

### Meeting Chat Transcript 05.09.24 - RSN session on the NPPF Consultation

#### Recording

This event is recorded for note taking purposes. We may also share images of those speaking on camera.

**Michael Burton, Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk** to Everyone 11:08

The new targets are directly a result of the removal of the 35% urban uplift that the previous Government (Boris Johnson's) introduced when they saw the implications of delivering 300,000 for rural constituencies.

**Cllr Peter Jackson - Lancaster City Council** to Everyone 11:09

Lancaster City Council is in the Oh No, it's impossible camp.

**Steve Priestley - North Kesteven District Council** to Everyone 11:11

Targets are one thing but there is only a certain amount of capacity, ability and appetite for delivery amongst the development sector- yet again planning will be penalised or painted as the blockage, but there are wider issues about meeting the nation's housing need. 👍 4

**Jaimie Jeyes, North Devon Council** 11:14 (Edited)

..and RPs ability to pick up s106 at present 👍 5

**Steve Priestley - North Kesteven District Council** 11:15

Indeed!

**Brian Wilson, Brian Wilson Associates** 11:16

Greater London is the least affordable place in the country, but its target has fallen. This does seem to imply the urban uplift is important. 👍 1

**Michael Burton, Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk** to Everyone 11:19

Hello All. Sorry about the audio problems. Hopefully sorted now. I just wanted to say that I am left feeling "here we go again". The concerns about near doubling of targets in the case of King's Lynn and West Norfolk becomes meaningless and effectively equates to planning by appeal. 👍 2

**Helen Wright, East Riding of Yorkshire Council** to Everyone 11:23

Audio and video problems! Just to say that the increase in housing numbers for East Riding is unrealistic. Agree with the earlier points about access to services and service provision.

**Vince Walsh - CAN Northumberland** to Everyone 11:19

The increase in Northumberland is 222% 549 to 1769 compared to much lower increases for Newcastle -4% and North Tyneside 44% doesn't make sense and not sure there is a land supply/resources to achieve these numbers and construction industry at a real low point 👍 1

**Andrea King, Northumberland County Council** 11:24

Yes, it would more than treble our minimum LHN to a level that's double our Local Plan's annual average requirement (885pa), and even higher than the significantly-above-requirement delivery in the past 8 yrs (1552pa).

**Daniel Corden, Shropshire Council** to Everyone 11:25

Proposed changes to the NPPF would remove the ability to utilise an alternative to the standard methodology.

**John Prickett - Isle of Wight Council** to Everyone 11:32

When speaking about "truly affordable on local rural level wages/salaries" does that include affordable home ownership? Which form of average is used for the wages/salaries?

**Cllr Andrew Brown, North Norfolk DC** to Everyone 11:32

Daniel is spot on about the viability challenge which would need reform to support wage linked affordable homes criteria

**Cllr Vincent Langdon-Morris - East Suffolk District Council** to Everyone 11:32

Sort of saying that the widely used term 'affordability' is, in effect, an oxymoron? Its a term developed by private sector developers ... who fund the housing development and influence policy at the centre .....

**Michael Burton, Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk** to Everyone 11:34

The former approach, whereby affordable housing needs are delivered on the back of conventional market housing have long gone. For rural areas, the focus should be upon Rural Exceptions schemes and/ or Neighbourhood Plans. These have some leverage in terms of setting local eligibility criteria.

**Jaimie Jeyes, North Devon Council** to Everyone 11:34

And HE grant won't cover s106 units (unless additionality or 100% AH)...

**Brian Wilson, Brian Wilson Associates** to Everyone 11:34

Spot on Mary. Unless Rachel Reeves is going to come up with extra funding, the intentions re affordable housing - including social rent - are surely pie in the sky.

**Andrea King, Northumberland County Council** to Everyone 11:34

Agree Government needs to more clearly set out the affordable housing proportion of their aspirational (yet unevidenced and unjustified) 300,000 housing requirement figure (NB. new standard method apparently seeks to achieve 375,000). But the issue is then about viability in delivering that. We need more affordable homes, not just any new homes regardless of affordability.

**Steve Priestley - North Kesteven District Council** to Everyone 11:35

The system is based on maintaining a cash return for the landowner and developer - proper land value uplift capture would fund affordable housing and wider infrastructure but no Govt has or will address this!

**Vince Walsh - CAN Northumberland** to Everyone 11:35

Homes England will need to double the grant rates to achieve the level of social rent and viability is a real concern for achieving social rent for RPs historically in some areas of North East

**Michael Burton, Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk** to Everyone 11:36

Generally supportive of tightened definition and move away from prioritising "discount market" housing which, in many rural areas, is still unaffordable/ out of reach of most people (e.g. 30% discount). 👍 2

**Jo Lavis (Richardson), Rural Housing Solutions** to Everyone 11:37

Grant critical to RPs being willing to take on small rural developments 👍 1

**Mary Ridgway Teignbridge DC** to Everyone 11:37

The capital gains tax relief on rural exception site is important 👍 1

**Vince Walsh - CAN Northumberland** to Everyone 11:39

Homes England need to introduce a national rural housing target - only soft rural target at present based at regional level introducing rural housing multiplier and RES passport for planning will also help 👍 2

**Michael Burton, Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk** to Everyone 11:39  
Proposed measures are bold, but may be overly prescriptive and arguably could represent a top-down approach to setting local authority spatial strategies (i.e. what goes where, and when). Development viability will always be a consideration.

**Daniel Corden, Shropshire Council** to Everyone 11:39  
The other issue in rural areas is the maintenance of the minimum size site/capacity thresholds for affordable housing - which is inconsistent with the proposal to change the direction that first 10% of affordable housing is for home ownership.

**Mary Ridgway Teignbridge DC** to Everyone 11:40  
not value of land Kerry its build cost sqm I was referring to

**David Morren, East Cambridgeshire DC** to Everyone 11:43  
Agree Steve we really struggle to get RSPs to want to take on small numbers of plots especially in the more rural areas as they prefer a quantum within smaller areas

**David Morren, East Cambridgeshire DC** to Everyone 11:45  
We had led with respect to CLT developments but the governments limit on the size of such developments caused both our LP to be effectively withdrawn and a single issue review undertaken. Locally for us we would want to use the CLT mechanism to deliver what the local people want in their communities. Kennett shows that a large (nearly 500 home) rural development can be delivered in this manner 👍 2

**Steve Priestley - North Kesteven District Council** to Everyone 11:46  
For RP partners rural exception sites seem to have to be at least 20 homes and preferably more to garner interest! The rural target the HE set should include the size of the schemes as well so important smaller schemes get delivered. But I suspect Govt will be all over the headline delivery numbers not the amount of bespoke rural delivery

**Kerry Booth, Rural Services Network** to Everyone 11:46  
For info-the recent research on Rural Exception Sites- <https://www.housing.org.uk/rural-exception-sites/>

**Jo Lavis (Richardson), Rural Housing Solutions** to Everyone 11:47  
Would 'well related' work better as wording for location/

**Andrea King, Northumberland County Council** to Everyone 11:47 (Edited)  
NPPF/PPG definition of rural exception sites already provides for being within, adjacent to or well-related to existing settlements.

**Mary Ridgway Teignbridge DC** to Everyone 11:47  
Reference to CLT and CLH is important. Positive inclusion in last NPPF which RSN could support and build on. They are a part of the mix of solutions, albeit maybe slowly unless strong policy framework and funding so strengthening the references in most recent NPPF helpful

**Michael Burton, Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk** to Everyone 11:49  
Pippa makes some really good points. The wider issue is the overly simplistic thinking; e.g. brownfield is good but by definition challenging to develop, while greenfield is easier to deliver/ offers potential for more financial return.

**Mary Ridgway Teignbridge DC** to Everyone 11:49

If RP have SP funding they should be required to deliver a target for rural as part of that contract

**Vince Walsh - CAN Northumberland** to Everyone 11:50

There needs to more housing diversity rather than a focus on volume in urban areas including rural and market towns - the drive for housing numbers in more urban areas will lead to more pressure on existing services

RPs do have rural/ supported housing targets in their SP programmes in the North East

**Jo Lavis (Richardson), Rural Housing Solutions** to Everyone 11:51

One of the reasons for the RES planning passport is to encourage RPs as it reduces risk and cost. But agree this has to be part of a package that includes better grant funding for rural affordable housing reflecting higher costs of development result of lack of econs of scale, rurality and remoteness etc.

**Mary Ridgway Teignbridge DC** to Everyone 11:51

CIL regs also important with loss of CIL on self build being significant for LAs and ability to fund infrastructure

**Jo Lavis (Richardson), Rural Housing Solutions** to Everyone 11:53

Re. Mary's point - could something to be done about S106 obligations e.g. education - RES be exempt

**Michael Burton, Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk** to Everyone 11:54

Well said - NPPF/ national thresholds have been tried before and this "one size fits all" is inevitably inappropriate at the local level

**RSN** to Everyone 11:54

#### **Feedback welcome**

We always seek to improve our services, and welcome feedback from our members. If you wish to leave us feedback for this event, please contact [events@sparse.gov.uk](mailto:events@sparse.gov.uk)

#### **Future events**

Book your place at future events at <https://www.rsonline.org.uk/future-meetings-and-events>  
Please note, our events are free to attend for RSN members only.

**Mary Ridgway Teignbridge DC** to Everyone 11:54

suggest social housing relief for CIL allow slightly wider range of discount for affordable self build

**RSN** to Everyone 11:55

#### **RSN Delivering for Rural Campaign**

<https://www.rsonline.org.uk/winning-the-rural-vote>

**Mary Ridgway Teignbridge DC** to Everyone 11:55

funding Housing Needs Surveys now a massive challenge LAs not got the funds. Need to be commissioned independently but paid for by any developers bringing sites forward in a parish 👍 1

**Jane Wormald, Uttlesfield District Council** to Everyone 11:55

green infrastructure and access to nature and wildlife too

**Jo Lavis (Richardson), Rural Housing Solutions** to Everyone 11:56

There is a national threshold now that precludes many rural areas from securing affordable housing because so many sites are small . It would be good if rural could take advantage of this route too. 👍 1

**Roger Ranson - Rutland County Council** to Everyone 11:57  
it is calendar year

**Michael Burton, Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk** to Everyone 11:58  
As an overall point, the Government has proceeded with a great deal of haste in reviewing/ updating the NPPF. This has only provided a limited window for a national conversation or responses/ representations to be given proper consideration. This is a fundamental concern, although we need to recognise that the Government is keen to get going with developing policies (NPPF and others).

**Steve Priestley - North Kesteven District Council** to Everyone 11:42  
As RPs get larger and larger through mergers and secure significant Strategic Partnership funding they have less capacity or appetite to deliver smaller rural schemes unfortunately . Need to support smaller specialist rural RPs with funding and capacity support.

**Mary Ridgway Teignbridge DC** 11:43  
and community led housing

**John Prickett - Isle of Wight Council** 11:58  
Agree! Possibly the only way on small rural sites - RPs not really interested in those here

**RSN** to Everyone 12:00

**Thank you**

For joining us today and for your contributions. Presentations and useful links will be emailed to you shortly. If you have any queries about our events, please contact [events@sparse.gov.uk](mailto:events@sparse.gov.uk)

**Roger Ranson - Rutland County Council** to Everyone 12:00  
there will be viability considerations in moving the threshold

**Jane Wormald, Uttlesfield District Council** to Everyone 12:01  
Will check with management and then will forward on if ok. Thank you very much for today.

**Jo Lavis (Richardson), Rural Housing Solutions** to Everyone 12:01  
Yes, but LAs can set them according to the viability in their areas and decision on whether on site of commuted sum

**Cllr Gordon Czapiewski, Mid Devon District** to Everyone 12:01

