a contribution unless, at some point in the future, it is no longer required and the owner makes an application to the Council to have the planning restriction lifted. This could be achieved through normal planning conditions, which would seek to retain affordable homes in perpetuity. Deferred contributions would also be possible for homes not built for immediate resale, perhaps by self-builders or landowners providing for family members. Under the new 'exceptions' policy in CP6, if you're in local housing need, the Council could also consent to a planning application to let you build yourself a home on land which would not normally allowed if the dwelling remains affordable in perpetuity – and the Council may even subsidise its construction from affordable housing contributions raised through CP6.

Further information on the expected operation of the proposed policy is detailed in the attached FAQs document.

If you would like to discuss the proposals please contact:

Mark Robson by telephone on 01748 827021 or John Hiles on 01748 827025

E-mail mark.robson@richmondshire.gov.uk
John.hiles@richmondshire.gov.uk

Yours sincerely

P.P. Mark Robson
Housing Delivery & Improvement Team Leader