

| Reference | Name | Organisation | Comment | BA Responses | Proposed changes |
|-----------|-------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|
| #1 | Laura Waters | Norfolk County Council | The LPA needs to be clear when they will accept a Viability Report's conclusions over provision of flood risk mitigation or SuDS. | Further clarification was sought from NCC and it seems that in some areas surface water flood risk may not have been addressed because of viability concerns in doing so. The Broads Authority has a recently adopted Local Plan with a strong surface water policy. It also has a Flood Risk SPD that is out for consultation at the same time as this and the LLFA seem content with it (and they helped to produce it). So in the absence of suggested text, in the absence of examples of where surface water has not been addressed in the Broads due to viability, in the presence of a recently adopted strong surface water policy, and in the presence of a SPD that refers to surface water which is supported by the LLFA, it is concluded that no change is needed in response to Norfolk County Council LLFA's comment. | No change to SPD |
| #2 | Joy Brown | Norwich City Council | With regards to the length of period for marketing although I would have no objection to the extension to 18 months within a stagnant market, I would suggest that 18 months is a long time to expect someone to market something before a change of use or redevelopment can be considered. Within Norwich City although we don't specify a time within our Local Plan we would only normally expect something to be marketed for around 9-12 months as within this time adjustments can be made to the marketing strategy if there is very little interest initially. | Comment noted. We agree that a longer period if the market is stagnant should be removed from the SPD. | Remove the reference to a longer period if the market is stagnant. |
| #3 | Joy Brown | Norwich City Council | The SPD could clarify how benchmark land value will be calculated and what won't be considered. | The area of the Broads is very mixed. We currently do not specify a process; we rely on guidance and the check by the independent person/district valuer. If the respondent would like to propose some wording and suggest where it goes then we can consider this. | No change to SPD |
| #4 | Joy Brown | Norwich City Council | The SPD could set out what is a reasonable profit level. | The area of the Broads is very mixed. We currently do not specify a process; we rely on guidance and the check by the independent person/district valuer. If the respondent would like to propose some wording and suggest where it goes then we can consider this. | No change to SPD |
| #5 | Joy Brown | Norwich City Council | The SPD could explain when viability would be reviewed if development hasn't commenced/been occupied i.e. is there a review mechanism built into s106 agreements? | We would expect the developer to come to us if they are experiencing issues. If sites do not come forward we will contact them as part of monitoring process. | No change to SPD |
| #6 | Lorraine Houseago | Norfolk County Council | We have no other comments to make. | Noted. | No change to SPD |
| #7 | Penny Turner | Norfolk Policy ACLO | We have no comments on the above at this stage. | Noted. | No change to SPD |
| #8 | James Knight | Individual | I am a former member of the RICS Governing Council, a South Norfolk District Councillor, and an appointed member of the Broads Authority and its Planning Committee. I am responding to this consultation in my capacity as a private individual, property developer and company director. I am not responding in my capacity as a member of the Broads Authority or its Planning Committee. | Noted. | No change to SPD |
| #9 | James Knight | Individual | 3.1. Viability assessments have a limited and specific scope, which is to determine the level of planning contributions which might be appropriate for a proposed development whilst maintaining its viability and deliverability. 3.2. The use of viability assessments to prove that an existing use is not viable appears to be a misuse of the principle of viability assessments as envisaged by the NPPF. 3.3. This may simply be a case of semantics (ie the SPD means 'marketing assessment' when it says 'viability assessment'). But there is a significant difference between proving that there is no demand for a property, and proving that an existing business which happens to trade from a property is viable. The first is clearly within the ambit of planning, whereas the second is not. | Noted. Perhaps in the next Local Plan we could say 'assessment of the viability of continuing the current use' or something like that. We could also add some explanatory text along those lines in the SPD as well. In general, assessing the viability of an existing use is an accepted approach when considering change of use applications. See response to comment #11 for local examples and National Park examples. | Add a section to clarify what we mean by viability assessments in this instance along the lines of 'assessment of the viability of continuing the current use' |
| #10 | James Knight | Individual | 3.4. The SPD lists 13 policies which contain viability requirements, including changes of use on any historic building, waterside site, employment land or holiday property. This represents a substantial proportion of all land within the Broads Executive Area. Notwithstanding the fact that the Plan has been adopted, this appears to be excessive by comparison with the policies of other local authorities, and demonstrates an overprescriptive approach to planning which is contrary to the overriding presumption in favour of sustainable development. | Noted. As Mr Knight says, the Local Plan is adopted. The SPD cannot change policy - it seeks to help the implementation. As such, the SPD cannot change policy, but the comment is noted for the next Local Plan. These are important uses which contribute to the special character of the Broads and are protected under planning policy for that very reason. However, we do accept that things change and planning does not seek to stop change, but to facilitate appropriate change where it can be demonstrated that an existing use is no longer viable. | No change to SPD |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|------------|---|---|---|
| #11 | James Knight | Individual | 3.5. In particular, the focus on requiring viability assessments when seeking changes of use in so many different circumstances demonstrates a pre-disposition against change, which is contrary to the principle of ensuring viability and sustainability, and in conflict with other policies designed to protect and enhance the Broads. Preventing or delaying change does not protect businesses. The Broads owes its historical success to its ability to evolve over time, and it must be allowed to continue to do so. | <p>Noted. See answer to previous comment. The use of viability assessments in considering proposals for change is a well established planning approach which has been used, for example, to protect town centre uses since around the 1980s.</p> <p>We looked at the local plans of our districts and some National Parks. Here are some examples from other LPAs that follow a similar approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadland Council, Development Management DPD, Policy CSU2, page 54. Requires change of use of community facilities to prove no longer viable. 12 month marketing period. • South Norfolk, Development Management DPD, Page 34 onwards. Employment use – evidence not viable and at least 6 months active professional marketing. Page 97 onwards. Community use – 6 months. • North Norfolk, Core Strategy and Development Management DPD, Page 97 onwards. Tourism accommodation – 12 months. Page 103 onwards. Local facilities and services – 12 months • Former Waveney area, Local Plan, Page 58 – change of use of employment at a particular site – 12 months. Page 205, 8.22 – self build plots – 12 months. Page 220 – employment – 12 months. Page 228 – tourist accommodation - 12 months. Page 237 – community facilities -12 months. Appendix 4 – marketing requirements. • Great Yarmouth, Core Strategy Local Plan, Page 54 – employment – 18 months. Page 97 – community facilitates 'thorough' but no timescale. • Norwich City, Development Management DPD, Page 155 onwards – community facilities – 9 months • Exmoor National Park, Local Plan, Page 195 - local commercial services and community facilities - 12 months. Page 213, employment land, 12 months. Page 228, serviced accommodation, 12 months. • Peak district, Development Management Document, Page 109, shops, community services and facilities, 12 months. Page 63, employment sites, 12 months. | No change to SPD |
| #12 | James Knight | Individual | 3.6. Small businesses are rarely cash rich. Owners will often fail to spot the early signs of decline, hoping each year that the next will be an improvement. It is often the case that they can be on the verge of failure before they consider the necessity of making significant changes. The cost and delay of producing a viability assessment could easily be the final nail in the coffin of a business which might otherwise be saved through a (possibly partial) change of use or other development. | This comment seems to suggest that when a business is in decline, the cost and time required to produce a viability assessment could be 'fatal'. It doesn't explain how not doing a viability assessment would alter this trajectory. If it is not viable then the outcome of the viability assessment will be to allow it to change to another use. | No change to SPD |
| #13 | James Knight | Individual | 3.7. The same is true in the case of historic buildings - in the absence of grant or charitable aid, historic buildings must continue to have an economic value in order to ensure their future. Resisting 'inappropriate' changes of use must be balanced against the need to ensure that the building has some future. There is a danger that, whilst lengthy viability assessments are being carried out, a building may continue to deteriorate to the point where it is no longer economically viable to save it. | <p>Heritage assets are of importance locally and nationally and it has been long recognised by the planning system that the best way to protect them is keep them in a viable use. For the use to be an appropriate means to protect the building, it does not have to be the most economically viable use (i.e. the most profitable), but it needs to be one that recognises and balances the specific constraints of the building. A viability assessment is a way of doing this.</p> <p>The NPPF is clear in relation to change of use of a heritage asset. 192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.</p> | No change to SPD |
| #14 | James Knight | Individual | 3.8. Whilst recognising the value and importance of policy-led planning, sometimes it is obvious that an existing use is neither viable nor, in many cases, even desirable when considering location and other factors. Under those circumstances, insisting on lengthy marketing or viability periods to "prove" what is already obvious can be an unhelpful box ticking exercise which is of no value to the applicant, future occupiers or the local community. | Planning relies on the presentation and consideration of evidence in favour or against a particular development. It will rarely be the case that something was so obvious that evidence was not needed. If evidence was not required and the planning system accepted assertions made without evidence, it may act as an incentive to run businesses down to get another use. See row #11 that shows the 12 month marketing period is consistent with other LPAs. | No change to SPD |
| #15 | James Knight | Individual | 3.9. Great care should be taken to ensure that requirements placed upon applicants to demonstrate viability of existing businesses, as distinct from demonstrating demand (or lack of it) for the property, are reasonable, proportionate and in accordance both with the NPPF and National Planning Guidance. | Noted. The approach of the Local plan is consistent with the NPPG and NPPF as the Local Plan has been assessed by an Independent Planning Inspector who concluded the plan to be sound. Conformity with the NPPF and NPPG is a key consideration. | No change to SPD |
| #16 | James Knight | Individual | 4.1. Where a marketing assessment is considered necessary, it is helpful for applicants to know in advance what is required of them, and this fundamental purpose of the SPD is therefore supported. | Support for SPD noted. | No change to SPD |
| #17 | James Knight | Individual | 4.2. The marketing instructions in section 5.4 are, however, far more prescriptive than should be expected from a planning document. The guidance significantly over-reaches itself into the detail of the work of an estate agent or surveyor, which is not only beyond the scope of a planning authority but will also rapidly become out of date. This section should simply identify the requirement for the applicant to use their best endeavours to use all appropriate methods to maximise exposure to the market. | The SPD clearly says that 'if you do not wish to use a particular method, you will need to fully explain and justify this in your strategy'. So this allows the marketing strategy to reflect the site being marketed. We can also make reference to the need for proportionality in relation to what is provided. | Make reference to proportionality. |
| #18 | James Knight | Individual | 4.3. Paragraph 5.5 is unreasonable in its requirements and exceeds those required by most other planning authorities. Some wealthy landowners holding vacant sites may be able to wait for 12 months, but for a majority of small business owners, this delay could be terminal. The concept of making the marketing period even longer when the market is stagnant – and the occupier is likely already to be suffering financial hardship – shows a breath-taking lack of understanding of the harsh realities facing businesses. | Comment noted. The 12 month period is consistent with many other Local Planning Authorities as set out at the response to comment #11. The SPD cannot change Local Plan policy. We will note this comment for when the Local Plan is reviewed. We agree that a longer period if the market is stagnant should be removed from the SPD. | Remove the reference to a longer period if the market is stagnant. In relation to the 3 month interval, add text that says along the lines of 'unless otherwise agreed with the Broads Authority as LPA'. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|----------------------|---|---|---|
| #19 | James Knight | Individual | 4.4. The arbitrary imposition of a 12-month (or even longer) marketing period, regardless of site-specific circumstances or other material considerations, is unnecessary and disproportionate. It would be better to specify a range (from say 3 to 12 months), which allows officers some flexibility in interpretation and the ability to negotiate with the applicant. | Comment noted. The 12 month period is consistent with many other Local Planning Authorities as set out at the response at row #11 and previous answer where we propose to add some flexibility to re-advertising. | See previous proposed change. |
| #20 | James Knight | Individual | 5.1. There are of course times when grants or other external interventions are useful and desirable in order to make improvements to a business which would otherwise be unaffordable. 5.2. It is rare, however, for an unprofitable business to be rendered profitable in the long term through public subsidy, and planning authorities should not – as a matter of policy - be encouraging businesses to seek external financial support in order to make a business viable. “Viable” means making a business capable of standing on its own feet for the foreseeable future, rather than just finding a way of making it last a few years longer in order to satisfy a regressive planning policy. | The planning system does not operate to support individual businesses, but to manage land use and protect land uses that are important to the character and operation of an area. The success or otherwise of a business can be dependent on the activities of its owner; operator 2 may make a success of a business where operator 1 has failed and this needs to be recognised. The reference to the potential for business rate relief came from a Member of Planning Committee who is a Councillor in one of our district councils. | No change to SPD |
| #21 | James Knight | Individual | 6.1. The principle of having a guide to assist planning applicants in ensuring that applications contain all relevant information at the outset is supported. | Support for SPD noted. | No change to SPD |
| #22 | James Knight | Individual | 6.2. Viability Assessments are a useful tool for determining an appropriate level of planning contributions for new development. | Noted. | No change to SPD |
| #23 | James Knight | Individual | 6.3. Marketing Assessments can be useful under limited circumstances in order to protect historic assets or the underlying character of culture the Broads. | Noted. | No change to SPD |
| #24 | James Knight | Individual | 6.4. The need to protect character and culture needs to be balanced against practicality and economic reality. It is not in the interests of residents, businesses or visitors for the Broads to become a decaying museum of past glories. | Noted. | No change to SPD |
| #25 | James Knight | Individual | 6.5. Marketing periods must be reasonable and proportionate in relation to the individual site. An arbitrary “one size fits all” period of 12 months (or more) is not conducive to positive planning. | Noted. It is proposed to remove the reference to longer periods if the market is stagnant. Also, this SPD cannot change things in the Local Plan. As detailed in response #11, these are the periods used in our districts' local plans: Broadland DC: 12 months South Norfolk DC: 6 months North Norfolk: 12 months WDC/East Suffolk: 12 months GYBC: 18 months for employment; no set time for community facilities Norwich CC: 9 months | No change to SPD |
| #26 | James Knight | Individual | 6.6. Good planning means identifying genuinely viable and sustainable uses for land and buildings - which might entail changes of use – rather than relying on public interventions and grants to maintain the status quo. | Noted. Policies allow change of use if certain criteria are met. The reference to public interventions and grants is an option and was suggested a few years ago by a Planning Committee Member as something to consider. | No change to SPD |
| #27 | James Knight | Individual | 6.7. The Broads Authority must become less prescriptive and more flexible in its approach to planning, accepting that generalised policies might not be appropriate or desirable in certain locations and could result in perverse outcomes if applied rigidly. | This SPD cannot change policy. We will note this comment down for when we produce the next Local Plan. | No change to SPD |
| #28 | Ben Wright | East Suffolk Council | The Council is broadly supportive of the details in the SPD. East Suffolk has similar requirements but these are set out in the appendices of the Local Plan covering the former Waveney area and the emerging Local Plan covering the former Suffolk Coastal area. The basis for this approach is the Council's Commercial Property Marketing Best Practice Guide which was published in August 2016. | Support for SPD noted. | No change to SPD |
| #29 | Ben Wright | East Suffolk Council | Business rate relief (lines 281-284). The SPD highlights that district council's may provide business rate relief. Although this is possible, it is a different approach from that of East Suffolk. Therefore would suggest that we consider ways to ensure greater consistency particularly in parts of East Suffolk that are within the Broads Authority. | Asked for clarification. This was an observation. ES were saying that seeking business rate relief is not a requirement in their Local Plan. It was explained to ES that the point of this section is for the applicant to consider ways of trying to improve the success of their business by trying the suggested 'interventions'. One of the interventions is to ask the district council for rate relief. The SPD does not say that this relief will be granted, but asks the applicant to consider asking for it. The District may agree or not and that discussion and outcome will help inform any decision making. ES clarified that they were not after any changes and did not suggest any changes; rather they wanted to highlight this. | No change to SPD |
| #30 | Ben Wright | East Suffolk Council | Confidentiality (lines 294-303). The Council support the intention that viability assessments are made available – this is consistent with the approach set out in the Local Plan for Waveney and the emerging Local Plan for Suffolk Coastal. | Support for SPD noted. | No change to SPD |
| #31 | Ben Wright | East Suffolk Council | Proposals relating to Public Houses (lines 318-330). Although we support the requirements set out, the section should probably include reference to public houses that may be identified as Assets of Community Value. My understanding is that the district council would identify these (even if within the Broads Authority) and therefore probably should be referenced in this SPD. | Agree with proposed change. | It is also important to note that some public houses may be listed as Assets of Community Value. These are allocated as such by the District Council, in liaison with the Broads Authority. There are certain requirements relating to these Assets which can be found here: https://mycommunity.org.uk/help-centre/resources/land-and-building-assets/assets-community-value-acv/. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| #32 | John Walchester and Simon Marjoram | Broadland District Council and South Norfolk District Council | An issue of concern is Para. 5.5 of the "Supplementary Planning Document on Marketing and Viability Assessment Requirements (Draft Consultation Version) September 2019". This appears to set out a marketing period of a minimum of 15 months. If this were to apply solely to a loss of commercial activity to residential use then this could help protect the potential commercial use of the site. However, Para. 5.1 of the document seems to indicate that this applies to any change of use – even from one commercial use to another (where planning permission is required). If this is the case, this seems excessive and it may be advisable to reduce this eg to a marketing period of 6 months. A period of 15 months for a commercial change of use could drive any potential developer/tenant elsewhere and leave the site stagnated and not responsive to economic trends. | Comment noted. We agree that a longer period if the market is stagnant should be removed from the SPD. The period of 12 months is consistent with other LPAS - see row #11. | Remove the reference to a longer period if the market is stagnant. |
| #33 | Charlie Middleton | Beccles Town Council | The Planning Committee, replying on behalf of Beccles Town Council, consider all three documents provide comprehensive support for the planning policies of the Broads Authority. | Support noted. | No change to SPD |
| #34 | Simon Marjoram | South Norfolk District Council | The Council would also highlight that many sites within the Broads Authority area include multiple uses. Some of these uses are core functions, important to the role, function and character of the Broads, and others are more ancillary in nature. As such, the SPD should explicitly include the potential for sites to be subdivided, with its requirements only applied to those elements that are the subject of any application, rather than the whole land holding and also reflecting the greater desirability of retaining those core functions. | On sites in a mixed use where change is proposed, we would always encourage a landowner to submit a comprehensive scheme and information covering the range of activities and always seek to be proportionate. | No change to SPD |
| #35 | Yvonne Wonnacott | Bramerton Parish Council | No comment | Noted. | No change to SPD |
| #36 | Ian Withington | North Norfolk District Council | Section 5.4 implies that the BA may request other ways of marketing. Could usefully say that the marketing strategy will need to be agreed in advance with the Broad's Authority. | We do say this in section 5.3. But see no harm in adding it again at 5.4. | Add: The Marketing Strategy will be agreed with the Broads Authority in advance. |
| #37 | Ian Withington | North Norfolk District Council | Section 6.2 Early on in the section it should set out that the Local Plan underwent viability testing and the national guidance's states that the assumptions and approach used in the plan wide viability should also form the basis of any site specific viability assessment submitted. The contextual information could also spell out in what circumstances site specific viability appraisals could be submitted. i.e that where up to date policies have set out the contributions expected from development, planning applications that comply with them will be assumed to be viable. hence no need to include an assessment unless contesting the council's position. Consider adding: The Local Plan Viability Assessment also sets the preferred standard approach to appraisals. Any viability assessment for specific applications must refer back to the assessment of the Plan and the standard methodology used, and be transparent. In all cases, submitted assessments will be made publicly available in accordance with paragraph 57 of the NPPF. | Some text added about the viability assessment for the Local Plan. It should be noted that the Local Plan was assessed against the 2012 NPPF and so the NPPG relating to viability appraisals and Local Plans was slightly different to what is in place now. Section 5 refers to policies that have an element relating to viability assessments and shows the circumstances when site specific viability assessments will likely be required. | Add this text to the start of section 7: It is important to note that the Local Plan and its policies underwent a viability appraisal as part of the production and examination. The viability appraisal and its assumptions should be an important consideration when producing a site-specific viability assessment. Footnote: By way of background, the Local Plan for the Broads was examined using the 2012 NPPF. It is noted that the NPPG and the new NPPF have specific requirements relating to viability appraisals and these are noted. When determining the specifics of a site-specific viability appraisal, the current NPPF and NPPG will be referred to, noting that the Local Plan was examined under the 2012 NPPF. |
| #38 | Ian Withington | North Norfolk District Council | Line 270 – it would be preferable if the optional approach indicated by the word "ideally" is not used. The SPD should clearly set out what is expected and also include an executive summary that brings it all together in descriptive form. le Any assessments submitted should include an executive summary and include a spreadsheet version of the viability assessment model that can be 270 opened and interrogated in Microsoft Excel and similar spreadsheet software applications. We 271 strongly recommend Homes England's Development Appraisal Tool, an open sourced spreadsheet 272 that anyone can use. | Noted. Will amend text. | Amend text to say: Any assessments submitted needs to include an executive summary and ideally, the appraisal will include a spreadsheet version of the viability assessment model that can be opened and interrogated in Microsoft Excel and similar spreadsheet software applications. We strongly recommend Homes England's Development Appraisal Tool, an open sourced spreadsheet that anyone can use. |
| #39 | Ian Withington | North Norfolk District Council | It would also be useful to place emphasis on the fact that viability assessments must now not be based on information specific to the developer, and therefore need not be treated as commercially sensitive. If commercially sensitive information is included, then it should be aggregated in published viability assessments and executive summaries. | Noted. Will amend text. | Add: Viability assessments must now not be based on information specific to the developer, and therefore need not be treated as commercially sensitive. If commercially sensitive information is included, then it should be aggregated in published viability assessments and executive summaries. |

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------|--|
| #40 | Ian Withington | North Norfolk District Council | <p>You may also wish to include text around land values and the onus now being on site promoters and developers to ensure that the price paid for land does not negatively affect the delivery of this Local Plan's objectives. Government advice clearly states that the "price paid for land is not a relevant justification for failing to accord with relevant policies in the plan" PPG, Section on Viability, para. 002. Reference ID: 10-002-20180724 revision 24.07.18. and where necessary the Local Planning Authority will require submission of viability and option agreements. Where land with planning permission is subsequently sold, the price paid for land should not be inflated to such an extent that it compromises the existing permission. Such land transactions should remain at a price that ensures that the development remains policy compliant.</p> | | <p>Add a new section as follows: <u>7.2 Land Values</u> <u>Site promoters and developers need to ensure that the price paid for land does not negatively affect the delivery of this Local Plan's objectives. The NPPG says:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>'The price paid for land is not a relevant justification for failing to accord with relevant policies in the plan. Landowners and site purchasers should consider this when agreeing land transactions'</u> <u>'It is important for developers and other parties buying (or interested in buying) land to have regard to the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies when agreeing a price for the land. Under no circumstances will the price paid for land be a relevant justification for failing to accord with relevant policies in the plan'</u> <u>'Under no circumstances will the price paid for land be a relevant justification for failing to accord with relevant policies in the plan'</u> <u>Where land with planning permission is subsequently sold, the price paid for land should not be inflated to such an extent that it compromises the existing permission. Such land transactions should remain at a price that ensures that the development remains policy compliant.</u></p> |
| #41 | Ian Withington | North Norfolk District Council | <p>Section 6.5 Disagree planning practice guidance is now clear that viability assessment should be prepared on the basis that it will be made publicly available other than in exceptional circumstances. Even when there are exceptional circumstances (i.e the BA's is satisfied that the information is commercially sensitive)the executive summary should be made public. In such publications the commercially sensitive information should be aggregated into costs in the executive summary. This DOES NOT mean that the information is not split out in the appraisal - just that it is not published in agreement with the BA's. Please see detail in Paragraph: 021 Reference ID: 10-021-20190509 Revision date: 09 05 2019.</p> <p>Suggest that references to the BA's keeping some or all of the appraisal confidential are removed</p> | Noted. Will amend text. | <p>7.6 Confidentiality <u>Planning practice guidance is now clear that viability assessment should be prepared on the basis that it will be made publicly available other than in exceptional circumstances.</u> In general, viability assessments are published online (as part of the supporting documents for planning applications on the Broads Authority's website) and are kept in the planning application file with the other studies, plans and information contained within the planning application. Members of the public may ask to see these files.</p> <p>In exceptional circumstances, where the publication of information would harm the competitiveness of a business due to the necessity to include commercial information unique to that business, the Authority will consider keeping some or all of the viability assessment confidential. In such cases, the applicant will need to provide full justification as to why the harm caused would outweigh the public interest in publishing the information.</p> <p><u>Even when there are exceptional circumstances (i.e. the Authority is satisfied that the information is commercially sensitive) the executive summary should be made public. In such publications, the commercially sensitive information should be aggregated into costs in the executive summary. This does not mean that the information is not split out in the appraisal; just that it is not published in agreement with the Authority. Please see detail in Paragraph: 021 Reference ID: 10-021-20190509 Revision date: 09 05 2019.</u></p> |
| #42 | Ian Withington | North Norfolk District Council | Section 6.8 – welcome the clarification that independent verification will be at the expense of the applicant. | Support noted. | No change to SPD |
| #43 | Ian Withington | North Norfolk District Council | <p>Policy DM34 surely the BA's wish to maximise affordable housing provision. if so the text should stipulate that the viability assessment should show the highest viable percentage and also using the transfer values used in the Local Plan viability testing along with an assessment of each type / mix of tenures to maximize the position and provision. Assessment should not just take the lowest transfer value i.e social rented.</p> | Noted. Will amend text. | <p>Add text to say: Policy DM34: Affordable housing reasoned justification says that effectively, the district's percentage will be a starting point for assessment. If viability is an issue, the assessment can assess lower percentages. <u>In assessing lower percentages, the assessment should demonstrate at what percentage the scheme becomes unviable. Any assessment should use different tenures as they have different transfer values. For example, shared equity may be 50% market value; Low Cost Home Ownership may be 80 % market value. Where a developer is suggesting a scheme is unviable and seeking to reduce affordable housing they should model the highest transfer values in order to maximise the choice.</u></p> |
| #44 | Ian Withington | North Norfolk District Council | Consider adding text that if no viability assessment is submitted then it will be assumed that the application is policy compliant and full policy ask is being delivered / not contended | Noted. Will amend text. | <p>Add text to say: <u>If no viability assessment is submitted then it will be assumed that the application is policy compliant and full policy ask is being delivered / not contended</u></p> |