Comment

Consultee	Mr Colin Adams (106357)
Email Address	[redacted]
Address	[redacted]
Event Name	Affordable Housing Delivery Local Plan - Issues and Options
Comment by	Mr Colin Adams
Comment ID	AHDIO10
Response Date	09/10/14 13:37
Consultation Point	Question 3 (View)
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

Question 3

Do you have any comments regarding the general requirement of 35% affordable housing?

Considering Moral Hazard and the SDA sites in Hailsham/ Hellingly that are probably marginally viable and the issue of social housing provision.. / It is important to ensure that house builders pay appropriate value for these sites. Why? I learnt at the SSLP EiP this summer that Bloor had extracted themselves from the Options Deal that they had been paying for some ten years They did so after the CS was found sound, they did so after, probably, paying at least half a million pounds for nil return / [my guess - having talked to one of their sales staff at the Woodside Site who said they were paying £50,000 p.a. and would be happy to be shot of the whole thing]. / Does this tell us something about the viability of much of site HHE? / Moral Hazard: when risky adventures are taken on the assumption that somebody else will pick up the pieces. Residential development on the previous Local Plan sites in Greater Hailsham demonstrates who picked up some of the bill last time round. No funding for the additional educational places and no land for the required primary school. This does demonstrate an enviable(?) track record! / Additionally Wealden's planners and councillors decided to concentrate significant additional housing across areas where there is a Development Headroom Issue that will preclude Non Local Plan building that cannot finance measures such as packaged (private) waste water treatment. I assume here that any 'shortfall' social housing would fall into this category. / I do not know if the allocations of around 35% social housing for the current Local Plans are adequate or justified in terms of need . If they are; then they needed to be delivered within the constraints of costs and development headroom and the local plan duration. If 'developers' are paid over the odds for development sites with marginal viability then the builder must not be in a position to significantly reduce or eliminate social housing provision as a way of rebuilding profit without consequence. / In this potentially catastrophic situation where much of the Hellingly/ and Hailsham sites are clearly marginal and there is no other, geographically distributed , site competition to bear down on land prices; a clear policy must be put into place that links open market provision and social housing. / It should be thus: if the builder cannot

or will not make provision for social housing and seeks a reduction then there should be an equivalent reduction in open market provision allowing the development headroom to redistributed for off-site social housing provision. (where of course is the problem – reuse of sites that fail to come forward?) / It is to be hoped that such a clear policy will ensure that builders pay appropriate values for these marginal sites. / [It would of course have been more sensible not allocating these local plan sites in the first place!]