

CARLISLE HOUSING PARTNERSHIP

HOUSING MARKET GROUP

26TH APRIL 2012
SLUPSK, CARLISLE CIVIC CENTRE

Attendees

Rachel Lightfoot - RL (Chair), Margaret Miller - MM (Carlisle City Council), Christopher Hardman - CH (Carlisle City Council), Jacqui Walsh - JW (Homes & Communities Agency), Anne-Marie Wilmot - AMW (Impact Housing), Jocelyn Holland - JH (Cumbria Association of Local Councils), Cllr Raynor Bloxham - RB (Portfolio Holder, Housing), Cllr Marilyn Bowman - MB (Portfolio Holder, Economic Development), John Clasper - JC (Eden Housing Association), Graham Hale - GH (Cumbria County Council), John Smith - JS (Thomas Armstrong), Mally Irving - MI (Riverside), Simon Taylor - ST (Carlisle City Council), Andrew Williams - AW (Carlisle City Council - minutes).

Minutes		Actions
1.	<p>Apologies</p> <p>Greg Denwood (Two Castles), Grant Seaton (Cumberland Building Society), Bob Allen (Brampton & Beyond),</p>	
2.	<p>Minutes of the Last Meeting</p> <p>Taken as a true record</p>	
3.	<p>Actions Arising</p> <p>Updated versions of the Housing Strategy and Action Plan will be circulated to the group – This has been done.</p> <p>City Council to feedback on how other LAs are mapping land – This action will be carried over to the next meeting.</p> <p>Group members to feedback on viability assessment – GH and RL highlighted that the standardised viability approach was being supported across the County and this was being fed into Cumbria Planning Group via Paul Feehily and hence into the LEP Expert Group. RL confirmed that the assumptions present in the viability template will change depending on the scheme. CH stated that the City Council is already asking developers to provide viability assessments when developers challenge requisite planning obligations. Failure to provide financial viability assessments has led to some planning applications being rejected in committee. RB stressed that if developers feel they are unable to provide certain planning obligations, then they should inform the planning team in advance. This saves time and conflict further down the line. GH added that developers should not ignore the importance of early engagement with both the City Council and the County Council regarding planning applications. It was agreed as an action to request the LEP Expert Group produce a protocol document, in order to promote best practice relating to s106 negotiations and early</p>	<p>AW to feedback on how other local authorities are mapping their land.</p> <p>AW/RL to write to chair of the LEP Expert group</p>

	engagement.	informing them of the group's recommendation for a best practice document to be developed.
4.	<p>Carlisle's Housing Strategy - Work Programme</p> <p>MM introduced the work programme, and the attendees discussed priority actions to make up the group's first year work programme (see drafted work programme for the Housing Market group). Discussions were held around each of the seven key actions of the Housing Strategy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Action 1 <p>JH queried the City Council's approach to allocating the New Homes Bonus. Officers were unable to give a firm answer, but it was agreed to bring a statement regarding the New Homes Bonus to the next meeting of the Housing Market group. GH stated that the County Council has made no specific commitment on how it will allocate its New Homes Bonus this year, though last year the County Council allocated its NHB to three projects. RL stated that a key barrier to delivering housing in the district was the delay in processing applications. CH stated that this was being worked on through the City Council's S106 working group; the group will eventually incorporate external organisations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Actions 2 & 3 <p>A discussion was held on the importance of information sharing. RB pointed to the failed Empty Homes bid, and the need to share information in advance to ensure that the most is made of the limited funding that is available.</p> <p>MM highlighted a housing delivery model brought forward by Cheshire, which uses public sector land to deliver a range of market and affordable housing. JW and AW are to update the group on this model. RB stated that public sector organisations need to take a longer-term view of the value of land assets, to which JC pointed out similarities to the situation in which developing housing associations find themselves, as these organisations can only sweat their assets so much in order to deliver in the current climate. GH highlighted that more partnership work should be undertaken with the County Council, including coordination of land releases. It was agreed that a member of the County Council Property Team should be invited to sit on the group. RB also suggested that the relevant portfolio holder from the County Council should be invited to the group as well.</p> <p>JH stated that she had a list of rural housing-related issues that should be considered in drawing up the work programme. It was agreed that they should be sent to AW pending update of work programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Actions 4 & 5 <p>JC cautioned that, alongside further development, the group should look to make existing developments more effective. He pointed to Heysham Gardens, where more strategic work is required to maximise the benefits of the scheme. AMW seconded this, stating that more should be done to flag up the scheme to local residents. It was agreed that this should make up the bulk of the next meeting, and that the meeting should take place at Heysham Gardens itself. It was also agreed that somebody from Adult Social Care should be invited to attend the meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Actions 6 & 7 	<p>MM/AW to bring statement on the NHB to the next meeting of the group.</p> <p>JW to send update on model to AW for circulation to group.</p> <p>GH to invite County representatives to the next meeting.</p> <p>JH to send list of issues to AW.</p> <p>AW and JC to organise next meeting at Heysham Gardens.</p> <p>GH to invite representative from Adult Social Care.</p>

	Members of the group felt that the actions in this plan were too specific to go into the work programme.	
5.	<p>Housing in the National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>CH gave a quick overview of the NPPF, and its vision of supporting sustainable development; a development should be considered in terms of its economic, environmental and social sustainability, with each factor weighed as equal.</p> <p>A further new initiative included in the NPPF is the potential for market housing to subsidise affordable housing in areas previously off-limits to market housing delivery.</p> <p>CH also stated that the City Council would, in line with guidance in the NPPF, be developing a Local Plan, and that this would speed up the land allocation process.</p>	
6.	<p>Stakeholders' update</p> <p>JH – The CRHT have received funding to employ a rural housing enabler for two years.</p>	
7.	<p>Agenda Items for Next Meeting</p> <p>Agenda items are to be forwarded to AW.</p>	
8.	<p>Dates for Next Meeting</p> <p>The next meeting of the group has yet to be confirmed, but will take place at Heysham Gardens.</p>	