

Chapter 5, Policy C8

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC8Q3: Response	CH5PC8Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
(Jon Kirby) GVA on behalf of Richborough Estates and Leicester County Council	366	Whilst the Council's acknowledgement of the Government's intention to increase self-build housing provision is supported, it is important that its availability on development sites is not held in perpetuity, at the expense of market housing delivery if the latter proves to be more viable.	The marketing period for plots, as stated in the policy wording, should be reduced from 12 to 6 months. This would bring the draft policy wording in line with that previously identified in the Emerging Options local plan, thus avoiding an unnecessary constraint to housing delivery.	The increase to 12 months was deemed to be fair, given the time it may take for the land to be advertised and a buyer able to find suitable funding for the scheme. Also, given the size of the development schemes (100 plus dwellings), this would normally take 3-5 years to build out entirely. There is however, no reason why the marketing could not take place in advance of construction starting.	None.
Carl Powell	231	agreed	none required	Support noted.	None.
Colin Love	173	Anyone wanting to 'self-build' will want to undertake the work and investment in a relatively favourable location. It is my understanding that it is not unknown for developers to allocate the least desirable plots as available for 'self-build'. This then results in those plots remaining unsold and then, after the prescribed period, the developer takes them back. This right to 'take back' after 12 months is presently contained in the wording of Policy C8. Any such outcome would be against achieving the fundamental objective of Policy C8 - ensuring the successful outcome of self-build. To achieve a high degree of successful outcome of Policy C8, it is necessary for the Policy to include some form of wording that ensures that those plots made available for self-build are amongst the most desirable - not the least desirable. The proposed Rectory Farm development in Bottesford, as a site of over 100 houses, would provide an ideal opportunity for imaginative, high quality, self-build.		It is difficult to quantify in planning policy terms which areas of land would be the most desirable land, as the terminology is subjective. Some people for example may want to be closer to the existing settlement, where other may want to be on the fringe of the development with better views and access to the countryside. As this policy is already placing a requirement on development, it is not felt necessary to place further requirements which could start to affect development viability or complicate its route through the development management process. It will be established at the very minimum that the area designated for self build, would be appropriate for housing through the development management phase.	None.
LCC (Highways, Education, Early Years, Waste, Property Assets, LLFA, Libraries & Culture, LRERC)	405		51. Paragraph 5.13 Self- Build needs to include Broadband if possible – especially sites over 5 houses.	Comment noted. Please note policy IN3 which delivers broadband.	None.
Melton North Land Consortium - GVA Consultants	415	Whilst the Council's acknowledgement of the Government's intention to increase self build housing provision is supported, it is important that its availability on development sites is not held in perpetuity, at the expense of market housing delivery if the latter proves to be more viable.	The marketing period for plots, as stated in the policy wording should be reduced from 12 to 6 months. This would bring the policy wording in line with that previously identified in the Emerging Options stage of the Local Plan, thus avoiding an unnecessary constraint to housing delivery.	The increase to 12 months was deemed to be fair, given the time it may take for the land to be advertised and a buyer able to find suitable funding for the scheme. Also, given the size of the development schemes (100 plus dwellings), this would normally take 3-5 years to build out entirely. There is however,	None.

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC8Q3: Response	CH5PC8Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
				no reason why the marketing could not take in advance of construction starting.	
Richard Simon, Clerk to BPNP Steering Group	429	Supported		Support noted.	
Richard Simon	266	Supported		Support noted.	
Robert Galij BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI, Planning Director - Barratt David Wilson Homes North Midlands	430	Concern is expressed over the proposed wording of this particular Policy ie ..."developers will supply"... and its intended targeting of ..."sites of 100 dwellings or more"... which represent 'restrictive business practice'. it is unclear how and why the "100 dwellings" threshold has been derived ? Nor does the Policy recognise the operational/health and safety/delivery issues associated with site development and implementation, particularly on large sites.	This Policy should be deleted or, if retained, amended to reflect 'encouragement' rather than 'coercion' and reflecting site specific considerations, evidence of demand and viability.	Comments noted. If not driven by policy, it is considered unlikely that larger schemes (100+ dwellings) will deliver any quantum of self build plots. The marketing of these plots could begin early after planning approval had been required (pottentially even outline dependant on layout being established as a reserved matter) and as such site specifics such as health and safety and marketing/demand can begin early to ensure timely delivery of both market and self/custom build housing.	None.
Susan E Green	109	The HBF supports self-build / custom build in principle for its potential additional contribution to the overall housing supply where this is based on a positive policy approach by the Council to increase the total amount of new housing development and meet an identified and quantified self-build / custom build housing need. However the HBF is not supportive of a policy requirement for the inclusion of such housing on large sites (100+ dwellings) as proposed by the Council. This approach provides no addition land supply but merely changes production from one to another type of builder. There are also implementation practicalities associated with such a restrictive policy which have to be overcome including health & safety implications, working hours, length of build programmes, etc. Moreover the suggested cascade mechanism contained within the proposed policy will only work in practice if the self-build plots are at the back end of the build programme otherwise the efficient delivery of the site will be disrupted. The Council should refer to the East Devon Local Plan Inspector's Final Report which expresses reservations about the implementation difficulties associated with this sort of policy. In para 46 the Inspector states "However, I don't see how the planning system		The East Devon Local Plan looked for 10% of all sites over 15 dwellings or 0.5ha available for small builders or for self build, not the 5% of 100 dwellings schemes for self or custom build as Melton's policy does. Therefore there is no requirement for housebuilders to "sell to rivals". Unless by rivals considers self builders rivals, however it is contested that those looking to build their own houses would otherwise buy standard new build housing, by their very definition those who wish to build their own house are unlikely to be rivals to traditional house builders. Moreover, if they wanted to, larger housebuilders could incorporate their own custom build housing options and simply build out the 5 dwellings themselves at the request of potential customers. There is an evidenced need established through both the Melton Borough Council Self and Custom Build Register and through the 'Buildstore' who run and manage the largest National Database for Self/Custom Build. Moreover, it must be remembered that unlike other parts of the country, 100 dwelling plus schemes will be exceptional,	

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC8Q3: Response	CH5PC8Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
		<p>can make developers sell land to potential rivals (and at a reasonable price)". It is not evident that the Council has assessed such housing needs in its SHMA work as set out in the NPPG (ID 2a-021-20140306) the Council should collate from reliable local information the local demand for people wishing to build their own homes. Furthermore it should be viability tested 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" (ID 10-009-20140306). If this policy requirement is not deleted then it is suggested that the policy is reworded as encouragement rather than a requirement subject to viability considerations, specific site circumstances and based on evidence of an identified demand for such housing.</p>		<p>with only a handful anticipated throughout the 20 year period of the plan.</p>	
William Davis Ltd	441	<p>William Davis also has concerns regarding the soundness of requiring 5% of plots on larger sites for self-build/custom build. The provision of such plots, as described in Policy C8, is considered to be incompatible with the delivery of larger housing sites and may well cause difficulties for future sales. Self-build can take far longer to build than standard estate dwellings with much of the work being weekend and evening build, with resulting implications also on the amenity of surrounding plots. This is likely to have a detrimental effect on sales of neighbouring plots to those areas reserved for self-build/custom build. Prospective purchasers of these neighbouring plots could also be put off by the uncertainty of knowing what design and character of the self-build plots was likely to be. In addition, self-build/custom build would create other practical difficulties of access and health and safety during evening and weekend working. Consequently Policy C8 is not considered to be justified or effective. William Davis Ltd accepts that there may be occasions where a developer of a site feels willing to support self-build/custom build; however the policy should not seek to impose such provision as a strict requirement. The policy should therefore be one of supporting and enabling such provision where appropriate, and not just restricted to sites of over 100 dwellings. Other smaller allocated</p>		<p>Comments noted. If not driven by policy, it is considered unlikely that larger schemes (100+ dwellings) will deliver any quantum of self build plots. The marketing of these plots could begin early after planning approval had been required (potentially even outline dependant on layout being established as a reserved matter) and as such site specifics such as health and safety and marketing/demand can begin early to ensure timely delivery of both market and self/custom build housing. Planning Conditions can be placed to ensure reasonable build times are applied.</p>	

Name	Representor Number	CH5PC8Q3: Response	CH5PC8Q4: Representor's Suggested Changes	MBC Response	MBC Suggested Modifications or Proposed Changes
Richard Crosthwaite (Gladman Developments)	443	<p>and windfall sites should not be excluded.</p> <p>The introduction of this policy should be informed by the Council's assessment of housing needs so that it appropriately reflects local circumstances in relation to the need and demand for self-build and custom build housing. In addition, any such requirements should be fully reflected in the Council's housing trajectory in terms of the impact that any delayed delivery of such plots may have on overall supply.</p> <p>Gladman are concerned that the policy wording is not sufficiently responsive to circumstances that will arise on a site by site basis and request that this is addressed through modifications to ensure that housing delivery is not delayed in circumstances where there is no demonstrable demand for these products. In addition, we request that the policy and supporting text makes it clear that the Council is 'seeking to encourage' the inclusion of self-build and custom build on large housing sites rather than 'requiring it'.</p>		<p>Comments noted. If not driven by policy, it is considered unlikely that larger schemes (100+ dwellings) will deliver any quantum of self build plots. The marketing of these plots could begin early after planning approval had been required (pottentially even outline dependant on layout being established as a reserved matter) and as such site specifics such as health and safety and marketing/demand can begin early to ensure timely delivery of both market and self/custom build housing.</p>	