

## 8500/IC1

Examination into the JCS of the GNDP  
Public Examination - Inspectors Changes  
30 December 2010

Hugh Ivins BA MRTPI  
Representor Ref 8500  
Re Matters IC 1 & IC6

Further Representations IC1 (NDR) (Document RF 117)

i) Para 6.18 In the final sentence of the proposed amendment the word 'some' should be replaced by 'sufficient', to ensure that development can continue to take place in accordance with the other policies of the JCS.

ii) Policy 20 page 93 – new paragraph after para 7.11. In proposed para 7 'Postwick' should be clarified as 'the Postwick Hub', to avoid confusion with any other Postwick proposals.

Further Representations IC 6(FC 1,2 and 3) (Supporting Document IC6)

a) Change to FC1; (Policy 4)

iii) It is necessary to qualify the proposed word 'regularly', to define what will 'kick start' this process within the 'updated needs assessment' and how often this will be monitored.

iv) Clarification is still necessary in respect of the meaning of 'numbers rounded, upwards from 0.5), particularly in the example where it relates to sites of 15 dwellings and the 30% proportion results in exactly 4.5 dw, in which case confirmation is needed that it will result in a requirement for 4 affordable units and not 5 units, as 0.5 is equal to 50% which is no more than half and it is upwards from 51% that is greater than half.

b) Changes to FC2; (para 5.29)

v) It needs to be recognised that the 'open-book process' approach is not the only one that can be used. The GLA and Housing Corporation 'toolkits' and Three Dragons Viability Assessment are others. The NNDC Core Strategy adopted in September 2008, para 3.2.12 simply states 'Applicants seeking to justify a lower proportion of affordable housing will be required to demonstrate why it is not economically viable to make provision'.

c)Changes to FC3 (paras28, 28A, 28B & 28C)

Para 28

vi)It is not clear why the word ‘permanently’ needs to be in this paragraph. PPS3 Housing Annexe B in defining ‘affordable housing’ does not use this word at all.

Para 28A

vii) Due to the ‘frontloading’,an additional sentence should be inserted towards the end of the proposed amended paragraph as follows ..’43% of overall provision. ‘However, this will be part of any site viability considerations that may prevent sites from coming forward at the appropriate time’. Regular monitoring ..

Para 28B

viii) No change to proposed advertised amendment

Para 28C

ix)The GNDP Supporting Document IC6 also includes paragraph 5.28C which does not appear to have been either subsumed into the above paragraphs or removed under the Inspectors advertised changes.

Hugh Ivins BA MRTPI

23 January 2011