

Worthing Draft Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document

Summary of Consultation Responses - Spring 2014

001	Samantha Prior – Sussex Police	Officer Response
	<p>Welcome this clear & concise document which explains the relationship between mechanisms. Welcome reference to 'Crime Prevention' (p16) as this will help to ensure that site specific requirements, such as CCTV and neighbourhood policing offices could be secured through legal agreements for larger development sites. Provided such facilities can be grouped under this '<i>Crime Prevention</i>' category, and can be justified (necessary and related to the specific development) then this wording within the proposed SPD is welcomed.</p>	Noted
002	Ben Cheal – Roffey Homes Ltd	Officer Response
	<p>In principle support for the guidance. However, disagree with requirement set out on Page 22 – if affordable housing is provided off site then it is wrong to calculate the percentage of affordable housing based on the total of both sites. Each site should be judged on their own size and the calculation carried out accordingly.</p>	<p>The Council will seek to ensure that there is no net loss in the level of affordable housing delivered across all sites that meet with policy requirements. It is considered that the existing wording is clear as this explains that affordable housing will be sought in line with what would be expected from each opportunity.</p>
003	Lucy Seymour-Bowry – West Sussex County Council	Officer Response
	<p>WSSCC has been working with WBC to identify infrastructure needs to support planned development.</p> <p>P10: Infrastructure to be funded through CIL – It is recommended that Green Infrastructure is specifically mentioned in this section.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to list G.I. here – other elements are</p>

<p>P16: It is encouraging to see that there is recognition that planning obligations would be an appropriate funding mechanism for a new school.</p> <p>Please add a bullet point for Green Infrastructure for inclusion in the list of infrastructure types that may be required and negotiated through a planning obligation.</p>	<p>not listed. This is the role of the Reg123 list.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Reference to G.I. added</p>
<p>004 Gladman Developments (Peter Dutton)</p>	<p>Officer Response</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPDs should not be used to introduce new policies. • Legal tests must be met in order for planning obligations to be sought. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a condition. • Planning obligations can only be sought where they are necessary to address the unacceptable planning impacts of a development. Contributions must be based on up-to-date, robust evidence of infrastructure needs and clearly based on policy requirements. • Planning obligations cannot be used to make up the funding gap for desirable infrastructure. • Planning obligations should be applied flexibly to prevent planned development being stalled. The costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development should, when taking account of the normal costs of development, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable. • Where the Council intends to fund an item of infrastructure through its CIL it cannot seek planning obligations for the same item of infrastructure. • The Council recognises that there will be instances where development proposals will be made unviable through obligations (particularly affordable housing). We welcome the recognition that there may be occasions when flexibility will be applied to achieve economic viability. 	<p>This representation largely provides a summary of relevant guidance and legislation. In this respect, the comments provide a useful checklist for the Council. In all respects it is considered that the requirements / expectations listed have been met within the document. Therefore, no additional amendments are required.</p>

Acknowledgement (no comments made)

- Highways Agency (Elizabeth Cleaver)