

## Housing

For the 'Housing' chapter a total of 149 responses were received. The individual comments were broken down as follows:

Number of comments made: 149

Object: 105

Support: 25

Neutral: 19

Specific and general consultation bodies	Key landowners / developers
<i>Bridport Town Council</i>	<i>Dorset Planning Consultant Limited</i>
<i>Burton Bradstock Parish Council</i>	<i>Home Builders Federation</i>
<i>Chideock Parish Council</i>	<i>Homes England</i>
<i>Dorchester Town Council</i>	<i>Neejam 165 Ltd &amp; Budworth Developments Ltd</i>
<i>Dorset County Council (Environment &amp; Economy)</i>	<i>Persimmon Homes</i>
<i>Dorset County Hospital</i>	<i>Symondsburry Estate and The Watton Hill Trust</i>
<i>Portland Town Council</i>	<i>Wyatt Homes</i>
<i>Sherborne Town Council</i>	

### Comments on the Introduction

#### Calculations of Housing Need

- The calculated need for housing is based on a central government target-based method without properly accounting for local factors. Local demographics, protected landscapes and the influx of people exacerbate the low cost, social housing shortage and put pressure on infrastructure services.

#### Demographic Change

- Para 5.1.2: The reason for the demographic change is incorrect as increases in life expectancy have been slowing down since 2011 and between 2015 and 2017 it plateaued. There is no evidence that it will begin to increase again. Also the average age of the local population is likely to increase.
- The population only remains fairly steady because people move here to retire (and buy second homes, holiday lets, etc.). Building more houses will simply allow more people to move here ruining the landscape.

#### Oversupply of Housing

- Para 5.1.3: WDDC is encouraging the wrong type of houses to be built and even with this gross oversupply of housing, the plan admits that the need for affordable housing will not be met in the plan review period.

- A 2015 report from CPRE states that housing targets 'are often arbitrary and inflated'. High housing targets are not sustainable and result in ever greater loss of our precious countryside.

### **Strategic Approach to Housing**

- Para 5.1.5: The approach will fail to provide sufficient housing for those on low incomes. 35% affordable housing is not actually built as viability assessments reduce and eliminate any commitment to build affordable housing.
- The most shocking statement in the Strategic Approach box is the admission that 'the total projected need for affordable housing is not expected to be met in the plan review period'. The plan has been set up to fail and points strongly to the need for solid, specific, deliverable measures and targets. Opportunities have been missed to secure affordable homes to meet local needs. (Chideock Parish Council)
- Para 5.1.5 admits an unacceptable lack of ambition to meet local needs.
- How is it possible to plan to develop a surplus of over 4,000 homes beyond overall projected need while at the same time planning for a shortfall in affordable homes?
- The Strategic Approach is welcome, if somewhat too vague and aspirational. More specific numbers and targets are essential. The recognition of the aim to 'reduce the need to travel' is not supported in the ENV, SUS and HOUS policies or their accompanying texts. The principle of co-location is missing, as is any concrete measure to deliver a balance between jobs and housing, which supports the ability to walk / cycle to work. (Chideock Parish Council)

### **Affordable Housing in Bridport**

- The additional plots to the west of Coronation Road and Pine View on Bridport's boundary should be allocated for local affordable housing for local people, adjacent to new employment land and new jobs. (Chideock Parish Council)

### **Affordable Housing in Sherborne**

- Paras 5.1.2 and 5.2: The numbers for affordable housing in Sherborne have recently increased and suggestions for more have just been made by Magna Housing. The allocation of these homes should be strictly for those in need or close to the appropriate town or village.
- Para 5.5: Provision has now been made for residential care accommodation in Sherborne.

**Responses to Question 5-i: In order to reflect changes (or proposed changes) to national policy, Policy HOUS<sub>1</sub> and supporting text have been amended to: establish thresholds above which affordable housing will be sought; offer 'vacant building credit' on brownfield sites; provide greater clarity on how viability should be assessed; and reflect the proposed broader definition of affordable housing in the split of tenures models sought. Do you have any views on these changes, or any other changes, to Policy HOUS<sub>1</sub>?**

### **Support**

- We support this policy. (Dorset County Council: Environment & Economy, Dorset County Hospital, Sherborne Town Council)

- Homes England supports the approach taken on affordable housing. New residential sites should make a contribution in line with local need. (Homes England)

#### **Definition of Affordable Housing: Tenure Mix**

- Affordable housing should include property for sale, shared equity, affordable rent and social rent. The proportions in each category should reflect the assessed need, according to the housing register.
- Affordable housing delivery should seek to encompass a range of delivery types, including elderly and specialist units, key worker units and other delivery models as set out in the paragraph 61 of the NPPF. This will provide flexibility and will assist in the delivery of viable schemes.
- The definition of 'affordable' should be changed to one that reflects genuinely affordable low cost housing.
- The affordable housing definition places too much emphasis on low cost home ownership options and far too little on social rent and shared ownership at 30-40% ownership levels where it is needed.
- There is a need to ensure that any affordable housing is strictly in compliance with the definition in the glossary. The term 'affordable' is much abused and is used to seek to achieve development that is unaffordable.
- Are these houses suitable for young people?

#### **Definition of Affordable Housing: Starter Homes**

- Bulleted item 'starter homes' should be deleted, as they are no longer mentioned in the NPPF (except in the glossary). Being eligible to eventually be sold onto the private market, they do not contribute to the permanent stock of affordable housing and are counter-productive to addressing the affordable housing shortage.
- The term 'affordable homes' is not realistic in Dorset. What's needed are 'starter homes'.

#### **Definition of Affordable Housing: Community Land Trusts**

- We seek the specific inclusion of community land trusts so that when a scheme comes forward it cannot be excluded by planners because of its 'novelty'. Again a flexible approach is needed.
- Where provision is to be made on site, to secure the affordable housing benefits into the long term, the land concerned should, where possible, be transferred to a community land trust or similar organisation. (Burton Bradstock Parish Council)

#### **HOUS<sub>1</sub> Criterion i): Support for the 10-Dwelling Threshold**

- The threshold of 10 units for the purposes of assessing the provision of affordable housing on individual sites is supported.
- I strongly endorse the policy of requiring a quota of affordable housing in all development sites which exceed 10 houses.

#### **HOUS<sub>1</sub> Criterion i): Objection to the Thresholds**

- The local plan should not rely on large-scale developments 'above a certain size' in the hope that they will secure an inadequately small, and not guaranteed, 35%

'affordable' housing in a form of a developer's bribe. This should instead be the starting point.

**HOUS<sub>1</sub> Criterion ii): Proportion of Affordable Housing Sought**

- The affordable housing ratio of 35% should be strictly enforced on all large scale developments with no exceptions.
- Even if 35% of the houses on a new development are 'affordable' 65% are open-market, 'full price' houses aimed at relatively wealthy incomers.
- The 35% threshold does not deliver an adequate proportion of affordable housing completions. It should be possible to vary the quota above 35% where the affordable housing delivery falls below the need or 20% of total completions, and to clearly and firmly define the quota of 35% as a minimum, subject to any increase relative to the shortfall in affordable housing delivery and the numbers on the registers in any one 5-year review period. (Chideock Parish Council)
- We do not understand why a lower proportion of affordable housing is to be sought in areas that experience more poverty, such as Portland, which have a higher percentage of population in need of low-cost rental and social housing.

**HOUS<sub>1</sub> Criterion ii): 10% Affordable Home Ownership Products**

- Pleased to see the national minimum of 10% affordable home ownership products is proposed in HOUS<sub>1</sub> in line with para 64 of the NPPF. Homes England welcome the recognition of individual sites. (Homes England)
- This clause means that of the 35% affordable homes built 10% must be home ownership products. But, if a viability assessment results in an agreement to build less than 35% of houses as affordable homes then, applying this clause as written, 10% of all the new homes must still be home ownership products. This unfairly eats in to the quota of affordable housing for rent, which is also really needed (in Bridport area at least). The wording needs to change such that it is clear that if there is a reduction in the 35% there should be a proportional reduction in the 10% of affordable home ownership products.

**HOUS<sub>1</sub> Criterion ii): Support for Vacant Building Credit**

- The reference to vacant building credit in paragraph 5.2.5 is welcomed as it provides transparency. (Homes England)

**HOUS<sub>1</sub> Criterion ii): Objections to Vacant Building Credit**

- We disagree with the provisions for 'vacant building credit', not least because this may reduce provision and result in the unnecessary use of greenfield sites for affordable housing. (Bridport Town Council)
- The meaning of 'vacant building' must be defined as one which is permanently in too poor a condition to be occupied – not just one which has simply been arbitrarily emptied by the owner in order to claim vacant building credit.

**HOUS<sub>1</sub> Criterion ii): Neighbourhood Plans**

- HOUS<sub>1</sub> ii) makes reference to the possibility of different percentages of affordable housing being required in neighbourhood plans. The affordable housing

requirement is a strategic policy, subject to detailed viability assessments, and should not be subject to change through neighbourhood plans. (Persimmon Homes)

- The Councils should re-consider Policy HOUS<sub>1</sub> for its consistency with national policy. Under the NPPF the provision of affordable housing is a strategic policy and neighbourhood plans should be in general conformity with and not undermine strategic policies. The application of different site thresholds and different percentages of affordable housing provision via neighbourhood plans is inappropriate. Furthermore any policy in a currently made neighbourhood plan will be superseded by the subsequent adoption of the Local Plan Review. Policy HOUS<sub>1</sub> should be clearly written and unambiguous. (Home Builders Federation)
- HOUS<sub>1</sub> v) and vii) should cite neighbourhood plans (where available) as sources of alternative identified needs.

### **HOUS<sub>1</sub> Criterion iii): On- and Off-site Provision and Financial Contributions**

- Is it possible to explain how it is intended that such a financial contribution will be used to provide affordable alternatives?

### **HOUS<sub>1</sub> iv): Assessing Viability**

- The level and type of affordable housing provision, together with other infrastructure, should not undermine deliverability. (Home Builders Federation)
- Affordability should take into account rents, ground rents, service charges as these can significantly affect affordability and can be used to conceal unaffordable costs.
- In HOUS<sub>1</sub> iv) you make it clear that you are aware and even expectant of viability arguments and that a reduction in affordable housing provision may be 'permitted' for the sake of allowing the rest of the development to go ahead.
- HOUS<sub>1</sub> iv) should require detail of which elements are contributing to non-viability. Planners must be robust in examining carefully any claim of non-viability and offer alternative ways of reaching viability. (Dorchester Town Council)
- NPPF guidance is that all viability assessments should be made publicly available. It refers to an 'open-book' approach (restated in HOUS<sub>1</sub>), but we are unclear about what this is supposed to mean? There is also a stated aim to be 'more transparent'.
- Viability assessment is sensitive to changes in its inputs and the cumulative burden of policy requirements should be set so that the majority of sites are deliverable without further viability negotiations. It is important that the Councils understand and test the influence of all inputs on viability as this determines if land is released for development. (Home Builders Federation)
- Could landowners make a gesture of goodwill and either sell part of the land at a reduced price or even donate some of the land for affordable housing? For houses to be truly affordable the land needs to be cheaper. Considering that agricultural land is much cheaper than development land, a smaller profit is not unreasonable.
- The Councils should undertake an updated viability assessment to determine whether the proposed proportions of affordable housing provision together with the cumulative burden of other policy requirements and necessary infrastructure provision remain viable and deliverable. (Home Builders Federation)

### **HOUS<sub>1</sub> Criterion v): Support for the Tenure Split**

- We condone the idea of 70% social / affordable rent and a maximum of 30% intermediate affordable housing.
- Mix of 35% affordable housing must be 70% to rent and 30% to buy.

### **HOUS<sub>1</sub> Criterion v): Objections to the Tenure Split**

- 70% affordable rent and 30% affordable home ownership sets the wrong priorities. 70% should be social rent and 30% intermediate rent, affordable rent and low cost home ownership.
- Should be social housing where possible. We need more rental properties. There has been no social housing built in 4 years.
- The level and balance between affordable rental and home ownership products should be discussed and agreed with the Town and Parish Councils concerned and other bodies, such as community land trusts. (Burton Bradstock Parish Council)
- 5.2.13 argues for 'affordable home ownership' to get people on the 'ladder' but many such schemes help only at the margin and do nothing to address the priorities.
- The policy clarifies that the % should be based on the number of dwellings rather than number of bedrooms or floorspace. Given that typically the affordable housing stock provided is smaller than the open market (in terms of bedrooms and floorspace) has this been taken into account in assessing what can be afforded? If not, it may be more appropriate to base the % on floorspace. (Dorset Planning Consultant Limited)

### **HOUS<sub>1</sub> Criterion vi): Size, Type and Housing Mix**

- I support provision of mixed housing including not only affordable housing but also mid-range housing that is within reach of the mid- and lower-income groups.
- It would be useful in para 5.2.15 to give some guidance on what is meant by a 'small cluster' given that there is both developer and housing provider interest in maximising the clustering for sales and management reasons. (Dorset Planning Consultant Limited)

### **HOUS<sub>1</sub> Criterion vii): People with Disabilities**

- Who confirms the identified need such that developers apply this clause?
- What does 'prioritise' in this context mean? 'Developments' cannot prioritise, but 'developers' can.

### **HOUS<sub>1</sub>: General Comments on the Wording / Content**

- The word 'should' must be replaced by 'shall' or 'will' throughout the policy statement except in HOUS<sub>1</sub> iii).
- It is important that affordable housing policy is sufficiently flexible so that it can respond to national changes as and when they take place.
- If the plan really is to help locals on low wages find homes, it would help to make public: what that target is; exactly how many local people are on the housing list and what percentage of those are on zero hours, minimum wage and / or benefits; then openly plan ahead to build suitable housing for them (i.e. affordable rents) and don't just make more profit for the few.

### **General Comments: Reducing the Affordable Housing Shortfall**

- The plan should be aspirational, demonstrating a planned reduction in the affordable homes shortage over the lifetime of the plan.
- The plan review acknowledges a well-proven need for affordable housing. Why does it not aim to deal with this issue within the plan period?
- WDDC accepts that it is making insufficient provision for affordable / low cost housing. Surely, we need a strategic approach so that we have the mix of houses which will create balanced communities?

### **General Comments: Meeting Local Affordable Housing Needs**

- Affordable and low-cost housing in Dorset for local people should be prioritised.
- The housing will be filled by inward migration rather than meeting local needs and will result in creeping suburbanisation at a time when there is a possibility that West Dorset could be a new National Park.
- It is affordable houses we need not 6-bed executive homes!

### **General Comments: Council Borrowing**

- Remove the cap on Council borrowing. Magna has decided to build again. An increase in the social and low cost housing stock in Dorset is achievable given action.

### **General Comments: Re-sale of Affordable Housing**

- How will the Council ensure that rents are affordable if they are in the private sector and what controls will be in place to ensure that the re-sale of affordable housing remains affordable?

### **General Comments: Overprovision of Housing**

- WDDC still seems to be driven to meet a 'share' of national targets rather than demonstrating the actual need in West Dorset and Bridport. Thus, WDDC is proposing an 'oversupply' which is significantly above the objectively assessed need.

### **General Comments: Impact of Brexit**

- The 775 dwellings per year is based on an expanding economy. The Government is now indicating that a deal with the EU is less likely and is predicting a severe recession. Brexit will, however deliver a clear immigration policy which will reduce the levels of mass migration and therefore lower the need for housing.

### **General Comments: Brownfield First**

- There is no evidence that brownfield sites have been considered. These sites should be fully considered before using up more valuable farm land.
- Why is this approach not taken by WDDC (i.e. brownfield first and use of vacant building credit grants)?

### **General Comments: Modular Housing**

- Modern pre-fabricated dwellings are quick to build, can look spectacular and are energy efficient. Please consider this option and not just what developers want to build.

## HOUS<sub>1</sub>: Town-specific Issues

- **Beaminster:** The provision of affordable housing is crucial in order to sustain a population balance in Beaminster which at present is becoming weighted towards old people.
- **Bridport:** We are concerned that Policy HOUS<sub>1</sub> will not achieve the affordable housing requirement for Bridport. (Bridport Town Council)
- **Dorchester:** There is a need for a mix of affordable housing for hospital staff. This housing should be made available to NHS staff and organisations to ensure that the right type of housing is available in the right places at the right time. (Dorset County Hospital)
- **Littlemoor:** Paragraph 9.4.3 states that other community infrastructure including contributions towards a community hall, sport and play facilities, libraries, healthcare and the Lorton Valley Nature Park will be sought in line with Policy COM<sub>1</sub>. A further cross-reference should be added here to draft Policy HOUS<sub>1</sub> iv). A lower level of provision will only be permitted if: the assessment shows that it is not economically viable to make the minimum level of provision being sought and there are good reasons to bring the development forward. (Neejam 165 Ltd & Budworth Developments Ltd)
- **Portland:** The designation of parts of Portland as urban is still contentious. (Portland Town Council)

**Responses to Question 5-ii: Policy HOUS<sub>2</sub> and supporting text have been amended to: set out how any exception scheme should meet identified local needs; and clarify that affordable home ownership products (including affordable self build and custom build homes) may be permitted on exception sites. Do you have any views on these changes, or any other changes, to Policy HOUS<sub>2</sub>?**

### Support

- We support this policy. (Dorset County Council: Environment & Economy, Portland Town Council, Sherborne Town Council)

### Market Housing on Exception Sites

- The suggestion in 5.2.17 that 100% affordable is unacceptable is unreasonable: before the right to buy 33% of all housing was affordable and often large estates functioned perfectly well.
- While we are in agreement with much of this paragraph, especially the implied protection against the right to buy / acquire, we take the stance that no market rate housing should be allowed on exception sites. (Lyme Regis CLT)
- Government legislation has meant that grant funding has become more easily obtained over the last year and the need for market rate funding has decreased accordingly. In an area like Lyme Regis geographical constraints mean that development on exception sites tends to be on the small side and any market rate housing alongside affordable housing on such sites would be totally inappropriate. We would therefore opt for option B and allow no cross subsidising on exception sites. (Lyme Regis CLT)
- We agree with paragraph 5.2.22 to disallow 'small numbers of market homes because it: would reduce the likelihood of 100% affordable housing sites being



delivered' — and in its admission that it could also 'potentially increase land values' and 'result in significant unplanned growth in adjoining settlements.'

- Only affordable houses should be on exception sites!

### **HOUS2: Definition of Small Scale**

- It may be useful to give a clearer definition of how 'small scale' would be judged. HOUS2 ii) could also reflect the potential for this to be achieved through NDOs. (Dorset Planning Consultant Limited)
- The words 'small-scale' in criterion i) should be deleted. Sites which meet an identified need for affordable housing and which meet other criteria for the grant of permission should be allowed. Affordable housing needs differ across the plan area. In Bridport there is an identified need for significant affordable housing which is not provided for in the plan. (Symondsburry Estate and The Watton Hill Trust)
- The policy is too vague. 'Small scale' is not defined and provides no numerical values for the number of homes to determine whether a proposed development meets this policy. As written a large scale development could be permitted on land where housing would not be permitted, e.g. a designated green space.

### **HOUS2: Other Comments**

- Para 5.2.18: We endorse most aspects of the policy in terms of 'affordable housing exception sites', but would wish the definition to be changed to that of low-cost housing for sale and rent and social housing. The provisions of para 5.2.18 set the strategic priority for the local plan and should be applied to all affordable housing.
- Para 5.2.20 is insulting as it implies that affordable housing for local people is an exception. This is an elitist policy. Disadvantaged local people are in reality given no housing priority.
- These conditions must be strictly applied with no grey areas that can be exploited. Our AONB landscape is important and to surrender any such land for affordable housing must always be strictly for local people affordable in perpetuity on small sites (up to 10). A small number of market homes would be acceptable to ensure the delivery of affordable homes defined for example up to a max of 25%.
- Bullet 4 in criterion i) should be amended to acknowledge the prospect of a change in circumstances that might justify a change in the tenure. (Symondsburry Estate and The Watton Hill Trust)

### **Single Plot Exception Sites**

- HOUS2 should explicitly allow for single plot exception sites, as included in Purbeck DC's Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2012-2027. This policy was first used in Shropshire, where it has allowed for some 250 affordable homes. In particular it allows younger people in villages who cannot afford a home, but who have access to an appropriate plot of land to commission or self-build an affordable dwelling, with local approval and through a simple planning process.

**Responses to Question 5-iii: There has been some minor updating of: Policy HOUS<sub>3</sub> – Open Market Housing Mix; Policy HOUS<sub>4</sub> – Development of Flats, Hostels and Houses in Multiple Occupation; Policy HOUS<sub>5</sub> – Residential Care accommodation; and text in relation to sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. Do you have any views on the changes to these policies and supporting text?**

### **HOUS<sub>3</sub>: Support**

- We support this policy (Dorset County Council: Environment & Economy)
- DCHFT supports this policy as it will ensure that a mix of housing is available which could be purchased by its employees and those connected to delivering services at DCH. (Dorset County Hospital)
- The policy recognises the need for different types and sizes of dwellings will change across the plan period by virtue of a changing population and any change in national policy. (Wyatt Homes)

### **HOUS<sub>3</sub>: Suggested Wording Changes**

- 'Wherever possible' and use of 'should' is not an acceptable way of controlling the contents of a new housing development. The policy should open 'Residential developments shall include...'
- Delete 'whenever possible'. Add 'Residential development should include an appropriate mix of size, type and affordability of dwelling, taking into account the likely need in that locality'. (Dorchester Town Council)

### **HOUS<sub>3</sub>: Housing Mix**

- We need more housing which should be a genuine mix to meet the needs of all income groups including social housing and affordable housing.
- Important to have a good mix and the affordable element maintained.
- The Council should also consider the mix on a case by case basis in respect of the size of the settlement. (Wyatt Homes)

### **HOUS<sub>3</sub>: Second Homes**

- New build properties attract a larger percentage of second home purchases than the average number of second homes in any locality. The council should find ways to reduce or even prevent the purchase of second homes by people outside of the immediate area. This could be done either by screening the current residency of the purchaser or by limiting the period of future occupancy in any one year.

### **HOUS<sub>3</sub>: Neighbourhood Plans**

- Neighbourhood Plans should be cited as a source of verified local size, type and affordability data.

### **HOUS<sub>4</sub>: Support / General Comments**

- We support this policy (Dorset County Council: Environment & Economy, Sherborne Town Council)
- DCHFT are considering the development of HMOs as part of the DCH masterplan. These would be provided to ensure the retention of the best high-quality staff at DCHFT. (Dorset County Hospital)

#### **HOUS4: Objections**

- HOUS4 should make reference to the proximity of appropriate community facilities. (Portland Town Council)
- No more HMOs in Weymouth.

#### **HOUS5: Support / General Comments**

- We support this policy (Dorset County Council - Environment & Economy)
- As part of the DCH Masterplan, DCHFT is considering developing residential care accommodation. This will be delivered to meet known existing demand and future demand. (Dorset County Hospital)

#### **HOUS5: Objections**

- HOUS5 criterion i), bullet 1 should be amended to allow residential care provision to be 'located within or adjoining a defined development boundaries or other appropriate locations and at an appropriate scale in relation to the location'. (Symonds Estate and The Watton Hill Trust)
- The infrastructure burden residential care housing places on medical support (ambulance services, hospitals, doctors, care staff etc.) should be recognised. The volume of care spaces should be monitored and permission declined on the grounds that a limit of provision has been reached in a settlement for medical support.

#### **Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople**

- No comments received.

**Responses to Question 5-iv: Policy HOUS6 and supporting text have been amended: to include a new section on ancillary domestic buildings within residential curtilages; to provide more detail on how other proposals for residential development outside DDBs will be considered; and to establish that, as a guide, replacement dwellings should be no more than 50% larger than the original. Do you have any views on these changes, or any other changes, to Policy HOUS6?**

#### **HOUS6: Support**

- We support this policy (Dorset County Council: Environment & Economy, Sherborne Town Council)

#### **HOUS6: Replacement Dwellings**

- Policy SUS4 in the 2015 Local Plan referred specifically to measures to protect against the loss of a heritage asset, and this is not replicated in HOUS6 and should be reinstated. (Bridport Town Council)
- There is an inconsistency between the policy wording and context paragraphs. There is no reference to 50% within the policy. (Portland Town Council)

#### **HOUS6: Ancillary Buildings**

- HOUS 6 iii), bullet 4. This policy needs to recognise the contribution of modern innovative architecture, and should not be prescriptive regarding the maximum size of any extension / addition. The assessment should be based on the quality of the

architecture and not on prescriptive limits. This stifles innovation and the creation of buildings which can be the historic buildings of the future. (Symondsburry Estate and The Watton Hill Trust)

**Responses to Question 5-v: New housing for rural workers is one form of residential development that may be permitted outside DDBs under Policy HOUS6 of the current local plan. It is proposed that new Policy HOUS7 would deal specifically with this issue setting out in more detail how proposals for permanent and temporary occupational dwellings would be considered and how proposals for the removal of any occupancy conditions would be determined. Do you have any views on the proposed new Policy HOUS7?**

#### **HOUS7: Support**

- We support this policy (Dorset County Council: Environment & Economy, Sherborne Town Council)

#### **HOUS7: Objections**

- Para 5.8.2: Occupational dwellings should be allowed for security reasons, given the extent of and increase in rural crime. (Bridport Town Council)
- The 'financial test' must be suitable in all circumstances, such as where occupants aim for self-sufficiency. In such a case, a test that is too commercially-oriented may result in an inappropriate refusal of permission. (Bridport Town Council)
- The policy does not appear to reflect the NPPF, which supports the scenarios of retired farmers' succession. (Dorset Planning Consultant Limited)

**Responses to Question 5-vi: Policy HOUS8 sets out the councils' approach to self-build and custom-build housing; on larger housing sites; outside DDBs; and in neighbourhood development plans. Do you agree with the Councils proposed approach to the provision of self-build and custom-build housing?**

#### **Support**

- We support this policy (Dorset County Council: Environment & Economy, Sherborne Town Council)
- The HBF supports the encouragement of self / custom build for its contribution to housing supply. (Home Builders Federation)

#### **HOUS8: Custom / Self-build on Strategic Allocations**

- This policy should support the inclusion of self / custom build housing on major sites as part of the affordable housing quota.
- The HBF agrees with the approach except for on strategic sites. This approach only changes housing delivery from one form of house building to another without boosting housing supply. (Home Builders Federation)
- Any policy requirement for self / custom build serviced plots on strategic housing allocations should be justified and supported by evidence. However, the self-build registers may not justify the proposed policy approach, as the preferences of entries may be for individual plots in rural locations, rather than for plots on strategic housing allocations. (Home Builders Federation)

- The councils should consider the practicalities of health & safety, working hours, length of build programme as well as viability assessing any adverse impacts. (Home Builders Federation)

#### **HOUS8: Other Comments**

- The policy should be stronger by making it clear that self-build is encouraged and developers / landowners should be encouraged to allocate land for such use.
- The quality of materials and robustness in exposed locations should be considered within the policy framework. (Portland Town Council)
- The Councils should assess custom / self-build housing needs in the SHMA and by collating reliable local information (including validated registrations on self / custom build registers) on the demand from people wishing to build their own homes. (Home Builders Federation)
- The NPPG confirms that 'different types of residential development such as those wanting to build their own homes ... are funded and delivered in different ways. This should be reflected in viability assessments'. (Home Builders Federation)
- There is a loss of CIL contributions as self / custom build properties are exempt. (Home Builders Federation)

#### **Definition of Self / Custom-build**

- A definition of self-build and custom-build should be included in the glossary. (Bridport Town Council)

### **Responses to Question 5-vii: Should the councils allocate additional sites exclusively for self-build and / or custom-build housing? If so, which specific sites should be allocated?**

#### **Support for the Approach**

- We support this approach (Dorset County Council: Environment & Economy, Sherborne Town Council)
- The Councils should allocate additional sites exclusively for self / custom build housing. (Home Builders Federation)
- Like the idea of accommodating good quality self-builds on the same sites as everyone else.

#### **Objections**

- A specific site allocation should be determined via the Bridport Area Neighbourhood Plan and through community land trust designation for self-build. (Bridport Town Council)
- Direct this type of development to more appropriate locations (Portland Town Council)
- Should not allocate, certainly not on greenfield sites. And no bad design.