

Sandhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan Responses to Independent Examiner's Clarification Note

Response to question for Tunbridge Wells Borough Council:

I note the details in the March 2025 Local Development Scheme.

Is there any further update on the Plan and the timescale for its adoption?

The Borough Council are currently waiting to receive the Inspector's Final Report on the Local Plan following a consultation on proposed main modifications to the Local Plan between March-April 2025. Once the final report has been received, an updated Local Development Scheme will be produced. This will reflect the updated timescales for its adoption.

Responses to questions for Sandhurst Parish Council, prepared by the Sandhurst Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group on behalf of Sandhurst Parish Council

29 July 2025

This response has been prepared by the Sandhurst Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group (SG) on behalf of Sandhurst Parish Council (SPC) in relation to the Sandhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan (SNP). We are grateful for the opportunity to provide further clarification on the points raised below by the independent examiner.

- **Policy S1: This is a good policy which establishes a spatial strategy for the parish.**
- **Policy S2: This is a good policy which underpinned by the Housing Needs Assessment.**
- **Policy S3: This is an excellent, locally-distinctive policy which is underpinned by the equally-impressive Design Guidance. In the round, it is a first-class local response to Section 12 of the NPPF.**
- **Policy S4: This is another excellent locally-distinctive policy. Its non-prescriptive approach has regard to Section 14 of NPPF and the Written Ministerial Statement of December 2023 on local energy efficiency standards.**
- **Policy S8: I looked at the proposed Local Green Spaces carefully during the visit. The policy is underpinned by the details in Appendix D.**
- **Policy S9: This is another good, locally distinctive policy which, in this case, is underpinned by the details in Appendix E.**

The positive comments on the above policies are noted.

- **Policy S10: I am minded to recommend that the policy should set out the requirements for development proposals rather than offering support to proposals. This would acknowledge that the application of other development plan policies would be involved in the determination of planning applications. Does the Parish Council have any comments on this proposition?**

We would be content with this approach.

- **Policy S12: Should Part C of the policy recognise that some of its outcomes may be permitted development?**

We would be content to refer to this, for instance caveating the clause with the wording, “Notwithstanding permitted development...”

- **Policy S13: On the one hand, the Plan’s proposal for a village hub is both exciting and ambitious. However, on the other hand, are the ambitions of the policy capable of delivery within the Plan period?**

The community are very supportive of such a proposal. The Parish Council is in active discussion with two potential venues for the village hub. It is anticipated that the proposal is deliverable in the plan period.

- **Implementation and Plan Review: Section 11 of the Plan addresses these matters in a very positive fashion. It anticipates the adoption of the emerging the Local Plan.**

This comment is noted.

- **Representations: It would be helpful if the Parish Council would respond to the comments from Kent County Council. The Borough Council also makes a series of comments and suggested revisions to the Plan. It would be helpful if the Parish Council would respond to those comments.**

Our comments on the representations from KCC and TWBC are contained in Appendix A.

We are grateful for the opportunity to provide further clarification on these questions and points.

Kathy O’Neil

Chair of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

Appendix A - Comments from SPC on representations received at Regulation 16

Response to comments from Kent County Council

- **Policy S7: Green and blue infrastructure and delivering biodiversity net gain:** Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS): The County Council, as Lead Local Flood Authority, recommends that Policy S7 could be strengthened to consider the use of SuDS as outlined in section 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for new development proposals. The multiple benefits SuDS can provide, including additional amenity and biodiversity benefits, are well documented and would align with this section of the Neighbourhood Plan, which seeks to ensure the multiple benefits of Sandhurst's green and blue spaces.

We would be content to add an additional clause within this policy relating to the use of multi-functional SuDS. This is a topic that is included in the Submission Local Plan (Policy EN 14), so we would need to avoid repetition, however that plan has not yet been adopted.

For example: "Where the development of a site requires the application of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), these should demonstrate the use of a wide range of creative SuDS solutions, for example through the provision of SuDS as part of green spaces, green roofs, permeable surfaces and rain gardens. The use of SuDS provision should demonstrate how its design will enhance wildlife and biodiversity as well as minimise the impacts of flooding".

- **Policy S11: Improving safe movement and promoting active modes of travel:** The County Council is keen to ensure that its interests are represented within the local policy frameworks of the Parishes in Kent. The reference to the Rights of Way Improvement Plan (ROWIP) in the Neighbourhood Plan is welcomed. However, the ROWIP is noted as being under KCC Highways (paragraph 9.4), when it is prepared by the PRoW and Access Service who is the Highway Authority for PRoW. The PRoW and Access Service would ask that this paragraph be amended to reflect this. The County Council considers the inclusion of ROWIP as an opportunity to enable a successful partnership to deliver improvements to the PRoW network in Sandhurst.

We would be content to amend this reference to the ROWIP.

- **Comments of Waste Management**

These comments are noted.

(This is what appears in the Submission version:

- 9.1. Sandhurst is surrounded by an extensive system of public rights of way (*Figure 13*) routed across large swathes of farmland, sections of woodland and ancient woodland, with stunning views, one of which is the High Weald behind St Nicholas Church. Having this wonderful asset around our village promotes walking and is good for tourism. Kent County Council Highways, via their [Kent Rights of Way Improvement Plan, supports the provision of](#) a high quality, well maintained public rights of way network.)

Response to comments from TWBC

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
Conformity references after policy boxes	Saved LP policies and Core Strategy policy references	It is noted that as set out below, it is expected that the new borough Local Plan will be adopted in summer 2025, well before the NDP is made if successful at referendum. Once adopted the Local Plan will supersede the saved Local Plan and Core Strategy and therefore reference to these policies will be out of date by the time the NDP is made (and possibly before its referendum stage). It is therefore considered that text referring to these documents needs further consideration / revision.	Noted. This will need to be amended post-examination and dependent upon the new borough Local Plan timescale. Many of the references in this section will need updating to reflect progress on the Local Plan process.
Para 1.6	Framework for monitoring and implementation	Suggest this includes review, so amend to read “monitoring, implementation and review” as review is mentioned further on in the NDP.	Content to amend.
Para 1.8	Local Planning Policy	A new KMWLP has recently been adopted so the text will need updating. Suggested wording: Kent Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2024 to 2039 (adopted March 2025)	Content to amend.
Para 1.10	Progress of borough Local Plan – further hearing sessions	This paragraph needs to be updated, as TWBC is now at the Main Modifications stage of the Local Plan Examination. Suggested text is: “Further hearing sessions will commence in relation to this. Stage 3 Hearing Sessions were held in 2024, and the Council has	Content to amend.

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
		consulted on proposed Main Modifications to the Plan, with receipt of the Inspectors Final report expected in due course, followed by adoption of the Local Plan in summer 2025”.	
Para 1.11	Local Development Scheme, October 2024	Requires an update as there is now an updated LDS dated March 2025 .	Content to amend.
Para 1.13	Reference to Local Plan Review	Delete the word “partial” as TWBC has yet to determine the scope of the review. It would also be advisable to use the annual housing figure (678) the emerging Local Plan is planning for to avoid complication around the figures from the start of the plan period (2020) and adoption (assumed 2025). The Local Plan Review will plan for the remaining five years of the SLP housing need figure of 678 per annum, as well as the difference between the 678 figure and the new housing need figure of 1,100 per annum (derived from the new standard method and the most recent housing affordability ratios released in March 2025).	Content to amend.
Para 1.14	Sandhurst Local Plan Policies	TWBC have just concluded a consultation on proposed main modifications to the Local Plan and are available to view in this Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications . It would be worth checking the schedule to consider any changes to these policies.	Noted and content to amend as necessary to mirror the Local Plan.
Para 1.18	Table 1	Given TWBC’s committee cycles (both pre and post NDP referendum), it is considered that the Sandhurst NDP is most likely to be ‘made’ (if successful at referendum) in early 2026. The NDP should consider updating this timeline for the NDP.	Noted and content to amend.
Para 1.21	Sustainability of the NDP	Delete the word “by” in first sentence.	Content to amend.

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
Para 2.3	Limits to Built Development	It is suggested that the wording is amended to reflect the Limits to Built Development boundary is defined through the Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan, not the Neighbourhood Plan. The wording should also reflect that the LBD has recently been amended/will be amended depending on whether the emerging Local Plan has been adopted (which it should be) ahead of publicising the referendum version of the NDP.	Content to amend.
Para 2.10	Issues and opportunities facing Sandhurst	TWBC notes and agrees with the issues and opportunities identified here. The Climate Action Group set up by the Parish Council could seek advice from the Private Sector Housing Team at the Borough Council in regards to the identified challenge in retrofitting the existing housing stock. The Borough Council would also support the Parish Council in working and negotiating with the relevant agencies to seek improved wastewater/sewerage infrastructure investment and resilience.	Noted. PC to pursue with TWBC.
Policy Box S1: Location of Development	Criterion B) iii	It is noted that as set out above, it is expected that the new borough Local Plan will be adopted in summer 2025, well before the NDP is made if successful at referendum. Once adopted the Local Plan will supersede the Core Strategy (and other documents) and therefore reference to Core Policy 6 will be out of date by the time the NDP is made (and possibly before its referendum stage). It is considered that this text therefore needs revision.	Content to amend one new Local Plan is adopted.
Para 4.4	Figures 2 and 3	Similar to the comment made relating to the LBD under section 2, consider the wording and illustration of the LBD on the figures depending on the status of the emerging Local Plan when producing the referendum version of the NDP.	Content to amend.
Policy S2	Criterion A) ii	It is noted the affordable housing tenure split, based on Housing Needs Study for the Parish, differs from the SLP as it proposes	Noted.

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
		50/50 split between affordable home ownership and social and affordable rent. SLP Policy H 3 has a split 40% intermediate tenures or affordable routes to home ownership and 60% social rent. However, Policy H 3 is 'subject to consideration of any subsequent local policy and/or evidence'.	
Policy S2	Table 2	<p>The indicative tenure mix at Table 2 specifies that 25% of affordable housing be provided as First Homes. Whilst noting that the housing needs study identified first time buyers and smaller/ younger households as being in need in the Parish, it is no longer a requirement that 25% of affordable housing on sites be provided as First Homes. Given our track record and the £250k cap on house prices for first homes, there may be difficulties delivering these and it may cause issues with registered providers taking on affordable housing schemes in Sandhurst.</p> <p>Although not precluded, given the affordability difficulties in the parish, the NDP may want to absorb this 25% into other forms of low cost home ownership such as shared ownership. This may also help improve the willingness of registered providers to take on affordable housing schemes in the Parish.</p>	The policy itself does not make this requirement. We would be content to amend the justification to apply a greater level of flexibility on that part of the indicative housing mix.
Paras 5.3 and 5.7		These paragraphs reference a housing survey of local residents. Was this the 2014 one or a more recent survey?	This does relate to the 2014 Village Survey.
Para 5.5		It is noted that a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan would consider a site allocation to address the affordable housing shortfall.	Noted.
Table 3	Suggested Dwelling Size Mix to 2038	Whilst it is noted that the Parish has a predominance of three bed houses, the % of 4 beds for any new development seems high at 18.3% given the affordability problems in the Parish.	The figures are taken from the HNA prepared by AECOM.

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
General		It is good that the concerns raised around the design policies and design guidance at the Regulation 14 consultation have largely been addressed. The comments in this table for this section predominantly seek to improve the wording or fix grammatical errors.	Noted.
Policy S3: Character and Design of development	Policy name	Decapitalise design for consistency with the naming of other policies	Content to amend.
Para 6.1		Delete the “.” in “Local Plan policies. which require....”	Content to amend.
Policy S3: Character and Design of Development	Criterion B) vii	Add ‘and’ before “pedestrian safety”.	Content to amend.
Para 6.2	Justification	Instead of “characterful buildings” put “buildings of character”.	Content to amend.
Para 6.5		“It focusses policies on three core considerations: respecting the setting of the High Weald, incorporating sympathetic placemaking principles next; encouraging detail design built in towards the end.”	Content to amend.

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
		Not sure this last sentence makes grammatical sense.	
Para 6.7		“[...] well-integrated with the existing settlements”. Use within rather than with.	Content to amend.
Para 6.8		“The Design Guidance identifies six character areas in the parish, areas, each with their own [...]”. Put “each area with their own”.	Content to amend.
Para 6.9	The Guidance	Add ‘s’ to “the Guidance provide...”	Content to amend.
Para 6.10	“Development should take account of both policies”	It is suggested that this text is deleted, since these are not the only applicable policies.	Content to remove.
Para 6.11		“This will help to mitigate against climate change”. Change this to “this will help mitigate the effects of climate change”.	Content to amend.
Policy Box S4: Energy Efficiency and Design	Criterion C	‘They should’ is currently in blue with a hyperlink continued from the sentence before.	Content to amend.
Policy Box S4: Energy Efficiency and Design	Criterion B) iii	A fabric first approach should be desirable and required in the first instance	Content to amend.

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
Para 6.12		Comma after “On 12 June 2019”.	Content to amend.
Para 6.16		<p>Capitalise the first “local plan”</p> <p>“[...] carbon dioxide emissions reductions”. Delete ‘s’ from emissions.</p> <p>“[...] and more sustainable energy sources”. Put “to use more sustainable energy sources”.</p> <p>The second sentence in this paragraph is quite long and could be split up.</p>	Content to amend.
Para 6.18		<p>“The design of developments should seek to ensure that surface water is appropriately managed, as close to source as possible. In terms of future flood risk, better rainwater management through SuDS is the preferred approach to avoid placing added pressure on drainage networks during heavy rainfall.</p> <p>The SNDP strongly supports the requirement to include SuDS within all development.”</p> <p>Consider putting this section of the last bullet point as its own paragraph.</p>	Content to amend.
Para 6.22		“In the absence of the Appraisal”. Put “In the absence of an appraisal”.	Content to amend.
Para 6.23		“There are 96 individual/groups of buildings and assets”. Put “There are 96 individual/groups of heritage assets”.	Content to amend.

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
Para 6.25		<p>“There are many other heritage assets, however, that contribute to the historic local context and story of the parish, but which are not nationally important enough to be included on the statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest compiled by the Government.”</p> <p>Put “There are, however, many other assets that contribute to the historic local context and story of the parish that are locally important but not of national importance.”</p>	
Para 6.29		<p>Hyperlink to referenced TWBC Historic Farmstead Guidance.</p> <p>“Finally, there are several farmsteads and oasthouses in Sandhurst Parish, typical in this part of Kent”. Put “Finally, there are several farmsteads and oasthouses in Sandhurst Parish which are typical in this part of Kent.”</p>	Content to amend.
Para 6.31		The comments on non-designated heritage assets are noted and will be added to the local list.	Noted.
Para 6.32		Hyperlink to the referenced Historic England annual Register of Heritage at Risk . “[...] to inform the TWBC work”. Put “to inform TWBC’s work”.	Content to amend.
Para 7.3	Reference to TWBC’s Validation Checklist requirements	Change the last sentence to say – TWBC will assess such impacts and each case on its merits having regard to its planning application validation checklist requirements (such as the requirement to submit landscape and visual impact assessments, heritage statements, ecological surveys etc.) and relevant development plan policies.	Content to amend.

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
Policy Box S7: Green and Blue Infrastructure and Delivering Biodiversity Net Gain	Criterion A	Suggest amending the wording for consistency and to better conform with national policy: “ with the aim of delivering and provide a measurable biodiversity net gain at least 10%. Proposals that deliver in excess of this will be <u>supported</u> . considered favourably .”	Content to amend.
Policy Box S7: Green and Blue Infrastructure and Delivering Biodiversity Net Gain	Criterion D) Trees and woodland: i	Consider rewording the first sentence (‘There is no unacceptable loss of...’), to avoid using a double negative and improve the clarity. This could be reworded to: ‘Development proposals should demonstrate’ ... ‘Any of loss of, or damage to, existing trees or woodlands during or as a result of development is justified and acceptable. ...’	Content to amend.
Policy Box S7: Green and Blue Infrastructure and Delivering Biodiversity Net Gain	Criterion D) Fauna vi	Suggest reframing this as per v and vii with wording such as: “Provision of bird and bat nesting boxes will be supported”.	Content to amend.
Policy S10: Dark skies	Purpose para 8.30	Add the word ‘the’ to the final sentence “valued aspect of <u>the</u> parish”.	
Policy S10: Dark skies	Justification para 8.33	Amend typo in final sentence “comprising” to ‘compromising’.	Content to amend.

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
Policy S11: Improving safe movement and promoting active modes of travel	Purpose para 9.1	This paragraph requires amendment as the KCC Local Transport Plan 4 referenced has now been superseded by the KCC Local Transport Plan 5 Striking the Balance now adopted by KCC.	Noted and content to amend.
Policy S11: Improving safe movement and promoting active modes of travel	Purpose para 9.12 final bullet point	Re 'Framing Kent's Future' – suggest that this is reworded since to consider any successor documents as it is only dated until 2026.	Content to amend.
Policy S11: Improving safe movement and promoting active modes of travel	Public transport para 9.15	It is suggested that the final sentence is amended to read “.....the wait for the return service is impractical and means that people now use their cars....”	Content to amend.
Policy S12: Publicly accessible parking	Criterion c) ii	It would be worth contacting KCC to see if there is any availability of LEVI grant funding to assist with the provision of EV charge points.	Noted and PC to pursue.
Policy S14	Policy name	It is suggested that the title of the policy be changed to include the retention of existing facilities (in accordance with criterion C) to read:	Content to amend.

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
		Policy S14: <u>Retaining and</u> Improving opportunities for community and cultural facilities, sport and recreation.	
Policy S14	Conformity reference	Add TWBC SLP policies ED 12 (Retention of Local Services and Facilities), OSSR 1 (Retention of Open Space) and OSSR 2 (Provision of Publicly Accessible Open Space and Recreation).	Content to add these.
Para 11.3	Second to last bullet point	It is suggested that this is reviewed/amended, given the timeline for adoption of the emerging borough Local Plan of summer 2025.	Noted and content to amend.
Para 12.2	Reference to LDS – final bullet point	Requires an update as there is now an updated LDS dated March 2025 .	Content to amend.
Figures 14 and 15		See the comments made under sections 2 and 4 in relation to the LBD boundary.	Noted and action as per previous comments.
Glossary		It is suggested that the definitions be checked against the glossaries included in the NPPF and the emerging borough Local Plan for consistency with those glossaries. For instance, consider the consistency of the affordable housing and previously developed land definitions with the NPPF definitions.	Definitions to be checked and aligned as suggested.
Limits to Built Development		This is queried as this is not just previously developed land. It is suggested that this be amended to reflect the definition set out in the emerging borough Local Plan i.e. “A line around settlements defining the area which is considered to be within the limits of the built area and that which is outside in order to restrict the encroachment of built form into the surrounding countryside”.	Content to amend to align to emerging borough Local Plan wording.
General comment		This is likely to need a review when considering/responding to comments made above.	Noted. PC to liaise with TWBC officers as modifications are made.

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
Design Guidance		<p>It is good that the concerns about the design guidance raised at the Regulation 14 consultation have largely been addressed.</p> <p>TWBC has one minor comment on this version of the design guidance which is under DG.8 it would be good to include photographs to illustrate appropriate materials. However, the wording is agreed.</p>	We would be content to include photographs.
Housing Needs Assessment		General Comment from SPC: The HNA has been produced externally by AECOM. There may be scope to ask them to review it in light of the comments received, however the funding available from government has ceased, so this may not be feasible. If not feasible, we would be content to add a note to the HNA setting out the comments raised by TWBC.	
Page 6 – para 1.7	Current Tenure Profile	Typo in line 3 , should read private ownership not rent.	Noted.
Para 1.8		Take out the word ‘across’.	Noted.
Page 7/8 – para 1.12	Affordable Housing Needs	It is noted AECOM estimates that most affordable housing should be provided as affordable ownership tenures which would be at odds with the Council’s SLP Policy of 60% social rent and 40% affordable home ownership.	Noted.
Page 8/9 – para 1.14	Estimated delivery of affordable housing in Sandhurst	The AECOM research for affordable home ownership exceeds the 10 affordable homes to be delivered through the Local Plan site allocations in Sandhurst. We would support the Parish should they take forward the AECOM recommendation of affordable housing ‘Rural Exception Site’. Policy H5 of the SLP supports such provision.	Noted – the PC will consider this.

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
Page 9 – para 1.19	Population characteristics	The study recommends the focusing of housing delivery on smaller units to help meet the needs of older people, given the ageing population over the Plan period. This is supported by Policy H6 in the SLP.	Noted.
Page 10 – para 1.20	Future Population and size needs	AECOM recommends that 70% of new dwellings should be 2 or fewer bedrooms and just under 20% should be four or more bedrooms. This is to reflect the needs of an ageing population and assist in altering the dwelling mix where large, detached homes predominate. This would be supported by Policy H1 of the SLP where any mix should reflect requirements of a 'made Neighbourhood Plan or local housing needs intelligence	Noted. This could be amended (as per general comment above).
Pg 10 – para 1.26	Need for Specialist Housing for Older People	The Study estimates a need for 25 to 27 specialist accommodation units for older people that may be needed over the Plan period. To accommodate such need would likely require a rural exception site to come forward given that the allocated sites will only provide 10 additional affordable housing units.	Noted.
Pg 19 – para 4.4	Definitions	First Homes as an affordable housing product is no longer specified in the NPPF as a specific affordable product. The Parish may wish instead to focus on shared ownership as an affordable route to home ownership.	Noted and this can be reflected in the SNP.
Pg 20 – para 4.7	Current tenure profile	Typo again should read 'private ownership' in line 3, not 'private rent.'	Noted.
Pg 25 – para 4.27 – 4.31	Affordable Home Ownership	There is discussion here about a higher discount for First Homes than afforded in the SLP. Given affordability pressures and that there is now no specific requirement to provide First Homes, the Parish may want to consider shared ownership tenure instead.	Noted as above, to broaden reference to shared ownership.
Pg 26 – para 4.32		There is some concern over the affordability of Rent to Buy as a product as rents can be at a higher rate not allowing the tenant to sufficiently save for a deposit. There are also not many RP's that offer this as an affordable housing tenure.	Noted.

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
Pg 28 – para 4.45	AECOM Estimates	The estimate of need based on the AECOM study suggests that 100% of new affordable dwellings in Sandhurst should be in affordable ownership tenures and that the Steering Group has expressed that there is little demand for affordable rent in the NA. However recent data taken for the Housing Register, (23 rd April) finds that there are 8 households waiting for social rented housing with a local connection to Sandhurst and 38 expressing a preference for Sandhurst as an area waiting on the Housing Register.	This is noted and can be reflected as an update to the HNA and within the policy justification.
Pg 30 – para 4.51	Evidence from the LPA	The data should be replaced with the following data from the LPA Housing Register in April 2025: Current households on the Housing Register with a confirmed Local connection to Sandhurst include 4 x 1 bed, 2 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed.	Noted. This could be amended (as per general comment above).
Pg 30 – para 4.54	Application of Local Plan Policies	The para notes that whilst NDP's can't normally influence the overall proportion of affordable housing, the research finds a robust evidence of need for affordable housing. The LPA would welcome discussions with the Steering Group around this topic particularly given the SLP Policy H5 Rural Exception Sites could be a mechanism for further affordable housing with the right provider partner and support of the Rural Housing Enabler.	Noted and to be pursued by the PC.
Pg 31 – para 4.55		The paragraph states that the local plan does not dictate a precise balance between rented and shared ownership. Whilst the Core Strategy 2010 does not, the Submitted Local Plan has a tenure split of 60% social rent and 40% shared ownership.	Noted. This could be amended (as per general comment above).
Pg 32 Table 4-7	Indicative tenure split (affordable housing)	Indicative affordable split includes First Homes. Given that there may be problems finding RP's to take affordable housing in the Parish, it may be preferable for low cost home ownership to be provided as shared ownership which RP's are normally more willing to provide.	Noted. This could be amended (as per general comment above).

Document Reference	Topic	Comment/ Recommended action	Comment from SPC
Pg 33 – para 4.62	Conclusion	Typo again in line 3 should say ‘private ownership’ and not ‘private rent’.	Noted.
Pg 35 – para 4.69		Noted that the need for affordable housing is greater than that which will be provided through allocations and therefore the NDP may wish to pursue a rural exceptions site of all affordable housing. The SLP has a policy H5 ‘Rural Exception Sites’.	Noted and for the PC to pursue.
Pg 58 – para 6.37	The Role of Mainstream Housing	Paragraph states that the SLP does not require housing to be built to specific requirements for older people. However, Policy H6 Housing for older people and people with disabilities includes for new build housing to meet the optional M4(2) standards. Also, in Policy H6, 5% of the affordable housing in schemes over 20 units is to be built to M4(3) standards.	Noted. This could be amended (as per general comment above).