



PARTIAL REVIEW OF REGIONAL  
SPATIAL STRATEGY (RSS) –

Consultation on the Draft Options: Housing C2&3  
June – July 2008

(Responses by Organisation)

## **North West Regional Assembly**

### **PARTIAL REVIEW OF REGIONAL SPATIAL STRATEGY (RSS) –**

Consultation on the Draft Options: Housing C2&3

A consultation report from

#### **CAG Consultants**

in association with **Concept 4 Creative and Community Consultants**

April 2008

CAG CONSULTANTS  
Gordon House  
6 Lissenden Gardens  
London NW5 1LX  
Tel/fax 020 7482 8882  
hq@cagconsult.co.uk  
www.cagconsultants.co.uk

for direct enquiries about this report please contact:

Emma Cranidge  
Ewood House, Ewood Lane, Todmorden, OL14 7DF  
tel 01706 817347 or mob 07879 017617  
[ec@cagconsult.co.uk](mailto:ec@cagconsult.co.uk)

## Macclesfield Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield BC	No	Macclesfield Borough Council supports the approach set out in option C1 not to give an indication of the level of housing provision in rural areas. This would rely on criteria rather than give targets for all settlements and give local planning authorities more freedom to address rural housing through the Local Development Framework. It is more likely to deliver appropriate levels of housing in rural areas than the setting of targets advocated in options C2 and C3. These options would lead to an increase in market housing in rural areas, with a negotiated proportion of affordable housing within each scheme. The draft Macclesfield Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment has shown that the vast majority of our available sites are in urban areas, and there are insufficient sites in rural areas to accommodate general market housing. Sites that would otherwise be considered unsuitable for housing may be able to accommodate small schemes for 100% affordable provision under option C1.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield BC	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield BC	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield BC	No	Macclesfield Borough Council supports the approach set out in option C1 not to give an indication of the level of housing provision in rural areas. This would rely on criteria rather than give targets for all settlements and give local planning authorities more freedom to address rural housing through the Local Development Framework. It is more likely to deliver appropriate levels of housing in rural areas than the setting of targets advocated in options C2 and C3. These options would lead to an increase in market housing in rural areas, with a negotiated proportion of affordable housing within each scheme. The draft Macclesfield Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment has shown that the vast majority of our available sites are in urban areas, and there are insufficient sites in rural areas to accommodate general market housing. Sites that would otherwise be considered unsuitable for housing may be able to accommodate small schemes for 100% affordable provision under option C1.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield BC	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Stewart House	Macclesfield BC	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Indigo Planning

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Charlotte Blinkhorn	Indigo Planning	No	CEG consider that there is a need to set provision levels for rural housing delivery, but that these need to be based on local needs and survey work undertaken through production of the SHLAA.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Charlotte Blinkhorn	Indigo Planning	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Charlotte Blinkhorn	Indigo Planning	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Charlotte Blinkhorn	Indigo Planning	No	As above (answer to C2)CEG consider that there is a need to set provision levels for rural housing delivery, but that these need to be based on local needs and survey work undertaken through production of the SHLAA.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Charlotte Blinkhorn	Indigo Planning	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Charlotte Blinkhorn	Indigo Planning	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Indigo Planning

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Sarah Williams	Indigo Planning	In part	CEG consider that there is a need to set provision levels for rural housing delivery, but that these need to be based on local needs and survey work undertaken through production of the SHLAA		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Sarah Williams	Indigo Planning	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Sarah Williams	Indigo Planning	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Sarah Williams	Indigo Planning	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Sarah Williams	Indigo Planning	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Sarah Williams	Indigo Planning	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Northwest Regional Development Agency

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	-			We note that the options paper refers to 'Safeguarding rural areas' (p. 6). This does not appear to be consistent with Proposed Changes to Submitted Draft RSS where the text of Draft RSS Policy DP1 now refers to 'mainstreaming rural issues', noting that 'safeguarding' was felt to be too narrow an approach in light of the pressures facing rural areas. We would suggest therefore that references to 'safeguarding rural areas' are updated to 'mainstreaming rural issues' in order to ensure a consistent approach. We anticipate the opportunity to comment upon any proposed methodology during the course of the Partial Review.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	-	-	-	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Steven Broomhead	Northwest Regional Development Agency	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>



## National Housing Federation

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Sallie Bridgen	National Housing Federation	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Sallie Bridgen	National Housing Federation	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Sallie Bridgen	National Housing Federation	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Sallie Bridgen	National Housing Federation	Yes	The rural economy and the rural affordable housing crisis go hand in hand. Limited development of affordable homes in rural areas leaves rural employers with restricted opportunities for recruitment. Improving and increasing the affordable housing offer in rural areas is vital to help sustain rural businesses and communities. Ref: Matthew Taylor Review on Rural Economy and Affordable Housing National Housing Federation submission – March 2008 Every year the potential to secure more rural affordable homes from the planning system is missed when there are no robust section 106 agreements in place. Given the urgent pressure on the lack of affordable		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
			homes in rural areas this must be addressed. Please see the Federation's response to the Matthew Taylor review on the rural economy and affordable housing for more detail.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Sallie Bridgen	National Housing Federation	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Sallie Bridgen	National Housing Federation	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Bartonwillmore (on behalf of Paycause Ltd)

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Nathan Smith	Bartonwillmore ( <i>on behalf of Paycause Ltd</i> )	No	Paycause acknowledges that there is a need to deliver all types of housing, including market and "affordable". Our clients believe that having an overall "target" could actually undermine the delivery of housing. Paycause believes that the NW Region housing market is very diverse and as such the delivery of affordable housing should be based on local housing market circumstances. The RSS should provide a flexible framework as is the case of current policy. The delivery of the amount/proportion and location of affordable housing should therefore be based on local circumstances and		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
			specific robust up to date evidence of local need.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Nathan Smith	Bartonwillmore ( <i>on behalf of Paycause Ltd</i> )	Option not supported

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Nathan Smith	Bartonwillmore ( <i>on behalf of Paycause Ltd</i> )	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Option not supported
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Option not supported
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Option not supported
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Option not supported
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Option not supported

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Nathan Smith	Bartonwillmore ( <i>on behalf of Paycause Ltd</i> )	No	Paycause supports the general principle of clear guidance on proportion of growth towards such areas, however there is a need to ensure that the growth is appropriate to settlements and does not undermine the overall spatial framework of the RSS which seeks to prioritise growth towards "higher order settlements" such as Chester.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Nathan Smith	Bartonwillmore ( <i>on behalf of Paycause Ltd</i> )	-

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Nathan Smith	Bartonwillmore (on behalf of Paycause Ltd)	<p><b>A) Delivery:</b> Paycause considers the Liverpool City Region is a key area in accommodating growth in the NWto meet the RSS spatial approach. It is noted that it is diverse in terms of settlement, scale and pattern. Our clients believe that Chester plays a key role in the LCR and wider region, where it is also acknowledged b this Housing Options Paper that there are cross boundary issues with Flintshire and W Cheshire of which Chester falls within. Therefore in order to deliver the core approach our clients do not consider it appropriate to distribute growth towards more rural areas which may lead to a more unsustainable pattern of development. It would be more appropriate to concentrate on "higher order" settlements such as Chester.</p> <p><b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b></p> <p><b>C) Community and social issues? -</b></p> <p><b>D) Environment? -</b></p> <p><b>E) Economy? -</b></p>

## Government Office North West

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
SARA LEWIS	GONW	-			In relation to provision in rural areas it is not clear whether the figures are for affordable housing only or all types of rural housing. The comments above about rural housing redistribution apply. Whilst there is a need to address the issue of rural sustainable communities it is not clear what the purpose of this approach is and how it will fit with other RSS policies including RDF2. This is particularly relevant in the case of option C3 where there could be conflicts with DP policies such as accessibility by public transport in DP5.

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
SARA LEWIS	GONW	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
SARA LEWIS	GONW	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
SARA LEWIS	GONW	-			In relation to provision in rural areas it is not clear whether the figures are for affordable housing only or all types of rural housing. The comments above about rural housing redistribution apply. Whilst there is a need to address the issue of rural sustainable communities it is not clear what the purpose of this approach is and how it will fit with other RSS policies including RDF2. This is particularly relevant in the case of option C3 where there could be conflicts with DP policies such as accessibility by public transport in DP5.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
SARA LEWIS	GONW	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
SARA LEWIS	GONW	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Preston City Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Molyneux	Preston City Council	No	Both this option and C3 impinge on local planning authorities' ability to determine the spatial vision for their area and therefore on their ability to produce Core Strategy where this level of detail is more appropriate. Therefore, the only option that can realistically be supported is C1.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Molyneux	Preston City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Molyneux	Preston City Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Molyneux	Preston City Council	No	Both this option and C2 impinge on local planning authorities' ability to determine the spatial vision for their area and therefore on their ability to produce Core Strategy where this level of detail is more appropriate. Therefore, the only option that can realistically be supported is C1.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Molyneux	Preston City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Molyneux	Preston City Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## The Ramblers Association Manchester and High Peaks Area

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association Manchester and High Peaks Area	-			Regarding the Consultation on "Homes for the Future", i have received the questions section but we have decided not to respond to the questions posed, but to make only one comment which is: We are extremely concerned to see under Section 1 (Issues to be addressed) that the figures presented in RSS documents are "no longer to be seen as maximum targets or ceilings". This could mean that many areas that we would deem unsuitable , eg greenfield land, could be open to unconstrained housing development. As recreational walkers, we feel that this could impair the quality of our walking experience, as it would be difficult to escape from urbanisation, ie the new housing and associated infrastructure that would accompany it. We feel that abolition of an upper limit completely undermined the role of regional planning and we are opposed to this change.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
	Manchester and High Peaks Area	

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association Manchester and High Peaks Area	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association Manchester and High Peaks Area	-			

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association Manchester and High Peaks Area	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Janet Cuff	The Ramblers Association Manchester and High Peaks Area	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>



Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		D) Environment? -
		E) Economy? -

## National Trust

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Hubbard, Alan	National Trust	Yes			It is reasonable to set a target that relates to identified needs.

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Hubbard, Alan	National Trust	No specific comments.

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Hubbard, Alan	National Trust	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Will be dependent upon actions at the local level in terms of assessing requirements, considering potential impacts (e.g. on landscape capacity) and taking forward allocations in LDDs.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> It will be important to ensure that high sustainability standards are met in order to reduce pressure upon infrastructure and meet more needs on site, e.g. in terms of high energy efficiency, on site renewables (especially for medium to large scale developments), minimisation of water use and grey water recycling, waste minimisation and recycling.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> No additional comments.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> NB Comments at A) above re-landscape character capacity to accept change; also issues relating to other environmental assets, their safeguarding and enhancement will need to be addressed.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Need to consider the role of rural diversification and opportunities for new local employment (including live-work units and IT provision) to reduce commuting activity.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Hubbard, Alan	National Trust	No	Unrealistic to assess requirements at this scale of settlement – this needs to be pursued as a bottom up, not a top down exercise, which will need initially to be considered by LPAs in their LDFs (and possibly cross-boundary through HMA work).		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Hubbard, Alan	National Trust	No specific comments.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Hubbard, Alan	National Trust	<b>A) Delivery:</b> No specific comments.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> No specific comments.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> No additional comments.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> No specific comments.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> No specific comments.

## Countryside Properties

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	Yes	Option 1 would provide a specific number of dwellings that must be delivered, which may prove to be too rigid to reflect changes in housing markets and rates of housing delivery over time. Option 2 should therefore be pursued.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
--------------	----------------------	---

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mark Waite	Countryside Properties	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	-	<p>We support option C1: Give no indication of the level of housing provision in rural areas. South Lakeland is a 'rural' district, but also contains two larger towns / service centres in Kendal and Ulverston. The option paper makes reference to the ONS Rural and Urban Area classification (ONS, 2004). Based on these classifications the towns of Kendal and Ulverston would be classified as urban areas. Under option C2 the RSS would give a figure for the level of provision to be made in rural settlements of less than 10,000 population, and option C3 a more detailed split including a separate target for settlements of less than 3000. By inference, these regional targets will be achieved if all authorities implement the split. However, if we were to apply these targets to our district, it would effectively dictate our spatial strategy (ie how much development should be in the two principal service centres of Kendal and Ulverston which have a population over 10000). Our understanding is that it remains the remit of the Core Strategy to make these decisions, underpinned by public participation. Rather than a rural housing target, it is felt that time would be better served providing some direction regarding second homes. Second homes is a major issue in rural areas such as South Lakeland and given that this appears to have been largely overlooked by the RSS, it is disappointing that the options do not consider this.</p>		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
--------------	----------------------	---

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
S Ottewell	South Lakeland District Council Development Plans Team	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Kirby	Lancashire County Council	No	Option C3 is preferred.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Kirby	Lancashire County Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Kirby	Lancashire County Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Kirby	Lancashire County Council	Yes	Option C3 is supported in principle. To recognise local circumstances it is considered that a figure would need to be provided for each housing market area.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Kirby	Lancashire County Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Kirby	Lancashire County Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Cheshire West and Chester

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	No			It is difficult to see on what basis a figure could be set that would be applicable across the region. This is a matter for LDFs. The RSS could certainly flag up this issue and ask LPAs to give it proper consideration preparing DPDs, particularly Core Strategies.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		E) Economy? -

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	No			It is difficult to see on what basis a figure could be set that would be applicable across the region. This is a matter for LDFs. The RSS could certainly flag up this issue and ask LPAs to give it proper consideration preparing DPDs, particularly Core Strategies.

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	-

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Jeremy Owens	Cheshire West and Chester ( <i>comments represent informal officer views</i> )	A) Delivery: -
		B) Infrastructure provision? -
		C) Community and social issues? -
		D) Environment? -
		E) Economy? -

## Haslington Parish Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.



<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
R. Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	No	Do nothing - leads to uncertainty, need to work to a target, need a limit beyond which no more is allowed.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
R. Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	Need to ensure protection of rural areas to ensure communities retain their character.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
R. Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Need to retain existing character of local communities.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Need to ensure existing Green Gaps and Green Belts are protected and potentially expanded – in order to preserve the character of local areas e.g. between Crewe and surrounding villages such as Haslington.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
R. Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	In part	Need to ensure that local communities are explicitly involved in the setting of the targets that directly affect them.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
R. Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	Need to ensure protection of rural areas and their local identities.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
R. Hovey	Haslington Parish Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Need to ensure existing Green Gaps and Green Belts are protected and potentially expanded – in order to preserve the character of local areas e.g. between Crewe and surrounding villages such as Haslington.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Merseyside Policy Unit

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	No		We support Option C1, which would allow those districts which do have significant rural housing to guide development in their rural areas without RSS setting housing requirements.	

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	No	See our response re: C2		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Mike Cryan	Merseyside Policy Unit	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Copeland Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
John Hughes	Copeland Borough Council	No	It is considered that a bottom-up approach utilising the local Cumbria Strategic Housing Market Assessment to derive a local Cumbria rural requirement would be a more sound evidence base to implement at a local level. The top-down approach in this option is not considered appropriate to local circumstances.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
John Hughes	Copeland Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
John Hughes	Copeland Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
John Hughes	Copeland Borough Council	No			It is considered that a bottom-up approach utilising the local Cumbria Strategic Housing Market Assessment to derive a local Cumbria rural requirement would be a more sound evidence base to implement at a local level. PPS3 (Housing) advises that it is a requirement for Local Authorities to carry out Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs) and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs), and it emphasises the importance of this bottom-up approach to defining local housing needs. The top-down approach in this option is not therefore considered appropriate to local planning for housing provision.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
John Hughes	Copeland Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
John Hughes	Copeland Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
	Council	<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Shelter

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Olive Butler	Shelter	Don't know			No comment on figures for level of provision to be made. However, it is vital that within the figures for affordable housing a target for social rented housing in rural areas also included.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Olive Butler	Shelter	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Olive Butler	Shelter	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
--------------	----------------------	--	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Olive Butler	Shelter	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Olive Butler	Shelter	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Olive Butler	Shelter	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Satnam Planning Services Ltd

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Colin Griffiths	Satnam Planning Services Ltd	Yes			Some measure of affordability provision must be included in the RSSPR, testing of this figure is welcomed.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Colin Griffiths	Satnam Planning Services Ltd	Flexibility as to locational matters, together with the characteristics of settlements needs to be investigated.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
--------------	----------------------	---

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Colin Griffiths	Satnam Planning Services Ltd	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Good prospects.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Poor, as high levels of affordable housing will not bring forward the developer led infrastructure requirements and improvements without financial incentives.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> A mixture of affordability issues being addressed and social issues being increased.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Risk of damage unless handled carefully.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Good for the rural economy but should not be allowed to lead to increased levels of commuting.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Colin Griffiths	Satnam Planning Services Ltd	No		This would represent a level of detail not appropriate for RSS.	

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Colin Griffiths	Satnam Planning Services Ltd	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Colin Griffiths	Satnam Planning Services Ltd	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Carlisle City Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	In part	There will as a matter of course inevitably be the need to provide some housing for rural areas and this will form part of the overall RSS requirement for housing however it is difficult to assess how 11,000 at a regional level translates to each rural area. This should be determined locally to deal with local needs but if done as part of the review this could be aggregated into the RSS figures.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	There would be implications for definition of centres over and above key service centres but this must be determined through LDFs. This would make it more difficult to provide an adequate figure at a regional level.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	In part	There is a need to ensure that rural areas are not missed when considering		



<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
			overall housing supply and the figures as part of the spatial strategy. Getting to pre-determined levels for individual centres is too detailed for RSS		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Chris Hardman	Carlisle City Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Ribble Valley Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	No	RVBC Consider that targets for affordable housing should be established at the local level		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	No		RVBC consider that Affordable Housing should be determined at the local level	

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Colin Hirst	Ribble Valley Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Lambert Smith Hampton

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Jennie Hann	Lambert Smith Hampton	No	Option C2 is going beyond the role of strategic planning. It is the role of LAs to decide which are the most appropriate rural settlements for increased housing provision. Some settlements have more facilities than others, and this is not always dependent on the population levels of that settlement. Where settlements have more facilities it is more appropriate to locate increased growth here than in other settlements. To provide a figure for all settlements of <10,000 at a strategic level may have sustainability issues conflicting with national guidance set out in PPS1 and PPS3. The LPAs are better placed to ensure that increased rural housing provision is provided in the most sustainable settlements.		

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Jennie Hann	Lambert Smith Hampton	Amend/revise Policies SD1, SD2 and SD3 of the RSS to support development in settlements <10,000 as policies currently support development around regional poles and surrounding area. Amend/revise Policy UR1 which relates to urban renaissance. Amend/revise Policy RU3 of the RSS to support housing provision more in rural areas. Review/amend Policy RDF1 to support development in rural locations and Policy RDF2 to support development in rural housing provision. Amend sub-regional policy framework to support the rural housing provision.

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Jennie Hann	Lambert Smith Hampton	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Unable to comment on deliverability of rural housing provision until the figures have been fully tested and the Housing Land Availability Assessments have been carried out throughout the region.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Rural housing provision may not improve infrastructure if the numbers provided are relatively small.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Increased rural housing provision will provide a wider choice of housing, high quality housing, mixed communities in terms of tenure and price and a mix of different households.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Would support regeneration of brownfield sites in rural locations, would reduce the potential of skewed investment in certain areas of the region.

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Limited impact on the economy if housing numbers are small, limiting the provision of additional services and facilities.

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Jennie Hann	Lambert Smith Hampton	No	Option C3 is going beyond the role of strategic planning. This option assumes that all settlements have the same facilities and services. This is unrealistic. It is the role of the LPA (who is best placed) to ensure that rural housing provision is provided in the most appropriate settlements in PPS3 terms. Providing rural housing provision figures at the strategic level would limit the control the LPA has in deciding where the most appropriate location for additional housing provision should be situated.		

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Jennie Hann	Lambert Smith Hampton	Amend/revise policies SD1, SD2 and SD3 of the RSS to support development in settlements <3,000 and 3-10,000 as policies currently support development around regional poles and the surrounding area. Amend/revise Policy UR1 which relates to urban renaissance and relate it so that it includes rural renaissance. Amend/revise Policy RU3 of the RSS to support housing provision more in rural areas. Review/amend Policy RDF1 to support development in rural locations and Policy RDF2 to support development in rural housing provision. Amend sub-regional policy framework to support rural housing provision.

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Jennie Hann	Lambert Smith Hampton	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Unable to comment fully on deliverability of rural housing provision until the figures have been tested and the Housing Land Availability Assessments have been carried out throughout the region.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Rural housing provision may not improve infrastructure if the numbers provided are relatively small.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Increased rural housing provision will provide a wider choice of housing, high quality housing, mixed communities in terms of tenure and price and a mix of different households. But may increase reliance on the motor vehicle.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<p><b>D) Environment?</b> Would support the regeneration of brownfield sites in rural locations, would reduce the potential of skewed investment in certain areas of the region. However, would potentially increase unsustainable development if development was encouraged in areas which had few facilities and services.</p> <p><b>E) Economy?</b> Limited impact on the economy if housing numbers are small, limiting the provision of additional services and facilities in these areas.</p>

## West Lancashire District Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Ian Gill	West Lancashire District Council	No			It is impossible to make a judgement at this point in time without knowing the results of the SHLAA and the effect upon rural settlements in the District. This issue should be left to Core Strategies and Site Allocations DPDs and housing need needs to be properly assessed.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Ian Gill	West Lancashire District Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Ian Gill	West Lancashire District Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Ian Gill	West Lancashire District Council	No	It is impossible to make a judgement at this point in time without knowing the results of the SHLAA and the effect upon rural settlements in the District. This issue should be left to Core Strategies and Site Allocations DPDs and housing need needs to be properly assessed.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Ian Gill	West Lancashire District Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Ian Gill	West Lancashire District Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Allerdale Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Richard Evans	Allerdale Borough Council	No	To use a population threshold of 10K pop. is arbitrary and not appropriate. We are talking here about overall housing provision. Some KSCs have less than 10K pop. This option seems to be driven purely by the stated figure for affordable housing being tied to settlements of 10K pop., levels of affordable need must inform the local split but should be derived from bottom up survey not top down prescription. It would be more useful to us for RSS to give an indicative proportional split between KSCs and LSCs rather than an		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
			absolute number in settlements above an absolute size. This should be indicative in order to give authorities some discretion to vary the proportions if local Housing Market Assessments indicate that such are justified.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Richard Evans	Allerdale Borough Council	As above, policy should be based upon the KSC/LSC split rather than an arbitrary population figure.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Richard Evans	Allerdale Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Not clear at this stage
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> As above
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> As above
		<b>D) Environment?</b> As above
		<b>E) Economy?</b> As above

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Richard Evans	Allerdale Borough Council	No	Our reasons are similar to those in Option C2. Use of a population threshold is arbitrary and inappropriate. One of our KSCs, as presently designated, has a pop. of less than 3000. As stated above, it would be more helpful for us if an indicative proportional split were given between KSCs and LSCs. As before a bottom up approach should inform the split in LDFs.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Richard Evans	Allerdale Borough Council	As stated above, policy should be based upon the KSC/LSC split and informed by affordable housing needs. It must always be remembered that in seeking a particular housing mix and a

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
		level of affordable provision in the development control process, the local housing survey/assessment should be paramount.

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Richard Evans	Allerdale Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Not clear at this stage
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> As above
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> As above
		<b>D) Environment?</b> As above
		<b>E) Economy?</b> As above

## Emerson Group

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
D.W. Short	Emerson Group	In part	If a target figure is to be built into the Review then the general level should be stated and, probably the Housing Market Area distribution given. Thereafter the LDD's can provide the more detailed locations in terms of settlement expansion.		

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
D.W. Short	Emerson Group	Review the rural orientated policies.

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
D.W. Short	Emerson Group	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Likely delay whilst policy is formulated and trickles down to District levels. Local opposition likely to this level of change.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Careful consideration needed of how extra capacity can be provided and where. Use existing spare capacity where available and sustainable.



Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Provision of any extra facilities needs to be programmed in to local policy formulation.
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Impact on open countryside and , potential green Belt.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> Upgrade of rural employment opportunities will be needed otherwise commuting likely to increase.

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
D.W. Short	Emerson Group	In part	Guidance will be necessary to inform LDD's.		

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
D.W. Short	Emerson Group	As C2 above

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
D.W. Short	Emerson Group	<b>A) Delivery:</b> As C2 above
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> As C2 above
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> As C2 above
		<b>D) Environment?</b> As C2 above
		<b>E) Economy?</b> As C2 above

## LDNPA

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Paula Allen	LDNPA	No	Policies should reflect the need to sustain communities rather than being a		

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
			simple numbers game. Housing delivery is much too complicated for that. Figures of this nature should be set locally to reflect local circumstances. LPAs work closely with their local communities and are therefore in a much better position to decide what is needed and where. This should be a 'bottom up' approach and not top down. The RSS still reflects the spirit of PPS3.		

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?			
Paula Allen	LDNPA	Recognise the importance of local needs surveys! Put the hooks in place to encourage these to be done.			

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:			
Paula Allen	LDNPA	<b>A) Delivery:</b> All the settlements within the LDNP have a population under 10,000 so all new housing provided contributes to this aspiration. Usual delivery issues, land acquisition, build costs, unit grant price, etc			
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> usual things as previously expressed, highways, waste, utilities, sewerage, water provision, flooding, etc. all difficult to negotiate with service providers due to economies of scale.			
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> All new housing in rural areas should have a positive effect on supporting and maintaining vibrant communities. They need to be secured so that these units are not lost to the open market and thus contributing further to the external demands from inward migration and second home ownership.			
		<b>D) Environment?</b> The capacity of the environment to accommodate house building needs to be considered when establishing figures.			
		<b>E) Economy?</b> The retention of local people to support local businesses is important.			

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Paula Allen	LDNPA	No			Too prescriptive. More appropriate for this to be locally led. It has the potential to undermine our policy approach in the LDNP. Technical research not drilled down sufficiently to the local level and is therefore not reflective of actual need. The Affordable Rural Housing Commission final report noted the problems of data not being available at the local level. It recommends that those undertaking HMAs should use data at least at ward level and ideally below that, and should take account of the views of local communities.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Paula Allen	LDNPA	Changes to HPDG would be useful to provide the carrot and not just the stick!

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Paula Allen	LDNPA	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Taylor Young Ltd

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Peter Haymes	Taylor Young Ltd	In part			I think it is important to set targets to encourage them to be met, although it may be better to set a proportional figure instead

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Peter Haymes	Taylor Young Ltd	-

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Peter Haymes	Taylor Young Ltd	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Developers may be discouraged from developing in certain rural areas is there is a high requirement for affordable homes here. How will this be enforced?
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Once again - resistance from the existing communities is to be expected especially if a set figure is put in place
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Development sites are going to be primarily greenfield sites
		<b>E) Economy?</b> See response to A1.2

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Peter Haymes	Taylor Young Ltd	In part	It will highlight the need that growth needs to be spread through all settlements and cannot be met purely by the big cities.		

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Peter Haymes	Taylor Young Ltd	-

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Peter Haymes	Taylor Young Ltd	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	No	Development in rural settlements is too sensitive. It should be for local authorities to decide in consultation with their own local communities through Community Strategies etc., to protect the character of these settlements. Rural housing can still be provided by each district within each district's housing requirement based on local circumstances.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	This Option may represent a change to the overall spatial strategy.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Wirral's villages are in the Green Belt and a number are designated conservation areas, where development would need to be more carefully considered and controlled.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Wirral's villages are in the Green Belt and a number are designated conservation areas, where development would need to be more carefully considered and controlled.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	No	Development in rural settlements is too sensitive. It should be for local authorities to decide in consultation with their own local communities through		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
			Community Strategies etc., to protect the character of these settlements. Rural housing can still be provided by each district within each district's housing requirement based on local circumstances.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	This Option may represent a change to the overall spatial strategy.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Andrew Fraser	Wirral MBC	<b>A) Delivery:</b> Wirral's villages are in the Green Belt and a number are designated conservation areas, where development would need to be more carefully considered and controlled.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Wirral's villages are in the Green Belt and a number are designated conservation areas, where development would need to be more carefully considered and controlled.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Pendle Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Jonathan Dicken	Pendle Borough Council	No	The amount of new housing to be located in rural areas should be set at a local level, determined and justified by the local evidence base, for example SHMAs. The Burnley and Pendle SHMA sets an affordable housing provision number for the rural areas. Other evidence base work has also been undertaken at a local level to look at the sustainability of rural areas. This work, along with other evidence base documents such as the SHLAA, helps		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
			to identify which settlements can accommodate an increase in development. It looks specifically at the existing levels of service provision and where there is potential capacity for further development. This work has been specifically undertaken following the decisions from inspectors on Core Strategies which have failed from not having a robust evidence base in place to show that settlements are sustainable and can accommodate housing growth. The establishment of a rural housing provision figure would have severe implications on the capacity of services and infrastructure. If a rural housing provision figure has to be derived it would be more appropriate to provide an affordable housing figure for rural areas rather than an overall housing figure. However, this would need to be aligned with the figure derived in the SHMA.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Jonathan Dicken	Pendle Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Jonathan Dicken	Pendle Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Jonathan Dicken	Pendle Borough Council	No	Setting figures for settlements of less than 3,000 and between 3,000 – 10,000 would be restrictive and would provide less flexibility for local		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
			<p>authorities to decide where new dwellings should be located. The location of new housing should be determined at the local level, taking into account local circumstances. The local evidence base is best placed to determine the most sustainable locations for new development. Evidence base work on the sustainability of rural areas has been undertaken to identify which settlements can accommodate an increase in development. This work looks specifically at the existing levels of service provision and where there is potential capacity for further development. This work has been specifically undertaken following the decisions from inspectors on Core Strategies which have failed from not having a robust evidence base in place to show that settlements are sustainable and can accommodate housing growth. If a rural housing provision figure has to be derived it would be more appropriate to provide an affordable housing figure for rural areas rather than an overall housing figure. However, this would need to be aligned with the figure derived in the SHMA.</p>		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Jonathan Dicken	Pendle Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Jonathan Dicken	Pendle Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Congleton Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.



<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	Don't know	It is not clear from the detail provided with the option whether this figure for the provision of rural housing will be provided for the region as a whole, or by housing market area or by local authority or whether the figure will be a maximum or minimum figure. It is also not clear how the figure will be determined, for example will it purely be based on the Affordable Rural Housing Commission figure of 11,000 units per annum. Again, it is suggested that above approaches rather oversimplify some of the more complex issues that will need to be addressed in relation to development within the rural areas. A figure could be provided but further consideration would need to be given to a number of related issues such as the sustainability of development in these rural areas, the effects on their existing infrastructure (services, amenities, transport etc), the significant differences between the rural areas across the region and the relationship of these developments to the urban areas in close proximity.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
--------------	----------------------	--	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	Don't know	It is not clear from the detail provided with the option whether this figure for the provision of rural housing will be provided for the region as a whole, or by housing market area or by local authority or whether the figure will be a maximum or minimum figure. It is also not clear how the figure will be determined, for example will it purely be based on the Affordable Rural Housing Commission figure of 11,000 units per annum. Again, it is suggested that above approaches rather oversimplify some of the more complex issues that will need to be addressed in relation to development within the rural areas. A figure could be provided but further consideration would need to be given to a number of related issues such as the sustainability of development in these rural areas, the effects on their existing infrastructure (services, amenities, transport etc), the significant differences between the rural areas across the region and the relationship of these developments to the urban areas in close proximity.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Joanne Dutton	Congleton Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

## Upper Eden Community Plan Group

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Tom Woof	Upper Eden Community Plan Group	No	We agree with C3		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Tom Woof	Upper Eden Community Plan Group	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Tom Woof	Upper Eden Community Plan Group	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Tom Woof	Upper Eden Community Plan Group	Yes	The provision of housing and affordable housing in rural areas is locationally critical. The evidence of need for housing in rural areas overwhelmingly points to that need being most acute in the smaller rural settlements. This does not mean that the need is large, rather that the need is small, but acute. Small settlements, hamlets and sparse parishes require, like everywhere else, a level of housing development that will allow the community and economy to remain stable, and hopefully improve. To allow this to happen, planning policy should explicitly allow small levels of development in all parishes commensurate with their needs. We estimate that an annual allocation of 1% of the existing household figure of a parish		

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
			<p>will sustain that community and encourage younger people to stay. Such a policy will not exclude the majority of the population of rural districts like Eden from the opportunity to maintain the family and social networks essential for sustainable living. The Governments overall policy aim for housing and planning in paragraph 9 of PPS3 states that everybody should be given the opportunity to live in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community where they want to live. Recent policies have prevented this aim from being achieved. It is important therefore for regional policy to make clear that housing must be provided in smaller communities, and indeed to prevent any community from being excluded from the opportunity to provide housing to meet its needs. The CRC is therefore correct to highlight the need for RSSs to set out the level of housing for smaller communities. In Eden the vast majority, some 70% of the population live in settlements of less than 3000, and most live in settlements of less than 1000. Regional policy should not only set out targets for housing in these settlements, but should encourage LPAs to use Parish Plans to determine local targets at parish level. In the Upper Eden area we have developed a formula approach to cover 17 parishes based on 1% per annum of existing households within each Parish. We believe that this approach can not only deliver a controlled and essential level of housing to the most sparse areas of the country, but can also deliver the majority of it as affordable housing. Through self build affordable housing schemes. The implications for monitoring this approach are unclear. LPAs have a duty to monitor housing in any event, and the ability to classify new development as affordable or otherwise, and the type of location in which it falls is well developed. We do not see any difficulty with undertaking a monitoring exercise suitable to allow this policy approach to be adopted. It may be that the correct approach could encourage parishes to participate in the monitoring process thus alleviating the principle authorities from any additional responsibilities.</p>		

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Tom Woof	Upper Eden Community Plan Group	As previously stated, a higher allocation of housing for rural areas will be required in order to allow both the ability to tackle the affordable housing need, and keep the general population stable and productive. A focus of new development should occur within the largest settlements together with a controlled level of development in the smaller ones. Such an approach for Eden

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
		<p>will require an allocation and delivery of something over 300 units per year. Despite the work they require, HMAs are crude tools for policy making even at District level. Policy should encourage finer and finer grain assessments of housing markets and use the results to set (eventually) site specific targets. Parishes are particularly well placed to carry out this work. Affordable housing targets should be set in absolute terms by higher tier policy and set as proportions as locally as possible. In general and hitherto, Regional Policy has ignored parish representation, and in fairness, parishes have ignored Regional Policy. There is much that can be gained by combining the local with the strategic. The issue of sustainable development is often misunderstood by policy makers, giving too great an emphasis on carbon emissions for transport use rather than the opportunities development in small communities can create. Regional policy has an opportunity to clarify the role appropriate rural development can play in sustaining small communities, contributing to renewable energy targets, and diversifying the rural economy. Higher tier policy has a role in setting the agenda to tackle unsustainable behaviour, rather than seeking to identify unsustainable locations.</p>

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Tom Woof	Upper Eden Community Plan Group	<p><b>A) Delivery:</b> There will be less risk to the delivery of the overall housing figures in rural areas by encouraging a more dispersed development pattern. More potential housing sites will be available. However, the proportions and thresholds for affordable housing will be a key factor in this. The smallest settlements will be able to accept the highest proportion of affordable housing as self build schemes in single unit developments.</p> <p><b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Important infrastructure vital for the well being of communities, such as education and health facilities, will be sustained by a stable population. There is more likely to be capacity in the local road, water and sewage infrastructure for a series of small scale developments dispersed throughout the rural areas.</p> <p><b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Settlements of less than 3000 require identified housing allocations to allow those in the community to plan ahead for their families. The ability to be secure in the knowledge that family members can remain local will affect a number of key life decisions such as educational choices for children, care for elderly parents, business development, self employment, farming practices, and, marriage and relationships. Without the confidence that the necessary housing will be available to support these choices, many such decisions may be put off, avoided, or taken elsewhere. The result is that the local communities are diminished through exodus.</p> <p><b>D) Environment?</b> The environmental impact of setting housing targets for small communities will protect greenfield areas adjacent to the larger settlements by reducing the requirement for all the</p>

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		<p>housing to be located there. The corollary is that small sites will be developed within smaller settlements. Overall, a more 'organic' pattern of development will ensue creating a less intrusive visual impact on the landscape. Smaller scale developments will also be more likely to fall within the environmental capacity of sites than larger ones. For a given quantity of development in an already sparsely developed rural area, a series of smaller individual schemes will be more acceptable than a fewer larger schemes.</p> <p><b>E) Economy?</b> A policy that encourages a greater number of smaller housing developments in smaller settlements will encourage smaller building firms to be sustained and grow in the rural areas. This will benefit the rural economy through reducing the net loss of economic multipliers to large volume house builders based outside the rural area. Completed housing within smaller settlements secured for local people will improve the local economy by providing additional markets and labour for local firms and service providers.</p>

## Cheshire East Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	No	Option C1 would rely on criteria rather than give targets for all settlements. This will give Local Planning Authorities more freedom to address rural housing through the Local Development Framework. It is more likely to deliver appropriate levels of rural housing in the right locations, than the setting of overall targets as advocated in options 2 and 3. This approach is preferred.		

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	<p><b>A) Delivery:</b> -</p> <p><b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -</p>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	No			Option C1 would rely on criteria rather than give targets for all settlements. This will give Local Planning Authorities more freedom to address rural housing through the Local Development Framework. It is more likely to deliver appropriate levels of rural housing in the right locations, than the setting of overall targets as advocated in options 2 and 3.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Paul Urwin	Cheshire East Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Chorley Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	No	This option impinges on the ability of a local planning authority to determine the spatial vision for their area and therefore on their ability to produce a Core Strategy where this level of detail is more appropriate		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	No	This option impinges on the ability of a local planning authority to determine the spatial vision for their area and therefore on their ability to produce a Core Strategy where this level of detail is more appropriate		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>



<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Alison Marland	Chorley Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## Chester City Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	No			While the importance of housing provision in the rural area is acknowledged, a rigid target for house building for settlements of below 3,000 and between 3,000 and 10,000 people would reduce the flexibility of local authorities to plan for local needs. If a rigid formula is adopted, especially in smaller settlements, the danger is that problems with bringing forward any one site could severely affect the ability of local authorities to deliver growth in those settlements and so meet RSS targets. In addition, while some smaller settlements may have the capacity for a higher level of growth – such as available brownfield sites - and benefit from good transport infrastructure, other settlements of a similar size may be less sustainable and have less capacity to accommodate growth. The distribution of housing development within an area should be for local authorities to determine through their Local Development Frameworks, taking into account the views of local communities, local need, capacity and sustainability.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
--------------	----------------------	---

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	No	See previous comments		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Adrian Tofts	Chester City Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

## CPRE North West

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
--------------	----------------------	--	-----------------------	-----------------------------	---

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	-	-		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	In part			To meet the recommendations of the Commission for Rural Communities and the Affordable Rural Housing Commission, RSS should set out guidance on the levels of housing to be delivered in settlements of under 3,000, and between 3,000 and 10,000. The type of development is set out in policy RDF2 – Rural Areas, ie to be of a scale and nature appropriate to meeting local needs, and to improve the quality of rural life. There is a very significant shortfall in the availability of affordable housing in particular in rural communities. This must be addressed in order to retain rural settlements as functioning communities rather than commuter dormitories or retirement villages. However, it is vital in pursuing this option that levels of affordable and market housing are distinguished from each other. There is a danger, particularly in the current economic / housing market conditions, that this policy option could be used in order to open up greenfield sites for executive housing that does nothing to improve the

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
			<p>balance or viability of rural communities. If this option is pursued, robust mechanisms must be put in place to prevent this happening. It will be important to ensure that the policy promotes targeted delivery to areas where housing will meet an identified need and will tackle issues of rural deprivation and decline of rural communities and economies. It is also vital, in order to comply with the spatial principles underpinning RSS, that any level set out under this option be seen as a target and a maximum, and NOT as a minimum level. This would compromise the requirements to maintain and enhance environmental quality and local character and distinctiveness, and would have the potential to undermine the spatial framework.</p>		

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	<p>This option would be implemented most effectively if total housing provision in RSS was treated as both a target and a maximum. Policies RDF2 and possibly DP8 would have to be refined in order to reflect this option. There would need to be an even clearer policy statement that development in rural areas must be to improve the sustainability of those settlements as living, functioning communities.</p>

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Andy Yuille	CPRE North West	<p><b>A) Delivery:</b> This option should ensure that sufficient, but not excessive, housing development would take place within rural settlements to ensure that they can be sustained as functioning, mixed, balanced communities.</p>
		<p><b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> In giving guidance on the amount of housing to be accommodated in rural areas, consideration would need to be given to the provision of sustainable transport infrastructure (eg public / community / demand responsive transport); environmental infrastructure (eg water supply / waste water); green infrastructure (eg play areas); and social infrastructure (eg schools, health services, shops, employment opportunities) in, or accessible by sustainable means from, rural communities.</p>
		<p><b>C) Community and social issues?</b> This option has the potential to improve the sustainability of rural communities, retaining younger people and those on lower incomes, and improving the mix and balance of population in rural settlements.</p>

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		<p><b>D) Environment?</b> This option would have to be very carefully managed in order to ensure that it did not result in any dilution of the requirements to maintain and enhance environmental quality and local character and distinctiveness.</p> <p><b>E) Economy?</b> This option has the potential to boost the rural economy by enabling more people of working age to live and work in rural settlements.</p>

## Manchester Disabled People's Access Group

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Flick Harris	Manchester Disabled People's Access Group	In part	Important to support affordable housing in areas where land value and housing value has risen beyond the reach of local people. Also ensure that there is sufficient accessible housing/accommodation for disabled and older people in rural communities, including the requirements of particular communities such as gypsies and travellers.		

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Flick Harris	Manchester Disabled People's Access Group	Mapping of accessible accommodation to new standards which include better specifications than Decent Homes and Lifetime Homes and incorporate guidance on accessibility and sustainability

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Flick Harris	Manchester Disabled People's Access Group	<p><b>A) Delivery:</b> Requires an agreed set of specifications and design standards for accessible housing Financial strategies for affordable housing to be made available for buyers</p> <p><b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Design standards incorporating accessibility and sustainability 2. Mapping process across the region to cover social housing and private sector housing 3. Encourage local authorities to provide percentage of accessible and adaptable accommodation 4. Advice and guidance for developers and for potential tenants, residents and community groups on options</p>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> Need to support mixed and sustainable communities, including range of ages, family structures and housing provision, along with community facilities, employment and travel opportunities
		<b>D) Environment?</b> Protection of green belt areas Design features to incorporate accessibility and sustainable, and energy conservation features
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Flick Harris	Manchester Disabled People's Access Group	Don't know		Don't have enough evidence to make any decision on this option	

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Flick Harris	Manchester Disabled People's Access Group	-

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Flick Harris	Manchester Disabled People's Access Group	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Graham Hale	Cumbria County Council / Cumbria Strategic Partnership	No	<p>It is considered that a bottom-up approach, utilising the local Cumbria Strategic Housing Market Assessment to derive a local Cumbria rural requirement would be a more sound evidence base to implement at a local level.</p> <p>The top-down approach in this option is not considered appropriate to local circumstances.</p>		

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Graham Hale	Cumbria County Council / Cumbria Strategic Partnership	It is not clear as to what the policy implications might be arising from using this option.

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Graham Hale	Cumbria County Council / Cumbria Strategic Partnership	<p><b>A) Delivery:</b> There are concerns about whether or not RSLs developers/house builders would be able to deliver this number of new affordable units, given present funding arrangements. It is important that there should be sufficient open market housing sites allocated in the LDFs to enable the increased level of delivery via cross-subsidy through S106 agreements.</p>
		<p><b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Not clear at this stage, however there may be implications for infrastructure especially within the rural parts of the County as well as the need to take proper account of the potential impacts upon the character of rural settlements.</p>
		<p><b>C) Community and social issues?</b> It is considered that there are likely to be effects upon community and social issues in the rural parts of the county.</p>
		<p><b>D) Environment?</b> Consideration will need to be taken of the environmental effects of higher levels of provision of affordable housing, especially in the rural parts of the County, such as South Lakeland and Eden.</p>
		<p><b>E) Economy?</b> It is likely that an increase in the provision of affordable housing would support the development of the economy, especially in rural areas.</p>

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Graham Hale	Cumbria County Council / Cumbria Strategic Partnership	No	<p>It is considered that a bottom-up approach utilising the local Cumbria Strategic Housing Market Assessment to derive a local Cumbria rural requirement would be a more sound evidence base to implement at a local level.</p> <p>PPS3 (Housing) advises that it is a requirement for Local Authorities to carry out Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs) and Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs), and it emphasises the importance of this bottom-up approach to defining local housing needs.</p> <p>The top-down approach in this option is not therefore considered appropriate to local planning for housing provision.</p>		

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Graham Hale	Cumbria County Council / Cumbria Strategic Partnership	It is not clear as to what the policy implications might be arising from using this option.

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Graham Hale	Cumbria County Council / Cumbria Strategic Partnership	<p><b>A) Delivery:</b> There are concerns about whether or not RSLs developers/house builders would be able to deliver this number of new affordable units, given present funding arrangements.</p> <p>It is important that there should be sufficient open market housing sites allocated in the LDFs to enable the increased level of delivery via cross-subsidy through S106 agreements.</p>
		<p><b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> Not clear at this stage, however there may be implications for infrastructure especially within the rural parts of the County as well as the need to take proper account of the potential impacts upon the character of rural settlements.</p>
		<p><b>C) Community and social issues?</b> It is considered that there are likely to be effects upon community and social issues in the rural parts of the county.</p>
		<p><b>D) Environment?</b> Consideration will need to be taken of the environmental effects of higher levels of provision of affordable housing, especially in the rural parts of the County, such as South Lakeland and Eden.</p>
		<p><b>E) Economy?</b> It is likely that an increase in the provision of affordable housing would support the</p>



Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
		development of the economy, especially in rural areas.

## Persimmon Homes (Lancashire) Limited and Prime Resorts Limited

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

Name:	Organisation:	1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?	1a. If so why?	1b. If not, why not?	1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
Nayan Gandhi	<i>on behalf of</i> Persimmon Homes (Lancashire) Limited and Prime Resorts Limited.	In part	We agree in part that there should be a provision made for rural housing. However, we disagree that it should always be located in settlements. There are, in special circumstances (including sustainability and maximising the use of previously developed land), reasons which mean that development may also take place outside of existing small settlements. This is in accordance with guidance in paragraph 41 of PPS3.		

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Nayan Gandhi	<i>on behalf of</i> Persimmon Homes (Lancashire) Limited and Prime Resorts Limited.	Policies DP1, DP8, RDF2, RDF5, L4 and Table 7.1

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Nayan Gandhi	<i>on behalf of</i> Persimmon Homes (Lancashire) Limited and Prime Resorts Limited.	<b>A) Delivery:</b> No different implications to the NWP.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> No different implications to the NWP.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> This will assist in ensuring the long-term survival of key essential facilities and services in the rural area (e.g. post offices, pubs, general stores, etc).
		<b>D) Environment?</b> No different implications to the NWP.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> This will assist in enabling young professionals and skilled workers to remain in their rural locality, thus assisting in the diversification of the rural economy.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Nayan Gandhi	<i>on behalf of</i> Persimmon Homes (Lancashire) Limited and Prime Resorts Limited.	In part			

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Nayan Gandhi	<i>on behalf of</i> Persimmon Homes (Lancashire) Limited and Prime Resorts Limited.	Policies DP1, DP8, RDF2, RDF5, L4 and Table 7.1

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Nayan Gandhi	<i>on behalf of</i> Persimmon Homes (Lancashire) Limited and Prime Resorts Limited.	<b>A) Delivery:</b> No different implications to the NWP.
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> No different implications to the NWP.
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> This will assist in ensuring the long-term survival of key essential facilities and services in the rural area (e.g. post offices, pubs, general stores, etc).
		<b>D) Environment?</b> No different implications to the NWP.
		<b>E) Economy?</b> This will assist in enabling young professionals and skilled workers to remain in their rural locality, thus assisting in the diversification of the rural economy.

## Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council

The table below shows the verbatim comments received.

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C2?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	No	Option C1 would rely on criteria rather than give targets for all settlements. This will give Local Planning Authorities more freedom to address rural housing through the Local Development Framework. It is more likely to deliver appropriate levels of rural housing in the right locations, than the setting of overall targets as advocated in options 2 and 3. This approach is preferred. This approach is preferred.		

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery: -</b>
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision? -</b>
		<b>C) Community and social issues? -</b>
		<b>D) Environment? -</b>
		<b>E) Economy? -</b>

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organisation:</b>	<b>1. Do you agree with Housing Option C3?</b>	<b>1a. If so why?</b>	<b>1b. If not, why not?</b>	<b>1c. Please explain your answer to the previous question.</b>
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	No	Option C1 would rely on criteria rather than give targets for all settlements. This will give Local Planning Authorities more freedom to address rural housing through the Local Development Framework. It is more likely to deliver appropriate levels of rural housing in the right locations, than the setting of overall targets as advocated in options 2 and 3. This approach is preferred.		

Name:	Organisation:	2. What other policy changes are required to RSS to deliver this option and why?
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	

Name:	Organisation:	3. In taking forward this option, what are the implications for:
Paul Urwin	Crewe and Nantwich Borough Council	<b>A) Delivery:</b> -
		<b>B) Infrastructure provision?</b> -
		<b>C) Community and social issues?</b> -
		<b>D) Environment?</b> -
		<b>E) Economy?</b> -