

Representation on the Sheffield Plan Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.056.001

What is your Name: NStyles

If you are making this representation as a member of an organisation, what is the name of your organisation:

The Planning Bureau

If you or your organisation are making a representation on behalf of another person, organisation or group, please tell us who it is and its role:

McCarthy Stone

Document

Which document to you wish to make a representation on:

Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Which section of the document is your representation on:

Chapter 3: Growth Plan and Spatial Strategy

Which paragraph/site/map layer of the document is representation on:

N/A

Representation

Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant: No

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: No

Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate: Yes

Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate:

POLICY SP1: OVERALL GROWTH PLAN

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Sheffield Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation. McCarthy Stone is the leading provider of specialist housing for older people in the UK.

Government's policy, as set out in the revised NPPF, is to boost significantly, the supply of housing. Paragraph 60 reads "To support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay."

The revised NPPF looks at delivering a sufficient supply of homes, Paragraph 62 identifies within this context that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies including older people.

In June 2019 the PPG was updated to include a section on Housing for Older and Disabled People, recognising the need to provide housing for older people.

Paragraph 001 Reference ID: 63-001-20190626 states:

“The need to provide housing for older people is critical. People are living longer lives and the proportion of older people in the population is increasing. In mid-2016 there were 1.6 million people aged 85 and over; by mid-2041 this is projected to double to 3.2 million. Offering older people a better choice of accommodation to suit their changing needs can help them live independently for longer, feel more connected to their communities and help reduce costs to the social care and health systems. Therefore, an understanding of how the ageing population affects housing needs is something to be considered from the early stages of plan-making through to decision-taking” (emphasis added)

Paragraph 003 Reference ID: 63-003-20190626 recognises that:

“the health and lifestyles of older people will differ greatly, as will their housing needs, which can range from accessible and adaptable general needs housing to specialist housing with high levels of care and support.”

Thus, a range of provision needs to be planned for. Paragraph 006 Reference ID: 63-006-20190626 sets out:

“plan-making authorities should set clear policies to address the housing needs of groups with particular needs such as older and disabled people. These policies can set out how the plan-making authority will consider proposals for the different types of housing that these groups are likely to require.”

Therefore, recognising that housing for older people has its own requirements and cannot be successfully considered against criteria for general family housing is important.

Need for Older Persons' Housing

It is well documented that the UK has an ageing population. Life expectancy is greater than it used to be and as set out above, by 2032 the number of people in the UK aged over 80 is set to increase from 3.2 million to 5 million (ONS mid 2018 population estimates).

It is generally recognised (for example, within the Homes for Later Living Report September 2019). That there is a need to deliver 30,000 retirement and extra care houses a year in the UK to keep pace with demand.

The age profile of Sheffield can be drawn from the 2018 population projections from the Office for National Statistics. This advises that there were 93,631 persons aged 65 and over in 2018, accounting for 16.1% of the total population of the City. This age range is projected to increase by 27,847 individuals, or 29.7%, to 121,478 between 2018 and 2043. The population aged 65 and over is expected to increase to account for 18.7% of the total population of the Borough by 2043.

In 2018 there were 26,624 persons aged 80 and over, individuals who are more likely to be frail and in need of long-term assistance. The number of people in this age range is forecasted to increase by 13,655 individuals, or 51.3%, to 40,279 between 2018 and 2043. The population aged 80 and over is anticipated to represent a higher proportion of Sheffield's residents, accounting for 4.6% of the total population in 2018 and increasing to 6.2% by 2043. This increase in older people and their housing need is confirmed within the Sheffield and Rotherham Strategic

Housing Market Assessment, 2018, Sheffield Hallam University Centre for Regional Economic & Social Research that states at para 7.25 'CRESR has developed a model for estimating the future supply of older people's housing. The Housing for Older People's Supply Recommendations (HOPSR) highlights a shortage of both sheltered and extra care housing against recommended levels. For Sheffield HOPSR suggests a current shortage of 5,000 sheltered and 135 extra care units' and HOPSR recommends a supply of over 1,000 units of extra care by 2035 in Sheffield and 649 in Rotherham. Responses from the household survey suggest that, even if HOPSR's recommendations for extra care in the SRHM were met, demand may outstrip supply'.

It is clear from the evidence that there will be a significant increase in older people over the plan period within the City and the provision of suitable housing and care to meet the needs of older people identified should be more a priority of the Local Plan to ensure it is consistent with national policy, justified and effective and ensure that the plan delivers the much needed older people's housing.

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above:

Recommendation:

As detailed above, for the plan to be justified, effective and consistent with national policy, Policy SP1 OVERALL GROWTH PLAN should be amended and the following text should be added to point a):

....,this will include the provision of at least, 1,000 extra care units and at least 5,000 sheltered units.

If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s):

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

N/A

Representation on the Sheffield Plan Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.056.002

What is your Name: NStyles

If you are making this representation as a member of an organisation, what is the name of your organisation:

The Planning Bureau

If you or your organisation are making a representation on behalf of another person, organisation or group, please tell us who it is and its role:

McCarthy Stone

Document

Which document to you wish to make a representation on:

Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Which section of the document is your representation on:

Policy SP1: Overall Growth Plan

Which paragraph/site/map layer of the document is representation on:

N/A

Representation

Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant: No

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: No

Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate: Yes

Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate:

POLICY SP1: OVERALL GROWTH PLAN

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Sheffield Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation. McCarthy Stone is the leading provider of specialist housing for older people in the UK.

Government's policy, as set out in the revised NPPF, is to boost significantly, the supply of housing. Paragraph 60 reads "To support the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed, that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and that land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay."

The revised NPPF looks at delivering a sufficient supply of homes, Paragraph 62 identifies within this context that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and reflected in planning policies including older people.

In June 2019 the PPG was updated to include a section on Housing for Older and Disabled People, recognising the need to provide housing for older people.

Paragraph 001 Reference ID: 63-001-20190626 states:

“The need to provide housing for older people is critical. People are living longer lives and the proportion of older people in the population is increasing. In mid-2016 there were 1.6 million people aged 85 and over; by mid-2041 this is projected to double to 3.2 million. Offering older people a better choice of accommodation to suit their changing needs can help them live independently for longer, feel more connected to their communities and help reduce costs to the social care and health systems. Therefore, an understanding of how the ageing population affects housing needs is something to be considered from the early stages of plan-making through to decision-taking” (emphasis added)

Paragraph 003 Reference ID: 63-003-20190626 recognises that:

“the health and lifestyles of older people will differ greatly, as will their housing needs, which can range from accessible and adaptable general needs housing to specialist housing with high levels of care and support.”

Thus, a range of provision needs to be planned for. Paragraph 006 Reference ID: 63-006-20190626 sets out:

“plan-making authorities should set clear policies to address the housing needs of groups with particular needs such as older and disabled people. These policies can set out how the plan-making authority will consider proposals for the different types of housing that these groups are likely to require.”

Therefore, recognising that housing for older people has its own requirements and cannot be successfully considered against criteria for general family housing is important.

Need for Older Persons' Housing

It is well documented that the UK has an ageing population. Life expectancy is greater than it used to be and as set out above, by 2032 the number of people in the UK aged over 80 is set to increase from 3.2 million to 5 million (ONS mid 2018 population estimates).

It is generally recognised (for example, within the Homes for Later Living Report September 2019). That there is a need to deliver 30,000 retirement and extra care houses a year in the UK to keep pace with demand.

The age profile of Sheffield can be drawn from the 2018 population projections from the Office for National Statistics. This advises that there were 93,631 persons aged 65 and over in 2018, accounting for 16.1% of the total population of the City. This age range is projected to increase by 27,847 individuals, or 29.7%, to 121,478 between 2018 and 2043. The population aged 65 and over is expected to increase to account for 18.7% of the total population of the Borough by 2043.

In 2018 there were 26,624 persons aged 80 and over, individuals who are more likely to be frail and in need of long-term assistance. The number of people in this age range is forecasted to increase by 13,655 individuals, or 51.3%, to 40,279 between 2018 and 2043. The population aged 80 and over is anticipated to represent a higher proportion of Sheffield's residents, accounting for 4.6% of the total population in 2018 and increasing to 6.2% by 2043. This increase in older people and their housing need is confirmed within the Sheffield and Rotherham Strategic

Housing Market Assessment, 2018, Sheffield Hallam University Centre for Regional Economic & Social Research that states at para 7.25 'CRESR has developed a model for estimating the future supply of older people's housing. The Housing for Older People's Supply Recommendations (HOPSR) highlights a shortage of both sheltered and extra care housing against recommended levels. For Sheffield HOPSR suggests a current shortage of 5,000 sheltered and 135 extra care units' and HOPSR recommends a supply of over 1,000 units of extra care by 2035 in Sheffield and 649 in Rotherham. Responses from the household survey suggest that, even if HOPSR's recommendations for extra care in the SRHM were met, demand may outstrip supply'.

It is clear from the evidence that there will be a significant increase in older people over the plan period within the City and the provision of suitable housing and care to meet the needs of older people identified should be more a priority of the Local Plan to ensure it is consistent with national policy, justified and effective and ensure that the plan delivers the much needed older people's housing.

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above:

Recommendation:

For the plan to be justified, effective and consistent with national policy, Policy SP1 OVERALL GROWTH PLAN should be amended and the following text should be added to point a):

....., this will include the provision of at least, 1,000 extra care units and at least 5,000 sheltered units.

If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s):

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

N/A

Representation on the Sheffield Plan Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.056.003

What is your Name: NStyles

If you are making this representation as a member of an organisation, what is the name of your organisation:

The Planning Bureau

If you or your organisation are making a representation on behalf of another person, organisation or group, please tell us who it is and its role:

McCarthy Stone

Document

Which document to you wish to make a representation on:

Part 1: Vision, Spatial Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations

Which section of the document is your representation on:

Policy H1: Scale and Supply of New Housing

Which paragraph/site/map layer of the document is representation on:

N/A

Representation

Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant: No

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: No

Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate: Yes

Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate:

POLICY H1: SCALE AND SUPPLY OF NEW HOUSING

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Sheffield Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation. McCarthy Stone is the leading provider of specialist housing for older people in the UK.

It is noted that para g) of policy H1 states 'A wide range of new housing will be supported to meet identified needs including custom build and self-build homes, older people's independent living accommodation and housing to meet the needs of disabled people (Policy NC4)'.

The Council should note that in June 2019 the PPG was updated to include a section on Housing for Older and Disabled People, recognising the need to provide housing

for older people. This is detailed in our response to policy SP1 and is detailed within Paragraph 001 Reference ID: 63-001-2019062 and Paragraph 003 Reference ID: 63-003-20190626. In particular, paragraph 006 Reference ID: 63-006-20190626 sets out;

‘plan-making authorities should set clear policies to address the housing needs of groups with particular needs such as older and disabled people. These policies can set out how the plan-making authority will consider proposals for the different types of housing that these groups are likely to require.’

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above:

Recommendation:

In order for the plan to be consistent in its terminology with national planning policy and ensure the Local Plan supports all types of housing for older people the words ‘independent living accommodation’ should be removed from Policy H1 point g.

If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s):

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

N/A

Representation on the Sheffield Plan Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.056.004

What is your Name: NStyles

If you are making this representation as a member of an organisation, what is the name of your organisation:

The Planning Bureau

If you or your organisation are making a representation on behalf of another person, organisation or group, please tell us who it is and its role:

McCarthy Stone

Document

Which document to you wish to make a representation on:

Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation

Which section of the document is your representation on:

Policy ES1: Measures Required to Achieve Net Zero Carbon Emissions in New Development

Which paragraph/site/map layer of the document is representation on:

N/A

Representation

Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant: No

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: No

Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate: Yes

Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate:

POLICY ES1: MEASURES REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE REDUCED CARBON EMISSIONS IN NEW DEVELOPMENT

The policy expects new dwellings 'to reduce their regulated carbon emissions by at least 75% from 1 January 2025 and be net zero carbon (in terms of both operational carbon and embodied carbon) from 1 January 2030'. The policy then sets a number of requirements in order for developers to achieve this.

The Council's commitment to meeting both its and the UK Government's target of net zero carbon emissions by 2030 is commendable. However, currently it appears that the Council is going to achieve this through having mandatory standards from

adoption of the plan that may go beyond government targets. However, it is our view that any requirement should be 'stepped' in line with Government targets and the proposed changes to the building regulations. This is more desirable as there is considerable momentum from Government in preparing enhanced sustainability standards as it is clear the energy efficiency requirements for domestic and non-domestic buildings will increase sharply in the coming years. Aligning the Council's requirement for carbon neutral development with those of Government would therefore be pragmatic and more achievable.

Were the Council to seek a higher standard from new development from the point of the Local Plan's adoption then we would remind the Council to include the uplift in build costs for delivering net zero within any forthcoming Local Plan viability assessment and that the PPG states that "Viability assessment should not compromise sustainable development but should be used to ensure that policies are realistic, and that the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine deliverability of the plan" (Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 10-002-20190509). This would ensure that the Council will be able to justify their plan.

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above:

Recommendation:

- That the policy is stepped in line with emerging government targets or
- The policy is deleted as Net Zero Carbon development is to be dealt with via the Building Regulations.

If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s):

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

N/A

Representation on the Sheffield Plan Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.056.005

What is your Name: NStyles

If you are making this representation as a member of an organisation, what is the name of your organisation:

The Planning Bureau

If you or your organisation are making a representation on behalf of another person, organisation or group, please tell us who it is and its role:

McCarthy Stone

Document

Which document to you wish to make a representation on:

Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation

Which section of the document is your representation on:

Policy NC3: Provision of Affordable Housing

Which paragraph/site/map layer of the document is representation on:

N/A

Representation

Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant: No

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: No

Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate: Yes

Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate:

POLICY NC3: PROVISION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Sheffield Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation. McCarthy Stone is the leading provider of specialist housing for older people in the UK.

Policy NC3 is not considered to be sound as requiring schemes delivering specialist housing for older people to meet affordable housing targets is not justified, positively prepared, effective or in line with the Council's own evidence.

To support the affordable housing requirement expressed in policy NC3 of the regulation 19 version of the Sheffield Local Plan the Council has undertaken a viability study entitled 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment, Sheffield City Council (HDH,

September 2022) ('Viability Study'). As part of the Viability Study, we note that both brownfield and greenfield options for housing for older people has been tested and this includes typologies for sheltered and extra care housing. Fourteen scenarios have been tested for each type of housing, with seven being on brownfield sites and seven being on greenfield sites. The policy requirement that creates the need for seven scenarios for each land and housing type is affordable housing provision and seven different affordable housing scenarios, 0%, 5%, 10%, 15%, 20%, 25% and 30% have been tested for each of the four scenarios. For each scenario test apart from sheltered greenfield at 0% and 5% affordable housing a negative residual land value has occurred and is confirmed in table 10.12 page 179 of the Viability Study (October 2022).

The evidence clearly shows that it is challenging for older people's housing schemes to deliver affordable housing. The Viability Study at para 10.87 confirms this and states: 'The results for these forms of development follow those for other flatted development, with the delivery of such development likely to be challenging. Based on the above analysis, there is limited scope for Sheltered or Extracare Housing to bear affordable housing. It is recommended that this type of development is not subject to affordable housing'. This is reconfirmed at para 12.95 of the Viability Study that states 'The results for these forms of development follow those for other flatted development, with the delivery of such development likely to be challenging. Based on the above analysis, there is limited scope for Sheltered or Extracare Housing to bear affordable housing'.

The Viability Study continues to state at para 10.88 and 12.96 that 'When considering the above, it is important to note that paragraph 10-007-20180724 of the updated PPG specifically anticipates that the viability of specialist older people's housing will be considered at the development management stage. It is therefore not considered necessary to develop specific policy for sheltered and extra-care housing'.

It should be noted by the Council that the PPG on viability at Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 10-002-20190509 confirms that 'The role for viability assessment is primarily at the plan making stage. Viability assessment should not compromise sustainable development but should be used to ensure that policies are realistic, and that the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine deliverability of the plan' and that 'Policy requirements, particularly for affordable housing, should be set at a level that takes account of affordable housing and infrastructure needs and allows for the planned types of sites and development to be deliverable, without the need for further viability assessment at the decision making stage'.

Para 10.88 and 12.96 of the viability study in effect provides the consultant, who undertook the viability study's, interpretation of paragraph 10-007-20180724 of PPG. It should also be noted that the paragraph referenced has been superseded and this is now Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 10-007-20190509. This now states: 'It is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage' and 'Such circumstances could include, for example where development is proposed on unallocated sites of a wholly different type to those used in viability assessment that informed the plan; where further information on infrastructure or site costs is required; where particular types of development are proposed which may significantly vary from standard models of development for sale (for example build to rent or housing for older people); or where a recession or similar significant economic changes have occurred since the plan was brought into force'.

Therefore, as the affordable housing requirement for older people's housing has been tested through the viability study supporting the submission Local Plan and the typology found to be unviable, requiring such sites to deliver affordable housing or requiring a viability study through the application stage is contrary to PPG. Any affordable housing requirement creates an unrealistic over aspirational policy requirement that will undermine deliverability. The plan as written, will not deliver sites for older people's housing in line with need without further viability assessment and is therefore not justified or effective. As older people's housing has been included within the viability assessment to inform the Local Plan and been found to not be viable the affordable housing requirement should be removed from older person's housing to ensure the Local Plan is in accordance with national policy and deliverable. In addition, any affordable housing requirement would no doubt result in protracted discussion at the decision making stage which would be contrary to the PPG and hinder the delivery of the Local Plan objectives. The policy and supporting paragraphs should therefore be amended to make it clear that older person's housing is exempt from all types of affordable housing in line with the viability study to ensure the plan is sound, deliverable, justified and consistent with national policy.

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above:

Recommendation:

Policy NC3 has not translated the evidence from the Viability Study through to the policy and therefore the policy is not justified, effective or consistent with national policy. To make the plan sound the Council should make the following amendments to the plan:

Add new point to end of policy NC3 to read:

'G. Schemes delivering housing for older people are exempt from delivering affordable housing.'

Add new para after 4.14 to read

'Schemes delivering housing for older people are exempt from delivering affordable housing. This is based on the analysis within the Local Plan Viability Assessment – October 2023 that confirms that older person's housing is unlikely to be viable in Sheffield'

The above amendments will make the plan sound by being fully justified, effective and consistent with national policy. The amendments will make sure the plan is consistent with the plans own evidence and specifically consistent with Paragraph: 007 Reference ID: 10-007-20190509 of PPG.

If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s):

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

To ensure the plan is sound by being fully justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Representation on the Sheffield Plan Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.056.006

What is your Name: NStyles

If you are making this representation as a member of an organisation, what is the name of your organisation:

The Planning Bureau

If you or your organisation are making a representation on behalf of another person, organisation or group, please tell us who it is and its role:

McCarthy Stone

Document

Which document to you wish to make a representation on:

Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation

Which section of the document is your representation on:

Policy NC4: Housing for Independent and Supported Living

Which paragraph/site/map layer of the document is representation on:

4.19 and part c)

Representation

Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant: No

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: No

Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate: Yes

Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate:

POLICY NC4: HOUSING FOR INDEPENDENT AND SUPPORTED LIVING

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Sheffield Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation. McCarthy Stone is the leading provider of specialist housing for older people in the UK.

We are concerned with regard to the accessibility requirements, requirement to identify older people's housing need and healthcare provision to support older people's housing schemes and these elements are discussed separately below.

Wheelchair accessible housing

Whilst we support policy NC4 in its support for Specialist housing designated for older or disabled people, we are concerned with regard to the element of the policy

that requires 'All specialist housing designated for older or disabled people, including supported accommodation (including hostels providing an element of care), and non-supported accommodation should be wheelchair adaptable or fully wheelchair accessible throughout'. We note that para 4.19 recognises that the policy is aiming to meet the 'Building Regulations Optional Technical Standard M4(2)' however we feel that firstly this element should be removed as M4 (2) standards are to become mandatory and therefore this is not necessary and secondary the wording goes beyond M4 (2) and tries to introduce M4(3) standards.

A supportive local planning policy framework will be crucial in increasing the delivery of specialist older persons' housing and it should be acknowledged that although adaptable housing can assist it does not remove the need for specific older person's housing. Housing particularly built to M4(3) standard may serve to institutionalise an older person's scheme reducing independence contrary to the ethos of older persons and particularly extra care housing.

Wheelchair accessible houses do not provide the on-site support, care and companionship of specialist older persons' housing developments nor do they provide the wider community benefits such as releasing under occupied family housing as well as savings to the public purse by reducing the stress of health and social care budgets. The recently published 'Healthier and Happier Report' by WPI Strategy (September 2019) calculated that the average person living in specialist housing for older people saves the NHS and social services £3,490 per year. We would like to remind the Council of the increased emphasis on Local Plan viability testing in Paragraph 58 of the NPPF and that the PPG states that "The role for viability assessment is primarily at the plan making stage. Viability assessment should not compromise sustainable development but should be used to ensure that policies are realistic, and that the total cumulative cost of all relevant policies will not undermine deliverability of the plan" (Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 10-002-20190509). M4 (Part 2 and 3) Housing also has a cost implication and may serve to reduce the number of apartments that can be provided, further reducing viability. It is noted that the viability study entitled 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment, Sheffield City Council (HDH, September 2022) ('Viability Study' undertaken to support the plan when assessing this policy, states at para 8.45 that: 'In discussion with the Council, the base scenario is assumed to be 100% M4(2) with options of 10% and 20% M4(3) also tested'. Therefore, requiring all supported accommodation and older people's housing to be 'Fully wheelchair accessible throughout' is contrary to the parameters tested within the viability study and contrary to national policy, it is not supported in evidence and not justified. The policy therefore will not be effective. This element of the policy should therefore be removed as detailed in our recommendation below.

Specialist housing designated for older or disabled people - Need

As detailed in our response to SP1, Sheffield has a large need for older people's housing with the Sheffield and Rotherham Strategic Housing Market Assessment, 2018, Sheffield Hallam University Centre for Regional Economic & Social Research confirming this at para 7.25 'CRESR has developed a model for estimating the future supply of older people's housing. The Housing for Older People's Supply Recommendations (HOPSR) 41 highlights a shortage of both sheltered and extra care housing against recommended levels. For Sheffield HOPSR suggests a current shortage of 5,000 sheltered and 135 extra care units' and HOPSR recommends a supply of over 1,000 units of extra care by 2035 in Sheffield and 649 in Rotherham. Responses from the household survey suggest that, even if HOPSR's

recommendations for extra care in the SRHM were met, demand may outstrip supply’.

It is therefore clear there will be a significant increase in older people’s housing need over the plan period and the provision of suitable housing and care to meet the needs of this demographic should not have to be justified through a planning application.

Health Facilities

The Council should note that there is a common misconception that older person’s housing places an additional burden on healthcare infrastructure and therefore rather than requiring applicants of older person’s schemes to show that there is capacity in healthcare systems, the policy should instead recognise the health benefits that delivering older people’s housing can bring to individuals.

Older Persons’ Housing produces a large number of significant benefits which can help to reduce the demands exerted on Health and Social Services and other care facilities – not only in terms of the fact that many of the residents remain in better health, both physically and mentally, but also doctors, physiotherapists, community nurses, hairdressers and other essential practitioners can all attend to visit several occupiers at once. This leads to a far more efficient and effective use of public resources.

A report “‘Healthier and Happier’ An analysis of the fiscal and wellbeing benefits of building more homes for later living” by WPI Strategy for Homes for Later Living explored the significant savings that Government and individuals could expect to make if more older people in the UK could access this type of housing. The analysis showed that:

- ‘Each person living in a home for later living enjoys a reduced risk of health challenges, contributing to fiscal savings to the NHS and social care services of approximately £3,500 per year.
- Building 30,000 more retirement housing dwellings every year for the next 10 years would generate fiscal savings across the NHS and social services of £2.1bn per year.
- On a selection of national well-being criteria such as happiness and life satisfaction, an average person aged 80 feels as good as someone 10 years younger after moving from mainstream housing to housing specially designed for later living.’

In addition, specifically designed housing for older people offers significant opportunities to enable residents to be as independent as possible in a safe and warm environment. Older homes are typically in a poorer state of repair, are often colder, damper, have more risk of fire and fall hazards. They lack in adaptations such as handrails, wider internal doors, stair lifts and walk in showers. Without these simple features everyday tasks can become harder and harder.

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above:

Recommendation:

For the plan to be in line with national policy and effective the policy should be amended so it reads as follows. This will also ensure that the policy does not repeat the requirements of the building regulations, or sets onerously high standards.

POLICY NC4: HOUSING FOR INDEPENDENT AND SUPPORTED LIVING

General needs housing

All new homes should be designed to enable independent living in line with the building regulations.

In developments of 50 or more new homes 2% should be wheelchair adaptable dwellings. Wheelchair adaptable homes should be located on the flattest part of a site and, where feasible, as close as possible to local facilities.

Exceptions to the required gradients for driveways to wheelchair accessible and adaptable dwellings may be made where it can be demonstrated that the topography of the site makes this impractical.

Specialist housing designated for older or disabled people

Specialist housing designated for older or disabled people will be supported.

Proposals will be acceptable where the accommodation would be close to essential services, particularly public transport, shops, and health services.

If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s):

Yes, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Not completed by respondent

Representation on the Sheffield Plan Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.056.007

What is your Name: NStyles

If you are making this representation as a member of an organisation, what is the name of your organisation:

The Planning Bureau

If you or your organisation are making a representation on behalf of another person, organisation or group, please tell us who it is and its role:

McCarthy Stone

Document

Which document to you wish to make a representation on:

Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation

Which section of the document is your representation on:

Policy GS6: Biodiversity Net Gain

Which paragraph/site/map layer of the document is representation on:

N/A

Representation

Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant: No

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: No

Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate: Yes

Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate:

POLICY GS6: BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN

The policy as written potentially requires developers to deliver more than 10% net gain depending on a number of variables that could be open to interpretation. The Council should not set a higher biodiversity net gain (BNG) requirement for development than 10% that is that set out in the Environment Act 2021. Requiring BNG above 10% does not meet the tests set out in paragraph 57 of the NPPF and in particular a greater than 10% requirement is not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. A 10% requirement should also be maintained in order

to ensure that the requirement is 'fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development' (para 57, NPPF).

Although we recognise that the 10% is a minimum it should be for the developer to decide whether to go beyond this not the Council. It is important to remember that it is impossible to know what the cost of delivering net gain is until the base level of biodiversity on a site is known and consequently what is required to achieve a 10% net gain. On some sites this may be achievable on site with no reduction in developable area, for others it may require a large proportion of it to be addressed offsite or a significant reduction in the developable area – a far more expensive option that could render a site unviable without a reduction in other policy requirements. The Council should therefore not require a BNG of greater than the 10% and should amend the policy accordingly.

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above:

POLICY GS6: BIODIVERSITY NET GAIN

Delete the following text from policy GS6 Biodiversity Net Gain to make the plan consistent with national policy and effective::

'BNG in excess of 10% may be required where:

- there is a particular ecological need in that location based on evidence in a biodiversity/nature recovery action plan or as part of the Local Nature Recovery Network mapping, or
- there is evidence of rare/protected species within, or close to, the development site; or
- the site starts with very low or nil existing biodiversity value'

If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s):

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

N/A

Representation on the Sheffield Plan Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft

Respondent details

Comment ID number: PDSP.056.008

What is your Name: NStyles

If you are making this representation as a member of an organisation, what is the name of your organisation:

The Planning Bureau

If you or your organisation are making a representation on behalf of another person, organisation or group, please tell us who it is and its role:

McCarthy Stone

Document

Which document to you wish to make a representation on:

Part 2: Development Management Policies and Implementation

Which section of the document is your representation on:

Policy DC1: The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and other Developer Contributions

Which paragraph/site/map layer of the document is representation on:

N/A

Representation

Do you consider the Local Plan is legally compliant: No

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound: No

Do you consider the Local Plan complies with the duty to co-operate: Yes

Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate:

POLICY DC1: THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) AND OTHER DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

It is noted that the Council's CIL charging schedule excludes retirement, extra care, sheltered housing and assisted living from the payment of CIL which is welcomed and that the continued need for an exemption is confirmed in para 10.86 of the 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment', Sheffield City Council (HDH, September 2022) ('Viability Study') that states that 'This sector is currently subject to a zero rate of CIL, so CIL is assumed not to apply'. However, it is noted that policy DC1 states that 'Developers of housing schemes comprising 10 or more new homes will be required

to contribute towards education facilities, health facilities and open space where needs are not being met through the CIL or other funded capital programmes and where further mitigation is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms’.

To ensure the plan is in accordance with NPPF para 57 that states ‘Planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following tests: a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, b) directly related to the development; and c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development’, the policy should exempt all older people’s housing from additional planning obligations detailed in policy DC1 as the elements would be unrelated to this kind of development for the following reasons:

- For older people the quality of open space either on site or easily accessible for passive recreation is much more important than formal open space or playing pitches.
- There is a common misconception that older person’s housing places an additional burden on healthcare infrastructure. Specialist Retirement Accommodation produces a large number of significant benefits detailed in our response to NC4 which can help to reduce the demands exerted on Health and Social Services and other care facilities.
- Older People’s housing by its very nature and age of residents does not create a demand for education.

Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above:

Recommendation:

For the plan to be consistent with national policy and effective the following text should be added to the end of policy DC1:

Older person’s housing schemes are exempt from the above requirement so long as high quality amenity space suitable for older people is provided on site.

If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s):

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

N/A