

**LONDON BOROUGH OF HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM
LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION****WRITTEN STATEMENT: HOUSING**

*** Please note the Council will be referring to document SD12 LBHF Housing Market Assessment as the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment.**

HO1 - Housing Supply**1) Is Policy HO1 justified and how will it be implemented effectively?**

Policy HO1 outlines the Council's annual housing target and the forms of housing supply available in the borough. This has been informed and justified by a range of evidence including the land allocated for housing in the four regeneration areas, current and existing planning applications informed by the Housing Trajectory, and trends in terms of housing conversions monitored through Annual Monitoring Reports and other evidence including the Council's SHMA (SD12). The policy also seeks to address vacant housing within the borough, which negatively impacts upon housing supply.

The Council's annual housing target has been informed by the GLA's Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP), its SHLAA and SHMA which collectively identify London's regional housing needs and the land supply available locally in each borough necessary to contribute London's housing supply. Table 2 in KD1 outlines where development will come forward. White City and Fulham Regeneration Areas have been identified in the London Plan as Opportunity Areas and have been subject to Opportunity Area Planning Frameworks. The Council has been proactive in terms of enabling development to come forward and many of the sites are subject to live planning applications. The London SHLAA is also identifying another source of housing supply which the Council has worked with the GLA on and will be positive in bringing development forward to meet the annual housing target.

The other forms of housing supply: housing conversions and other windfall within the borough have been identified through regular monitoring by way of AMRs and inputting into the London Development Database (LDD). Table 2 in KD1 has been informed and led by the Housing Trajectory and is considered to provide an up to date position on housing supply over the duration of the Plan period.

In terms of implementation of the policy, the Council's Housing Trajectory (SD14) indicates where applications have been received or where delivery has begun or where implementation of a permission is imminent. The Council also prepares an AMR report which signals housing completion rates and permissions. The Council will continue to monitor policy HO1 to ensure this is being implemented effectively and seek to address housing supply shortages where possible by monitoring and keeping an up to date housing trajectory.

Through the Regulation 19 consultation, the Council received comments regarding HO1 (e). The Council has sought to clarify the position on this through the Schedule of minor and technical changes (KD4). The Council's concern is regarding the high levels of vacant dwellings and access to housing based on a lack of affordability which is exacerbated by a loss of occupied housing in the borough. The Council considers the proposed change allows greater flexibility and it is within the Council's remit to seek to address this issue as it impacts overall housing supply.

How has the Plan been informed by, and is it consistent with, the Council's (and London's) Housing Strategy?

The Council produced the document entitled 'Delivering the Change We Need in Housing' (SD16) in May 2015. The proposed Local Plan (KD1) has been informed by the three key themes of that Housing Strategy, which are:

- 1) Regenerating Places & Increasing Affordable Housing Supply
- 2) Meeting Housing Need and Aspiration
- 3) Excellent Housing Services for All

The Housing Strategy calls for planning and housing to be closely aligned to deliver the aims of this strategy. Following the theme 'Regenerating Places & Increasing Affordable Housing Supply', the Council sets out its objectives in working with existing Council tenants, delivering a range of affordable housing tenures in and outside of regeneration areas, providing choice for affordable ownership and rented housing. The Local Plan seeks to boost housing supply by identifying the regeneration areas and boundaries for growth, setting a 50% affordable housing target for all developments with the capacity for 10 units, and setting out an affordable housing tenure mix to provide greater choice.

Under the heading 'Meeting Housing Need and Aspiration', the Housing Strategy pursues a fairer housing allocation scheme, and identifies the aims of reducing homelessness within the borough and meeting older people's and disabled people's housing needs. The Local Plan policies aim to boost all types of housing supply and the Plan encourages the development of older people's housing. The third objective ('Excellent Housing Services for All') relates directly to improving the customer experience provided by the Council as a housing management organisation.

London's Housing Strategy seeks to boost overall supply, increase access to housing that is affordable to Londoners and decrease overcrowding in social rented properties, as well as boosting the private rental market. The Proposed Submission Local Plan (KD1) aligns with these principles in seeking to boost and to encourage development in the borough by identifying land for development and redevelopment, increasing affordable housing supply and encouraging a better quality of life for those living in the social rented sector.

Is Policy HO1 consistent with NPPF and aligned adequately with the London Plan?

Paragraphs 47 – 51 and 159 are particularly important in setting out the NPPF's requirements, relevant to LBHF in terms of housing. Principally, the Council must

ensure that market and affordable housing needs are being met, identify a supply of deliverable sites as part of the five year land supply with a 5% buffer, identify developable sites across the latter stages of the plan period and identify the rate of delivery as part of the Housing Trajectory. The Council has acted in accordance with the NPPF and has provided the relevant information as part of the Local Plan and subsequent evidence base. The Local Plan contains indicative levels of housing to come forward over the Plan period, demonstrates how it will be meeting housing needs and outlines the key sites and development across the borough, based on the Housing Trajectory (SD14).

The London Plan policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply (SD68), identifies the need for more homes with annual housing targets for London as a whole and annual borough targets for the purposes of Local Plan preparation. The London Plan also sets the strategic direction that Londoners should have a genuine choice of homes that they can afford. The annual housing target has been included and identified as a minimum target with land allocations and other forms of housing supply to meet this strategic direction. The London Plan also outlines the need for family housing in across London, which the proposed Local Plan has sought to support through the implementation of HO2, HO4 and HO5.

The annual housing target in the London Plan is set between 2015 – 2025. Beyond this period, the London Plan policy identifies boroughs should roll forward the target until a revised London Plan target is produced. This guidance has been adhered to and work has already commenced with the GLA regarding revised borough targets.

Policy HO1 is indeed consistent with the NPPF, and in alignment with the London Plan.

Is the evidence in support of the planned level of housing provision robust (with due regard to data relating to population projections and alternative methodologies and the Council's 2016 SHMA)?

The planned level of housing provision is considered to be a sound assessment of housing need. The data which underpins the planned level of housing provision is robust.

In terms of population projections the PPG identifies that:

- Work to assess development needs should be proportionate and does not require local councils to consider purely hypothetical future scenarios
- Household projections should be used as the starting point
- Plan-makers may consider sensitivity testing, specific to their local circumstances in relation to the underlying demographic projections and household formation rates

The Council has developed its own SHMA (SD12) in the context of a two-tier system whereby the Greater London Authority provides the strategic context and direction for London boroughs. As previously referenced the London-wide SHMA (SD71) identifies the Objectively Assessed Housing Need figure for London, identifying it as having its own housing market area and recommending that

boroughs identify localised housing market areas to assess local housing need. The individual borough's responsibility is to identify the size, type and tenure mix of homes to provide.

Is the SHMAA robust, has it used the most up to date housing projections and how does it inform the Plan housing requirement with due regard to the housing market area?

The Council's SHMA is robust. It has been prepared in accordance with the NPPF and PPG. The Council's SHMA adopts a 'policy off' approach outlining the levels of household growth required to keep up with population projections without applying policy and land use constraints. The SHMA identifies the dynamics of the housing market area by analysing the demographics, a profile of housing and the economic profile, and establishes housing needs for specific groups. The SHMA indicates the complexity of the housing market area and highlights the diverse nature of housing need across the wider area and within the sub-market areas, using up to date housing projections.

The Council's SHMA indicates that 844 homes are required per annum in order to meet the estimated long-term household projection rates. This conclusion has been made due to the high level of affordable housing need across the housing market area. The borough is characterised by areas with high levels of deprivation, predominantly located in the north of the borough; a high working population and high number of jobs in the borough; and some of the highest house prices in the country (at March 2016 the average house price was £767,000). This has resulted in a disproportionately high need for affordable housing in the borough. At p.117 and p. 79 of the Council's SHMA (SD12) it identifies the estimated need for intermediate housing and affordable social rent in the borough and the estimated levels of those in housing need. It demonstrates that affordable housing need outstrips the need for market housing and has shown that the market has delivered the levels of housing needed to meet population demand.

As the Council's SHMA identifies a high level of affordable housing need. For these reasons, the Plan identifies the London Plan annual housing target as the most appropriate housing target as it is based on housing and land capacity in the borough.

Are the population forecasts and assumptions relating to migration robust?

As part of the developing of the Council's SHMA, the DCLG projections to 2041, the GLA short-term and long-term scenarios were all analysed. Each of the projections show variations in future growth which can be seen in Chart 3.4 in the Council's SHMA. The DCLG projections show a much lower household projection rate against the GLA long-term trends and the GLA SHLAA estimates. The PPGs identify that some local sensitivity testing may be required.

The GLA trend-based population and household projections are produced on a regular basis and cover the Greater London area. During the FALP Examination, the GLA argued the use of the GLA data to underpin the 2013 SHLAA, instead of those prepared by DCLG. The FALP Inspector accepted this argument as the GLA

projections have proven to be more accurate than ONS projections. In the case of LBHF, this is also proven to be the case.

According to the DCLG projections, the authority lost 9,675 people from the population through internal and international migration between 2011 and 2015. This is the equivalent of approximately 4,280 households (using the 2011 Census people per household count of 2.26) and would amount to a high loss (the second highest number in the country). The DCLG projections are not borne out by other source data. In particular, when compared to the number of households paying council tax, the DCLG figure does not appear robust, since this data does not suggest the population loss that the DCLG projections supposedly identify.

The GLA long term projections therefore reflect a more accurate position and are considered to be the most robust. The GLA long-term trends identify there is expected to be a 23.6% increase in the total number of households from 2011 to 2041. Between 2015 – 2025 there is expected to be an increase of 10.3% from the 2015 estimate of households, which represents an increase of 8,441 households.

2. Should housing targets be referenced as minimums?

The Council agrees that Policy HO1 should include 1,031 additional homes per year as a 'minimum' target. Proposed changes have been made in the Schedule (KD4) at MC61.

3. What robust evidence underpins the approach of the Plan towards the housing needs of vulnerable and older people? Does this encompass the need for retirement properties and adequately?

The Council's SHMA has included a robust assessment of vulnerable and older people's housing needs. The PPG requires plan makers to consider the size, location and quality of dwellings needed in the future to allow them to live independently and in their own homes for as long as possible. The Council's SHMA concurs with the PPG that there will be a growing trend for older people's housing needs in Hammersmith & Fulham.

The Council owns a large proportion of older peoples and vulnerable housing within the borough (975 units are local authority run sheltered housing; the remaining 464 units are run by Housing Associations). The Council is working with a number of organisations including the NHS, City of Westminster, Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea on meeting older and vulnerable people's and housing needs.

The Proposed Submission Local Plan (KD1) contains policy HO7 to accommodate special needs housing. The supporting text provides a definition of special needs (paragraph 6.50 of KD1). This policy positively encourages new development proposals for special needs housings and supported housing with a criteria based policy to steer proposals. The justification text also refers to the London Plan indicative benchmark for specialist housing which the Council will use to monitor supply. The policy discourages the loss of special needs housing, however in

response to the concerns facing existing special needs accommodation (across the sector) the Council will consider replacement.

4. Are the needs of single persons recognised adequately?

The Proposed Submission Local Plan adequately deals with the needs of single persons. Policies HO1, HO5 and HO8 specifically deal with single persons housing needs. HO1 seeks to overall boost supply of housing; HO5 addresses housing mix, identifying a high proportion of intermediate housing for 1 bedroom properties (the market housing is likely to cater to single persons as they are in high demand); HO8 also seeks to address this issue of accommodating single persons.

The Council considers that this approach recognises the position of single persons sufficiently, but is willing to discuss this in more detail at the Examination, should the Inspector have further thoughts about this issue.

5. Is the level of proposed housing over the plan period deliverable? How has the housing trajectory been derived and is it robust? Does the Council have a five year supply of housing sites consistent with national policy?

The Council has adhered to the NPPF in developing the Housing Trajectory (SD14); paragraph 47 identifies that authorities should identify a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of housing with an additional 5% housing buffer. 'Deliverable' is defined as sites being available now, offering a suitable location for development now, being achievable within 5 years and viable.

The Council's Housing Trajectory (SD14) is robust as it identifies sufficient levels of housing to ensure the Council meets and delivers the annual housing targets with a 5% buffer. The sites within the first five years of the plan period satisfy the NPPF's definition of 'deliverable'. The Housing Trajectory divides development by regeneration area and outside of the regeneration areas. Across the first five years of the Plan period, the Housing Trajectory identifies a 8,341 net additional homes with evidence of planning applications setting out how and where they will be delivered.

The Housing Trajectory has been derived by monitored housing completions prior to the Plan period commencing (2010/11 to 2015/16), monitoring all existing or extant planning applications (this includes regeneration areas and areas outside of), includes all sites through the SHLAA, and sets out a robust phasing strategy in relation to delivery previously and following discussions with both officers within the department and developers.

Across the four regeneration areas – White City, South Fulham, Earls Court and Fulham – allocated sites for development and existing planning applications have been included in the Housing Trajectory with phasing suitable to the scale and complexity of the sites. The Council has taken a positive and proactive role in identifying and allocating sites for development over the duration of the Plan. The Housing Trajectory identifies levels of growth which will facilitate the wider regeneration of the four areas. Alongside, the four key areas, the Council is

aware that the regeneration is likely to have a wider effect and generate further development outside of the proposed regeneration area boundaries to come forward. Where possible, these have been identified either by existing or extant planning applications in the system. The Council undertakes regular monitoring exercises through the preparation of its AMR as well as working with the GLA on the London Development Database, which involves regular updates on planning applications, permissions and completions.

In relation to windfall, paragraph 48 of the NPPF identifies that boroughs should not rely on windfall sites for the purposes of demonstrating their 5 year supply unless there is compelling evidence. The London Plan echoes this guidance. The GLA SHLAA provides a windfall target figure based on the supply of small sites, which the Council uses to identify its windfall figure. The Council has not included the windfall figure as part of its five year supply, instead including it between the 6-11 years of the plan.

Is a 'non-implementation allowance' required?

In the course of the Regulation 19 consultation, comments were received requesting the Council to introduce a 'non-implementation allowance' whereby the Council adds an allowance to its five year land supply in the event that the Council does not achieve its' annual target. The Council does not consider this necessary as the five year land supply has been based on sites with existing or extant planning permission which are considered deliverable. Furthermore, a 5% buffer has been included in the five year land supply figure consistent with the NPPF and is considered sufficient.

The Council has however, included a 'Managed Delivery Target' in the Housing Trajectory (SD14) to show the number of dwellings needed to be built per year to ensure the overall plan target is met. This identifies the number of units required per year to ensure the overall housing targets are met. The calculation includes the number of units completed during the 2015/16 year as the starting point.

6. Does the Plan recognise the issues around 'build to rent'? Does the plan acknowledge adequately the provision of private rented housing in the supply side?

The Council has recognised through the Regulation 19 consultation that the Plan requires greater reference to the 'build to rent' sector. The Council has acknowledged the comments received during the Regulation 19 consultation, proposed further wording has been included in the Schedule (KD4) at MC69.

The Council is aware of the potential and growing interest for build to rent nationally and across London. The build to rent sector is different to the private development market and it is necessary to outline the unique development factors that differ from traditional market sale schemes. Based on the current levels of interest in build to rent sector the Council has not considered LBHF a prime area due to the built up nature of the borough, and the high land values which attract a quicker return for developers. The Council is aware of some schemes going forward outside of the borough.

In terms of supply, as there are no build to rent schemes the Council has not factored this into the housing trajectory due to the lack of evidence for its demand in the borough. This, however, does not rule out build to rent schemes coming forward over the Plan period.

In terms of private rented housing, the Council's SHMA has seen an increase in private rented properties in the borough with decreasing home ownership between Census'. Private rental housing in the borough has increased for a number of reasons including; issues of affordability in London and across the borough in relation to house prices and the large proportion of flats and apartments, as examples. The Council's main strategy in relation to the Plan is to increase the overall housing supply, to offer a range of affordable housing options and housing products to encompass the needs identified in the Council's SHMA. The Council is willing to discuss what the Plan can do further during the Examination.

HO2 – Housing Conversion and Retention

7. What evidence supports the content of Policy HO2 and is the policy justified?

This policy seeks to minimise the loss of housing supply and to mitigate the impact of housing conversions in the borough by ensuring space standards are met and suitable on-street parking arrangements are met. On average over the last four years, the Council has received 73 planning applications per year to convert existing houses into flats/apartments. The 73 applications per year in effect create a greater number of dwellings than the number of applications received by the Council. These applications form part of the housing supply in the borough, and have the potential to maximise the use of existing living spaces and reflect living in a densely populated urban environment.

However, it is important to ensure that household conversions do not create poor living spaces for future residents, and that they do maintain space standards set by the London Plan. The Council's SHMA has also identified that a high proportion of existing housing stock are converted flats. The Council considers this to be a trend that is likely to continue and has the potential to create issues at a neighbourhood scale, for example in relation to parking and access to amenity. This policy seeks to address these issues.

HO3 – Affordable Housing

8. Is Policy HO3 justified and effective and consistent with national policy?

The Council's affordable housing policy seeks to positively address the issue of affordability in the borough and seeks to support London-wide housing needs. The Council's SHMA highlights the lack of affordability in the borough in relation to wages, the high numbers of those in housing need (from the Council's Housing Register), and the higher levels of occupation in the social rented sector. The Council also prepared a Housing Viability Assessment (SD15) to assess the impact of a 50% affordable housing target upon viability (the aims of the study are set out at 2.1 of the study).

In the Regulation 18 draft of the Plan, the Council proposed a 40% affordable housing target. This overall increase is not considered to be detrimental to overall housing supply, and based on the Mayor's draft Homes for Londoners SPG (SD73), it is evident that a 50% affordable housing target is also the Mayor's direction of travel for the London Plan.

The GLA has consulted on the document entitled 'A City for All Londoners' (SD69) and the 'Homes for Londoners' SPG (SD72) between November 2016 – February 2017. Both documents set a clear direction in terms of housing: boosting affordable housing with a focus upon public sector land and implementing a London-wide viability protocol. The Homes for Londoners SPG consulted upon a 35% affordable housing threshold, a viability protocol and build to rent policy. The SPG has been drafted in accordance with the current London Plan which identifies a 40% affordable housing target, however it is made clear that the Mayor is moving towards delivery of 50% affordable housing (paragraph 2.17 of SD73) and is the direction of travel for the London Plan review. Nonetheless, the Council is aware that the SPG is still in draft and further changes may be made before it is confirmed.

The affordable housing split is consistent with the London Plan and is consistent with the aims and objectives of the Council's Housing Strategy.

Paragraph 173 of the NPPF identifies that policy burdens and costs of infrastructure should not threaten the viability of development. The Council considers that the policy is worded with sufficient flexibility to allow for schemes to be assessed on their own merits (HO3(e)), and will be applied in conjunction with the Viability Protocol. Paragraph 6.29 in KD1 further explains the position when negotiating affordable housing on specific schemes. The Housing Viability Assessment (SD15) has shown that 50% affordable housing is achievable subject to site specific considerations, and discussions at the time of an application regarding the mix and tenure.

The Council has identified that affordable housing should apply to sites with the capacity for 10 or more self contained dwellings. The Council considers this to be in conformity with London Plan policy and with the emerging SPG that supports London boroughs.

Does the LP reference 'starter homes' robustly? Should the Plan reference self-build opportunities for affordable housing? Are self-build and starter homes referenced adequately and in line with national policy?

As part of the preparation of Local Plan, the Council prepared the Housing Viability Assessment (SD15). The impact of Starter Homes was included in the assessment to understand the effects it would have upon viability and upon delivering other forms of affordable housing. The concept of Starter Homes was introduced by the Government to help people on to the housing ladder who earn within a certain income bracket. The Housing Viability Study concluded that the subsidy required to cap house values to £450,000 would need a discount of approximately 31% (rather than the 20% proposed by DCLG). Consequently, this would decrease the subsidy available within schemes to provide other affordable housing tenures. The Council considers there are other forms of

affordable housing products such as intermediate housing, that have also been identified in the GLA Affordable Housing SPG that meet this housing need. The Council is concerned that the inclusion of Starter Homes may negatively impact upon delivering housing for those in immediate need as these generate a lower return.

In terms of self-build, the Council has set up the self-build register and is supportive of self-build development. The Council has monitored the register and has found that the key drivers for those registering are:

- To build a home to their own design and specifications;
- A home that individuals can afford to buy;
- A property that is better for the environment with low running costs.

The Council will continue to analyse this further, along with Housing colleagues.

The GLA SHLAA has also broadly analysed self build across London and has found that self-build in an area as expensive as London is a challenging proposition; the ability of individuals to identify land and to gain access to adequate finance, remains very limited. The Council is aware of the barriers however is supportive of it in principle and has proposed further wording, set out in KD4 at MC63 and MC65, to ensure the plan is in accordance with current guidance.

The Council agrees however, that further reference to Starter Homes is required in the plan. This can be discussed further during the Hearings.

Is the Policy consistent with the Mayor's emerging SPG?

The Council's proposed Local Plan is broadly consistent with the Mayor's emerging SPG. Certainly, as an overarching observation, the Policy is consistent with the Mayor's aim of increasing provision of affordable housing.

The Council has expressed support to the Mayor's emerging SPG in terms of introducing a threshold approach to affordable housing and a viability protocol. Officers have been part of the London Viability Forum and have supported a more transparent and London wide approach to dealing with viability. The recommendations from this forum have been put forward and implemented by the SPG.

The SPG does not include a 50% affordable housing target, however it identifies this is the direction of travel in that the figure of 50% is expressly cited as a "long term strategic aim". The Council therefore considers the draft Local Plan is consistent with the SPG.

Does the plan acknowledge adequately the role of intermediate rent as an affordable housing tenure within private rent developments?

The Proposed Submission Local Plan may require further detail on this matter. The Mayor's recent Homes for Londoners SPG (SD73) sets out recommendations on the matter of intermediate rent within private rent developments.

The Council is willing to discuss this matter in more detail at the Hearings.

9. Is a 50% threshold for affordable housing deliverable and viable? Is the Policy consistent with the NPPF, with due regard to positive planning considerations of viability?

Paragraphs 173 – 177 in the NPPF set out relevant guidance for authorities when considering viability. The NPPF is clear that authorities must take heed of viability and deliverability, understanding the full scale of infrastructure requirements and the impact of further policy, such as SPDs, that may impact the viability of development. To understand the impact of a 50% affordable housing target may have upon the delivery and viability of development the Council has prepared a Housing Viability Assessment (SD15). The Housing Viability Assessment tested a range of scenarios and has found that 50% affordable housing is achievable in many of them. The scenarios have anticipated costs associated with development and any other costs that may be incurred due to policy requirements. SD15 is clear in its recommendations that 50% affordable housing is achievable, however housing tenure and mix may need to be adapted.

The Council adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) in September 2015 and regularly monitors infrastructure requirements. These represent the full scale of infrastructure required to achieve the full objectives of the Local Plan. As the CIL has been adopted, this provides the Council with the confidence that development is not being put at serious risk and that the appropriate balance has been struck. The CIL and the Local Plan have been developed alongside one another; in this regard the Council has been proactive and transparent in identifying the full scale of infrastructure and where any monies received through CIL will be spent. The Housing Viability Assessment (SD15) has tested the 50% affordable housing target against the full scale of costs relevant to any schemes in the borough, including national and regional policy costs.

The policy is considered to be positively prepared with due regard to viability, identifying site size, site constraints and financial viability as material considerations when negotiating affordable housing. The Council acknowledges that each development may require a range of infrastructure to make it acceptable in planning terms. The policy is worded flexibly to facilitate the balance to be made at the point of a planning application.

10. Is the approach for viability assessments for each scheme justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

The Council considers the Viability Protocol is a suitable approach to addressing the issue of viability, consistent with national policy. Para.173 of the NPPF directs that careful attention should be paid to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking, so that after having regard to all costs incurred development should still provide a competitive return to a landowner and developer, in order to ensure deliverability.

The proposed Viability Protocol provides clarity to developers on what the Council expects from their viability appraisals and how we will approach matters such as viability review mechanisms. This should provide developers with greater certainty and ability to plan ahead. The Viability Protocol provides very clear advice on inputs such as development values and build costs and is not overly prescriptive given the nature of economic conditions in the market. For example, the developer's profit is not set but we advise it should be proportional to the risk associated with the proposed development.

Importantly, the principles applied in the council's protocol have developed from our work with the London Borough Viability Group, formed in 2014 and made up of a wide collection of London and Outer London boroughs who have produced a London Borough Development Viability Protocol (November 2016). The Mayor's Draft Housing and Affordability SPG (SD73) advises that in relation to viability assessments the draft SPG builds on the work of the London Borough Viability Protocol and aims to provide a clear approach that can be consistently applied across London.

In relation to whether a 'viability assessment' is justified in all cases, the Viability Protocol itself expressly states that an assessment will only be required in circumstances where viability is relevant. In this context, draft Local Plan policy HO3 – Affordable Housing, applies only to sites with the capacity for 10 or more dwellings and advises at criteria (e) that financial viability is one of a number of considerations to be taken into account, including site constraints, individual circumstances of the site and the availability of public subsidy. Experience at the Council has been that developers preference is to submit a viability assessment to justify their proposed affordable housing offer and it is their viability assessment that they attach most weight to in their justification and negotiations with us on affordable housing in their scheme.

To what extent has 'pepper potting' been considered in relation to its potential effect upon the viability of developments?

The Council considers the policy wording is sufficiently flexible to mitigate the impact of viability: the wording does not focus upon the specific affordable housing tenure and allows for discussion during the development management process. For example, the affordable housing mix and tenure is likely to differ on each scheme depending on a range of factors, where the affordable housing units will vary depending on whether they are social/affordable rent, intermediate, the number of family sized units. This policy is seeking to encourage mixed communities where social polarisation is not encouraged based on the location of development.

However, to provide further clarity on this issue and to deal with the response made at the Regulation 19 consultation, the Council has proposed further wording (MC77) to the supporting text in KD4.

HO4 – HO9**11. Is Policy HO4 (Housing Quality and Density) justified and aligned with the London Plan? Is it flexible?**

This policy is also in accordance with the London Plan (SD68) and the London Housing SPG (SD72). The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham is a predominantly built up area with a range of design and conservation constraints. This policy is justified in relation to the four key regeneration areas, the increase in conversions across the borough and in relation to the sensitive design issues across the borough. The Council considers the policy to be aligned with the London Plan, appropriate references are made to the relevant standards and SPGs in the Proposed Submission document. The Council has adopted the London Plan internal standards and will progress with a Development Management SPD to set out in more detail how these can be delivered.

In terms of density, this policy should be considered alongside HO1 which seeks to increase housing supply across the borough. HO4 broadly sets out the Council's guidelines when considering density and the scale of buildings. The policy is setting out the Council's key concerns in relation to the existing built up nature of the borough, which broadly aligns with the regeneration strategy. The policy is considered to have sufficient flexibility built in to enable further discussion during the development management process.

Minor proposed changes have been set out in the Schedule (KD4) at MC78.

12. Is HO5 (Housing Mix) justified and deliverable? What is the evidence for the housing mix proposed by HO5 and how has this been considered against alternatives?

The Council's aim is to improve and increase the quantum of affordable housing across the borough. There are high levels of deprivation in the borough alongside varying degrees of housing need, as indicated by the Council's Housing Register.

As regards affordable housing, HO5 provides an indicative mix that the Council considers justified. The Council's SHMA has identified key issues of overcrowding and high numbers of multi-generational family units that reside in social housing. The Council maintains a Housing Register with high volumes registered. The average waiting time from those registering to obtaining a bed room flat is 12 months, a 2 bedroom flat is 23 months; waiting times increasing as larger housing is required. The proposed housing mix therefore is considered a positive effort to increase supply and decrease housing waiting times for those in need.

During the Development Management Examination (2013), the Inspector agreed with the Council, subject to modifications being made to the wording of the policy to allow more flexibility. The wording of the policy is considered to be sufficiently flexible to allow discussion to be made during the time of an application and relevant to the particulars of the site.

Most intermediate products are aimed at the first time buyer market as one of the key barriers to purchasing a home outright is saving for a deposit. The

majority of those looking to be moving into intermediate housing are those not in immediate housing need but those within a specific income bracket. The proposed mix therefore proposes 50% of all intermediate housing to be 1 bedroom to ensure development viability is not negatively impacted. The Council has considered the impact of larger units upon development viability and has proposed lower percentages for 4+ units for social/affordable rent units.

The Council has not identified a housing mix for market housing to allow flexibility at the point of an application and acknowledging that the houses will be sold on the open market.

13. Is HO6 (Accessible Housing) justified, deliverable with regard to viability and consistent with national policy?

HO6 is considered justified; the NPPF sets out the definition of sustainable development as including 'widening the choice of high quality homes for all' being inclusive and planning for a mix of housing needs. HO6 also reflects the standards set in the London Plan. Policy 3.8 (d) and (e) set out the requirements of Local Plan preparation and planning decisions. This policy is considered to be justified in terms of national and regional policy. It is therefore the Council's duty to plan for and consider the entire needs of the community, in which Accessible Housing is included.

Further to this, the Council maintains an accessible housing register to support the needs of vulnerable groups living in the borough. The data shows that the majority of general needs housing is not well suited to those with physical disability. The borough also has a large percentage of flat/apartments, three quarters of which has no ground floor entrance and many without lift access. The Council is working with other organisations to address this issue in Local authority properties, however, the Council is also required to expect new development to meet the relevant standards to better improve the quality of life for those in need.

14. Should HO7 (Needs of people who need care and support) include a target for the provision of supported homes?

As identified in the Council's SHMA, the Council owns a large proportion of supported homes within the borough. The Council is working with a range of organisations and with the community to deliver new supported homes across the borough. The Proposed Submission Local Plan (KD1) makes reference to the London Plan benchmark of approximately 60 specialist dwellings to be delivered per annum (paragraph 6.52 KD1), the Council considers this sufficient and will be used to monitor supply in the borough.

15. Is HO8 (Hostels and Houses in Multiple Occupation) justified and is it clear how it would be implemented effectively?

The NPPF identifies that authorities should plan for local needs and circumstances. The Council is aware of the role HMO play in providing housing for single people who cannot afford self-contained accommodation, especially in a borough with high private rents (p. 95 SD12). However, the Council is also aware that many existing HMO's are in a poor state for people to live in,

therefore the criteria sets out how applications should be assessed in response to the loss or increase in HMO's or hostels. This policy allows due consideration to be given to the criteria in response to the circumstances of the application.

Furthermore this policy has been adopted from the Core Strategy Development Management Local Plan (SD6) and has been considered successful in assessing applications.

16. Should the plan confirm that student accommodation (Policy HO9) does not contribute to the housing target? Are the policy criteria sufficiently clear for effective implementation?

The Council confirms that student accommodation does not contribute to the housing target. The Housing Trajectory does not make reference to student accommodation. No changes have been proposed to confirm this position, however, we are willing to make changes if that is thought appropriate by the Inspector, and are willing to discuss this further during the Examination Hearings.

The criteria are considered to be clear and effective; the supporting text alongside the policy sets out the rationale for each of the criteria. As part of the Regulation 19 consultation, a comment was made in reference to the 'element of affordable accommodation in accordance with the London Plan'. The Council considers the policy wording is clear, however further wording could be added to the supporting text to provide greater clarity.

17. Is HO11 (Detailed Residential Standards) justified and flexible?

The NPPF includes various references to this issue. Paragraphs 56 – 68 identify the issue of design, outlining that planning policies should plan for the long term and not the short term. 'Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes' also touches on this issue. These paragraphs refer to design and HO11 seeks to address these considerations in addressing residential standards, and how they are expected to delivery high quality, well performing development. As the borough becomes more built up over time, it is important to ensure high standards are met in order to protect existing and future occupiers in terms of noise and overlooking; the built up environment; to mitigate long term climate change impact; access to amenity and garden land; parking issues, etc.

This policy is flexible in its wording, in that these are considerations to be taken account of on a case by case basis; each aspect may not be relevant to every application. These considerations are not considered to be disproportionate to the impact of development, nor are they expecting development proposals to mitigate against existing issues. As such, they are therefore considered to be justified.

HO10 – Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation**18. What evidence justifies the approach of the Plan towards gypsies and travellers and travelling showpeople and is this sufficiently up to date and consistent with national policy? What engagement with relevant communities has been undertaken outside of the Borough?**

The Council has prepared a Joint Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment (SD17) with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea in accordance with the NPPF and the Planning Policy for Travellers (PPTS). The NPPF outlines that it should be read alongside the PPTS as regards Gypsy and Traveller matters.

It is this GTANA which justifies the approach taken in the Plan as regards the needs of Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. The assessment is up to date, and consistent with national policy. The Council's GTANA uses a methodology approach that has been accepted by various Inspectors in establishing planning need under the new definition. The approach shows a robust and credible demonstration of planning for gypsy and traveller accommodation needs.

It is acknowledged that establishing contact with Gypsy and Traveller community groups living in bricks and mortar can be difficult. In attempts to ensure a broad reach and level of engagement was made, the Councils (both LBHF and RBKC) used all relevant contacts and means possible. The Councils undertook a number of consultation events at various stages of the GTANA process; these events were advertised by the Stable Way site manager who has a good relationship with residents, contact was also made to those known living in bricks and mortar; enquiries were made internally within the Council to Housing department whether it would be possible to make contact directly with Gypsies and Travellers residing in council accommodation. This last option was explored however, it was not considered appropriate in terms of personal data and identify. (The needs of those living in bricks and mortar have also been considered through the Council's SHMA).

The Councils also contacted and discussed their approach with the London Gypsy and Traveller Unit. Overall, we are satisfied that all reasonable possibilities were pursued and that any household that wanted its views taken into account was given the opportunity to participate.

19. Has the duty to cooperate been employed adequately (and sufficiently widely) to address the issue of gypsy and traveller accommodation effectively?

The Council has adequately dealt with this issue: the Council has worked directly and jointly with the Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea; has assisted Hounslow in preparing their Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Needs Assessment and concluded that neither borough consider gypsy and travellers to be a duty to cooperate matter at this time; has discussed and continues to work with the OPDC, and the boroughs of Ealing and Brent. The OPDC's emerging draft Local Plan makes reference to adjacent borough's needs in

dealing with Gypsy and Traveller accommodation. Following surveys and consultation with the gypsy and traveller community in Stable Way, the Council is weary of working within a too wide of a catchment will not effectively meet the needs of the Gypsy and Traveller community as they are likely to stay in proximity to their communities' networks.

20. How have alternatives been considered and discounted? Has consideration been given to accommodating needs elsewhere within the Borough?

The Council considers that there may be further sites available in the borough. As part of the GTANA surveys, respondents were asked whether they were aware of any suitable sites. The Council will pursue a site search in order to assess these sites against a methodological framework agreed with RBKC. A number of the sites are located outside of the borough boundaries, including within the OPDC, the Council has made the OPDC aware of the GTANA and conclusions found. The Council is also aware that the borough is a highly constrained area for the type of density needed for a G&T development.

The Council has proposed further changes in the Schedule (KD4) to HO10 at MC81 and MC82 in order to deal with potential planning applications.

21. Is the needs assessment adequate for the entire plan period and how does it relate to Section 124 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 (caravans and houseboats)? How will the issue of needs assessment and site supply be address into the future?

The GTANA is considered robust evidence in determining the level of need, setting out the level of need in relation to household growth over the plan period.

Section 124 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 relates to the assessment of houseboat and caravan accommodation needs for local housing authorities. Local housing authorities have the duty to to consider the needs of those residing or resorting in caravans or houseboats. Both authorities consider this a duty for the housing authority to undertake, which may in turn impact upon plan making. The joint GTANA is formed on the basis that the PPTS definition of a gypsy and traveller is a working and legal definition for authorities to use in plan making. Those that do not meet the PPTS definition of a gypsy and traveller are part of a protected group in the Equalities Act (2010) and, under the assessment of caravan and boat dwellings. For the purposes of the plan, the Council considers it has met its obligations for planning for the gypsy and traveller needs.

In relation to addressing needs assessment in the future, the Council will require further discussion with Housing to coordinate accommodation assessments. In terms of site supply this has been responded to in the answer above.