

Outcomes of consultation

A10.1 Introduction.....	1
A10.2 First Partnership Event, 7 February 2007	1
Table 1: The Housing Market - Hopes	2
Table 2: The Housing Market - fears and solutions	5
Table 3: The Housing Market Assessment: Hopes.....	11
Table 4: The Housing Market Assessment: Fears and solutions	14
Table 5: Get involved, keep in touch.....	20
Table 6: Feedback Sheets	22
A10.3 Second Cambridge HMA Partnership Event, 26 April 2007	23
A10.4 Formal consultation on the draft SHMA.....	26
A10.5 Responses to draft SHMA	26
Table 7: Please indicate which sections of the SHMA you are commenting on... ..	27
Table 8: How robust and credible do you think the SHMA is?.....	28
Table 9: Comments made on the form, comments and actions arising	30
Table 10: Other comments made with comments and actions.....	46
Table 11: Compliments	55
A10.6 Third workshop feedback, 30 January 2008.....	56
Table 12: Group feedback and actions/reactions arising.....	56
Table 13: Feedback sheets.....	60

Appendix 10. Outcomes of consultation

A10.1 Introduction

One of the fundamental principles behind this SHMA was to include and involve a broad range of partners in the research, in its outcomes, and in its the shape and coverage.

The project team has followed a variety of courses to make this possible, including:

- Briefing notes
- Contact via e-mails
- Visiting and updating existing groups on the SHMA's progress and inviting feedback
- Three major consultation events
- A formal consultation on the draft, covering an eight week period and including a consultation response form to help guide respondents' thoughts within the CLG's robust and credible criteria.

Appendix 6,7,8,and 9 provide copies of the briefing notes which include some feedback to stakeholders on each event. This appendix gives a review of the events held, the outcomes, the action taken as a result, the formal consultation and in each case specifies what partners said and the SHMA project team's responses or plans to address issues.

A10.2 First Partnership Event, 7 February 2007

On 7th Feb 2007 some 47 people attended the workshop, and 24 returned feedback sheets. The feedback from the event was summarised in our second briefing note, see Appendix 7.

Presentations

The opening sessions provided an outline of the reasons for doing a housing market assessment and progress to date in the Cambridge sub region, the differences between previous the housing need survey approach to HMAs, and the current stage of CLG guidance.

There was an outline of all the information being used at this early stage, and thoughts on how the assessment would build over time. This included plans for our Household survey and the intentions of this new primary research. There followed presentations on what we know now about Demography, affordability and planning. Our final presentation summarised the recent survey of new residents at Cambourne, and highlighted some lessons we can learn from this recent development when visualising and planning for new developments in future.

During questions raised in the opening sessions, the issue of communication was raised and a suggestion that all the slides and notes should be available on the internet.

In response to this, and to ensure the messages from the workshop and resulting actions are clear for all stakeholders, Horizons has undertaken to e-mail the presentations and feedback to delegates and invitees, and to set up a "virtual" place for the HMA where the materials, notes and action plans are freely available, along with supporting information for the HMA.

Workgroups

After a break, delegates broke up into 3 workshop groups, which all considered the following questions:

Hopes and fears:

- ...for the housing market
- ...for the housing market assessment
- Overcoming barriers

This exercise looked at delegates' hopes and fears for two separate issues: the housing market, and the housing market assessment. It then asked people to think about possible solutions to their fears, and for their colleagues' fears if they had ideas to share.

Once everyone had time to put up hopes and fears, they moved on to noting down how to overcome "their own" barriers, and looking at other's "barriers" and suggesting how to overcome them.

The tables below group comments made under side headings, for ease of reference, though these were added after the event and are meant only to help link ideas and suggestions. The "hopes" column on the left should be read separately from the other columns. However "fears" and "solutions" usually relate to each other – where a solution was suggested for a specific fear, this is listed next to that fear.

Please note: the workshop notes are simply the comments people made, written up, and have not been edited or adjusted. They do not imply agreement by the parties involved in organising the event.

Hopes were identified at the workshop. Action/reaction added in later stages of SHMA production to try to point out where and how we have responded.

Table 1: The Housing Market - Hopes

Hopes	Action / Reaction
That supply will increase and prices fall	Monitor trends in future under Chapter 20, <i>Affordability in current market</i> ; Section 4: <i>Future Housing Market</i> and Section 5: <i>Housing Need</i>
Supply meets demand	
Price rises slow down a bit	
Land prices stop rising	
House prices will stabilise	
Barker is right – greater supply reduces cost	
Luck, as in housing supply will help stabilise / reduce housing costs	
Taking account of the risks to the development industry in housing delivery	Gain Development Industry feedback on Section 4, <i>Future housing market</i> , specifically Chapter 24 <i>Key drivers of the housing market and building industry</i>
Greater acceptance of need to provide more homes	Need to continually work together with all stakeholders to keep promoting this message.
Meets the housing needs of all and not the few	
To identify better the needs of the Cambridge Sub Region population – plan for the future better	Respond to reactions to Chapters 9 and 10 on demography and economic forecasts.

Hopes	Action / Reaction
Sufficient houses are built to avoid further market stress	Continue to update and monitor delivery against the RSS and district trajectories as outlined in Chapter 21 <i>Planning context</i> and Chapter 22 <i>Past and future housing delivery</i> .
More housing choice for all	
New housing development is designed in a way that promotes environmental and social sustainability rather than goes for the commercially safe option	Continue to negotiate and progress the environmental and sustainability agendas for new developments in future. Could plan to build monitoring of environmental impact into SHMA in future as part of Chapter 22, <i>Past and future housing delivery</i>
High quality housing based on learning from previous problems	
High quality design and sustainability	
I hope that the housing market will ensure there is a variety and volume of different tenure types to meet the varied circumstances of occupiers i.e. not just owner occupiers or social rent	Monitor responses to chapters on tenure, size and type set out in Chapters 20, 25 and 26 and section 5 <i>Housing Need</i> . Monitor effectiveness of the information in the SHMA and its value as an evidence base for planners and other stakeholders following consultation. Monitor changes in Chapter 20, <i>Affordability in the current market</i> .
More products within the housing market	
Better balance of housing tenure and type and cost to cater for current and future need	
A more proactive and business-like approach from local planning authorities incentivising development based on market signals rather than using restrictive planning policy	
A more sensible approach to planning for housing – especially market housing	
Significant increase in supply of land / houses to reduce price rises	
Housing Corporation comes up with the goods!	
Integration of housing corporation funding within planning system and housing market	Continue to work together with HC and planners to report on housing delivery in future as part of Chapter 22, <i>Past and future housing delivery</i>
Local community strategy / core strategy integrated	Separate from the core function of the SHMA, but may help to have a universal evidence base for strategy writers to refer to.
Clearer guidance from planning guidance on delivery of affordable housing through s.106's / developer contributions	Continual process of development via Planning Bill and EERA Good Practice Guide developing for s106 agreements.
That infrastructure issues in the sub region will be addressed	Housing Delivery Fund bid for 2008-11 moderately successful, however not enough funding for all the infrastructure required from the source so prioritisation is needed, and will need to work on resourcing other needs not forthcoming from HDF.
Central government provides huge infrastructure grants	
Improved funding for infrastructure and facilities to serve major housing development	
Supported by adequate services and infrastructure	
% of affordable housing increases	This conflict is telling, we have worked to provide the evidence required under the CLG guidance and to provide the context and evidence needed by planners to devise locally relevant LDF targets. However we need to see the outcomes of the draft SHMA consultation to gauge how effectively we have met this need.
% of affordable housing decreases	

Hopes	Action / Reaction
Delivery against affordable targets	Past and future delivery included in Chapter 22 but needs continual update
Affordable housing for local people	
That housing becomes more affordable	Will monitor based on Chapter 20, <i>Affordability in current market</i> as data is renewed and/or we seek new sources of data in future
We plan more effectively for lower income households	
Opportunities for local people to access affordable housing	
On-going overview of changing demand for intermediate tenure	Comprehensive assessment provided in Chapter 19, <i>Intermediate housing</i> , which will need update as new data is available and as Choice Based Lettings increases publicity for all forms of affordable housing.
That the market becomes better at meeting needs, i.e. solving the issue of "intermediate housing" etc.	
Supplies sufficient housing to support economic growth of the Cambridge sub region, for both key workers and workers in growth industries	Need to analyse the Intermediate Market with stakeholders to see what and how we need to view this part of the market and how best to monitor changes in demand and affordability.
Greater % of wheelchair-accessible housing across all tenures	Continuing work required on Chapter 34, <i>Disability and Housing</i> to see whether and how to best put this suggestion into effect Have worked with County Disability Group to form this chapter, await consultation to see how effective this has been and how to build on it in future.
Consultation with disability groups and specialist providers	
Choice of accessible housing for people with disabilities	
That limits will be put on buy-to-let and student housing in certain areas	We have analysed both buy to let and student housing, while not suggesting specific limits have outlined the effect both have on the housing market. Important not to demonise a tenure or a customer group, but also vital to continually monitor effects of "segments" of the market in future.
Local planners to specifically allocate sites for park homes in areas which may currently fall outside village framework	Park homes included in the SHMA within chapter 35, Rural housing to highlight the role played by Park Homes across the sub region.
Rent controls imposed on private landlords	The private rented market is analysed in some depth in Chapter 15. Important to monitor trends in affordability in future, and also to gauge the effect of changes to the Rent Service areas effective from 2007.
Address the numbers of people with second homes – council tax	Empty and second homes not found to be huge issues generally across the sub-region, however may want to investigate further in future to verify.
Empty homes – remove VAT on costs to bring empties back into use – not charged on new build.	
Engage homeless people in bringing empties back into use	Very interesting to investigate such a system in future. Needs further investigation, separate from the SHMA itself.
Employ / engage unemployed people in the delivery of affordable housing – in return for a salary and other benefits	

Table 2: The Housing Market - fears and solutions

Both fears and corresponding solutions were identified at the workshop. Action/reaction added in later stages of SHMA production to try to point out where and how we have responded.

Fears	Solutions	Action / reaction
That the latest Barker review will not be implemented		Housing and Planning Bills set to legislate in response to Barker (among other issues). Have briefly set out the principles in Chapter 24, <i>Key drivers</i> .
Guided bus is a disaster – infrastructure cannot cope		Not strictly a housing issue, GAF funding has been used to make progress on the Busway.
Different aspirations of all the people involved in the housing market		By trying to assess different aspects of the housing market, we aim for the SHMA to help clarify and bring out these aspirations between those parties involved or affected.
Barker is wrong, greater supply does not increase cost		Probably outside the scope of our sub region to address. But vital to monitor effects of supply, demand, price and availability by monitoring Chapter 22, <i>Past and future housing delivery</i> .
There is not one sub regional housing market		True, we agreed to work within an administrative boundary, but have found different markets and types of market within this area.
Unforeseen downturn in national economy and house building		Probably outside our scope to address, but can monitor effects.
Lack of appropriate building skills		An effect on the building industry itself, touched on in Chapter 24 but needs further investigation and joint action planning to respond effectively. Projects already running in the County, may want to investigate further and share learning from these.
Link to jobs and houses		Tried to make this link clear in Chapter 9, <i>Economic context</i>
Not within the control of councils		Councils are not setting up to answer all questions or tackle all issues, but to bring together information and help partners find what they need and suggest improvements in the future. More about councils enabling and networking than knowing everything.

Fears	Solutions	Action / reaction
Prices will continue to rise leading to a generation who will never realise their aspirations		Again, beyond the control of the SHMA but can be monitored and further research and actions undertaken as Chapter 20, <i>Current affordability</i> is kept under review and further data on prices and effects on the markets analysed.
Delivers sub standard homes which are very expensive		
House prices continue to rise, pricing more people out!		
House price differentials increase social polarisation		
Certain segments of the population being excluded from appropriate housing, i.e. middle income, new students, senior execs		Sectors of the population have been looked at in Chapter 34, <i>Housing for different household types</i> , which may be extended in future to assess specific effects on such groups
Market will not provide for low earners and the economic and service needs of the area		The SHMA attempts to look at factors affecting the building industry, and at different household types, market segments in terms of tenure. All this needs to be consulted on and stakeholders' views accommodated. Plans for future research will need to incorporate effective alternative interventions, to be considered and put into effect between different members of the SHMA partnership team.
Market housing developers cannot meet all affordable housing needs – other interventions are required on a major scale		
Large scale housing developments that do not integrate with existing communities – not balanced or sustainable	If all housing and public realm was wheelchair accessible, choice and sustainability would increase Robust policies that insist on and support / fund a full range of housing	The SHMA looks to provide the evidence, or foundation for the evidence needed, to take such policy decisions either across the sub region or by individual districts.
New communities dominated by private housing agenda, not integrated, sustainable communities	The right balance is achieved between social and private housing, informed by research on what is the right tenure mix for a balanced community – rather than simply relying on district-wide targets for affordable housing	Precisely what the SHMA aims to achieve, though future improvement and development will spring from the consultation and feedback of all partner, including planners, on how successful it as been at it's first iteration.
Providing enough variety of housing types, not just tenures		
Large group of intermediate tenure not met		
Too little family housing because of high density requirements	Insist in housing strategies and planning policies on appropriate mix/ land-take for larger family housing and bungalows etc	It is up to local planning authorities to use the evidence within the SHMA to devise their planning policies and housing strategies. Each will need o consider these issues, and

Fears	Solutions	Action / reaction
		further research may be needed to balance density and quality with numbers and delivery.
Not enough smaller units will be built	We don't need more smaller units, we need family housing! Have accurate data	The first SHMA attempts analysis of past trends, and summarises good practice guidance on mixed and balanced communities in chapter 26. Further research on these issues is planned to add to the current draft SHMA.
Lack of grant funding	Sufficient supply of grant Introduce private finance	Certainly one of the outcomes of the SHMA is a clear need for more housing to be delivered, of all tenures, and this will include the need for funding for all planning gain including affordable housing.
Insufficient funding to deliver balanced housing market	Securing maximum housing corp, s.106 and LA investment Greater public funding of affordable housing	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review planning system in light of emerging local government agenda • Development of housing may be delayed due to procedural issues – decision making process is lengthy 	More resources for planning departments Status and remuneration for planners needs to increase and training on housing issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Certainly an issue for delivery of homes and delivery of planning decisions. • Will need to respond to the Planning Bill 2007 incorporating these issues
Planners / govt refuse to release more land for housing	More supply of land for housing – redesignate green belts	Cambridgeshire has benefited in terms of housing gain from changes of designation for greenbelt, however by developing the strategic link to land availability assessments in future, as they are produced, consulted upon and adopted, we may be able to secure a new data to support integrated land use planning across the sub-region. Naturally this also depends upon considering the different boundaries currently being used for housing and planning sub regions.
Greenbelt is not re-designated leading to imbalance of jobs and homes = more commuting		
That changes in planning policy guidance (PPS3/ RSS etc) will create more of an “unplanned” rather than “planned” approach to housing provision		Certainly a possibility, we will need to use the opportunity of SHLAAs and SHMAs to try to strengthen the planned as opposed to the “appeal” focus for planning decisions on larger sites. We may look to the Mereham enquiry to set the scene for this issue locally.

Fears	Solutions	Action / reaction
Uncertainty for the development industry because of government proposals for a planning-gain supplement		Again, we need to consider and respond as a group to the Planning Bill 2007 to express our concerns and hopes for any new PGS system. Concerns have already been clearly expressed by the LDV, in the HDF bid for 2008-11 and in the sub regional response to the housing green paper in 2007 on this issue. However we could be able to use the Partnership Team to consider, test and suggest further alternatives.
Increasingly demanding planning gain expectations, e.g. energy efficiency, affordable housing, etc. versus the need to increase housing delivery		
Region-wide or district-wide target for affordable housing results in excessive concentration of it in new developments, giving unbalanced social mix		The SHMA still operates on the basis of district wide LDF / planning policy. Further work would be needed to change to a broader area for planning gain policy however comparing and learning from each others' existing practice may still prove helpful to all parties to ensure clarity, consistency and early communication of gains likely to be required on specific sites.
Land supply dries up	Planners need to designate a pipeline of land for 20+ years in local plans	SHLAAs underway (see chapter 24)
Insufficient land supply in the right (i.e. most sustainable) locations to meet housing needs	LPDs (especially SCDC) to look positively at opportunities to increase housing land supply at the edge of Cambridge	Will need to continually monitor available land supply in relation to need to deliver homes (see chapter 23).
Housing out of step with services	Harness private sector investment in infrastructure where possible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to ensure we work to ensure a joined-up approach and clear decision-making within districts on all areas of planning gain required. • May be possible to work together to assess the good practice being created by EERA, and other good practice from across the UK, and formulate how we can apply it locally.
Infrastructure not in place to facilitate sustainable communities in new developments	Aligned strategies	We have set out good practice and thinking around balanced communities in chapter 26, and from the Cambourne

Fears	Solutions	Action / reaction
How much do community services have an impact on housing market?		experience. Important to learn from both and apply to new developments planned in our area if they are to be as successful as possible.
Affordable housing will still not be a tenure of "choice"	All new developments should be tenure blind and that affordable housing should be made up of a variety of tenures, not just social rented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SHMA identifies broad groups of households who may be able to afford different tenure types. • We need to explore the options further to ensure we take every opportunity to meet housing need, demand and ensure people have real choice about their homes. • Some imaginative scenario-testing may help assess the possibility of alternative tenure models, and affordability of existing tenures, to diversify and extend choice in the housing market of the future.
Price rise = more unaffordability – first time buyers cannot buy	Planners would need to take account of "the market" when deciding upon land use allocation	Direct links to the evidence with the SHMA and the link to SHLAAs.
Local people increasingly priced out of market housing as better-off move in – unsustainable communities		
Affordability decreases leading to more demand for affordable housing and increasing homelessness		
That the increase in affordable housing requirements will reduce the amount of affordable housing	Lobby the Housing Corporation to reduce restrictions	Needs further thought, as reducing standards may not help us plan homes or communities which are fit for purpose in the future. A delicate balance is needed, which includes the levels of funding available to support delivery of more expensive affordable homes
Unpopular new developments because of unsustainable level of affordable housing		
Affordable housing is not always affordable and/or is in wrong location		
Current overheating in housing market means that affordability in intermediate housing not achievable		Certainly Chapter 20 shows surprising levels of affordability for intermediate tenures, however with the launch of new products due early in 2008 we will need to assess these products and monitor their take

Fears	Solutions	Action / reaction
		up and affordability in future, as part of developing the SHMA.
Shortage of key worker staff on national basis will be felt most in areas of high housing cost such as Cambridge		Assessment of intermediate and key worker housing in chapters 19 and 20.
Increase in numbers of people being caught between social and intermediate sector, big impact on key workers		A vital area to investigate and assess with key worker employers to ensure we can take opportunities to help balance each area of the market
Provision of supported housing will become cost prohibitive for RSLs		Vital this conception does not prove itself in our sub region. Although affordability is a sharp focus need, supported is also critical and needs further work to assess comprehensively. We acknowledge supported housing needs require further examination as the SHMA develops.
Buy to let grows causing loss of community cohesion	Services set themselves up to work with and involve the buy to let tenants	The first SHMA assesses available information on buy to let, however this is an area needed further research and monitoring of trends as the housing market changes and adjusts in future. Again, important not to demonise buy to let, but to work with it and ensure we take every opportunity to help investors let these homes wherever possible, with appropriate support, guarantees and standards.
That buy to let and student housing will destroy communities Buy to let market increases by investors buying large number of properties at once Institutional investors buy up all new properties	Government needs to look at legislation that will limit buy to let e.g. financial measures or legislation Put limits on buy to let – legislation	
Buy to let properties are investment and not used for rental market		
That Park Homes sector will get caught up with local gypsy/traveller issues		We have assessed Park Homes and Gypsy and Traveller housing issues, and have not perceived a cross-over in our research to date.
That park homes will not be considered as “affordable”		Park Homes are not affordable within the new PPS3 definition, however we have acknowledged them as part of our housing market, and a part which is invariably priced below more tradition housing forms.
Olympics will reduce funding available in this sub region		A trend to keep monitoring in future, and to consult the development industry on locally for their views and possible
Olympics – HC funds going to London		

Fears	Solutions	Action / reaction
Impact of Olympics – price of materials, lack of skills, impact on market		interventions which might be needed.
That we carry on as we are – no change	Ensure the ideas of this workshop are acted upon	The workshop provided a very firm foundation for the SHMA work and our approach to it.
Will result in even greater micro-management of the market	Greater flexibility in delivering tenure and mix via planning policies	We have tried to avoid micro-management by producing the evidence needed without excessive conclusions or analysis, to enable the consultation and eventually local planning authorities to draw the appropriate local conclusions.
Achieving sustainable communities – can we do it?		Welcome feedback from partners on the consultation draft on how and whether the draft SHMA will help us achieve this.

Table 3: The Housing Market Assessment: Hopes

Hopes	Action / reaction
The information obtained will be used to encourage more and better new homes	Welcome views on how the consultation draft does and can help us do this, now and in future.
Encompass diversity of population's housing needs	Specific chapters included to cover diversity of population, but certainly an area which can be developed in future.
To provide better information regarding housing types needed	Again, welcome feedback on this.
It helps us to develop a accurate assessment of need and gives enough focus on affordability	Welcome feedback
Uses all demand data available	Certainly tried to use consistent and reliable data, but again see this as an area for improvement and development in future
Less emphasis on owner occupation as the only viable tenure	Chapter 21 aims to show the spectrum of affordability and links to tenure ranges.
That it is based on a robust and defensible methodology which is supported by all key stakeholders – including the private sector	We have followed CLG guidance closely and welcome feedback from all stakeholders on how we have achieved this and where we can improve in future.
Better quality, more up to date information on housing need / demand than in the past	Certainly provides a consistent and reliable database, again feedback encouraged.
More evidence of interrelation-ship of various markets	An areas for development – we have tried to asses the sub regional markets but acknowledge there are many "layers" in the housing market and many perspectives to view it from, all of which need to be assessed and developed as part of the learning and building process in future.
We have a better understanding of what people want and can afford	Welcome feedback.

Hopes	Action / reaction
Greater understanding of regional variations in need / demand enabling more focussed development	Welcome feedback.
Able to use to build developments that meet more accurately (?) demand	Welcome feedback.
HMA will better inform market to supply the economic / service needs of the area	Welcome feedback, included strongly in chapter 22, but would like views on how well we have achieved this and how we can continue to link with future economic and integrated regional strategies via both EERA and EEDA's future roles.
Able to share housing market data / key indicators BETWEEN growth areas	Have worked with neighbouring sub regions in developing our SHMA, however an area for future work and look to progress through the EEER Quality Assurance work.
Difference between different needs will be evidence-based rather than hear-say	Welcome feedback.
Move away from the approach that affordable is good, market is bad	Welcome feedback.
Get a reliable, representative sample for the survey – sample a similar “area” in Cambridgeshire	Have aimed to do this and to cross-reference survey data and secondary data. Again, welcome feedback on our approach and effectiveness.
Wider understanding of housing needs – pan-tenure (SR, LCHO, INT and market needs)	Have attempted in section D, future housing needs and in chapter 21, current affordability. Welcome feedback on effectiveness and usefulness of assessment across tenures.
Understand balance between need and aspiration	Welcome feedback.
The it raises the profile of housing issues in the sub region	We hope so, welcome feedback.
It will involve all the key organisations involved in providing housing	Certainly have involved a broad range of partners in consultation, welcome feedback on effectiveness and on other partners to include in future.
It is accepted / used by both local planning authorities and the development industry	Works with stakeholders to make aware of, and get involved in, the assessment. Both groups named are on project and partnership teams.
Links with growth agenda	Have included in SHMA and plan to continue strengthening this link in future.
Buy-in from partners reducing the potential to challenge the findings	We hope so
Positive industry involvement	Definitely
That policy makers and planners take it seriously	As an evidence base we believe the SHMA will be indispensable, and will promote its use and explain it's outcomes to all stakeholders.
Working together will provide an answer to the housing problems	A great intention
Key worker employers to be involved in HMA work	We have included key worker issues, and are grateful for KWE input. However this is an area

Hopes	Action / reaction
Retention of staff in key worker employment is important. Hope this will be included in HMA	we need to build on in future.
Recognition that there are higher education and research workers – key workers in the Cambridge context but excluded from Govt. definitions – whose needs also need to be met	This is an area we need to work more closely with key worker employers with, in future.
Assess the relationship between economy and housing, not just data on each independently	We hope we have achieved this.
Generates sensible funding packages	A good intention
Links with funding	We hope so
Hopefully we will have the finalised guidance by the time PPS3 becomes fully operational on 1 April 2007. It will provide greater clarity on a number of issues (we hope!)	Yes
Realistically reflect the characteristics of the private housing markets – failed to be achieved in previous housing need assessments	We have worked hard on this but accept can always do more, and need to build partnerships to help extend our assessment.
Greater clarity on housing need and demand (in comparison to housing need surveys)	We hope so
It will be robust and not open to challenge at (planning) examination	We have tried to be inclusive and to welcome feedback on the SHMA, however cannot completely repel challenge.
That the HMA is a robust valid piece of work that will withstand the rigours of the first test case appeal!	
Assessment is used as an influential tool to inform decisions on housing provision	We hope so
Strong evidence base for planning process	
Improve understanding of requirement for socially rented and intermediate housing by taking forward-looking approach (versus backward-looking housing needs survey method)	
I hope that the HMA will give clear evidence of need for intermediate tenure – for elderly people i.e. shared ownership	We have certainly gathered information on intermediate tenures following this suggestion, and would welcome ideas on how successful this has been and whether we could do it better in future.
I hope that the HMA will give clear evidence of need for minority groups with special needs	We have included various chapters on specific needs, welcome feedback on how successful these chapters are.
I hope that the HMA will give clear evidence of need for young people who are ready, but not able, to leave home	
Better assessment for specialist housing	We are working on ways to identify markets related to housing and support, and plan to include more information on this in future work on the SHMA
Properly looks at “Park Homes” as affordable / low cost housing	Included (Chapter 36)
Provides a better understanding of private rental / buy to rent market	Included (Chapters 15 and 16)

Hopes	Action / reaction
It will show which income households are unable to access the private rented sector	Included (Chapters 15 and 21)
Deal with the issue that many private landlords / agent will not accept benefit dependent households as tenants	This tenure segment is included in chapters 15 and 21, however the links to and relationship with the Benefits system need further analysis.
Health impact of results to be included in study?	Not in the initial version, however links to health and to joint care plans a possible area for future research
Developers accept its findings	We hope so.
Speedy delivery while not sacrificing climate / environmental standards	This balance needs to be struck in our growth environment, however the SHMA may not be the tool to affect it.
HMA will lead to more ownership between private sector and (local) authorities and therefore less appeals	We hope so.
More understanding of the private rented sector on the area	We hope so.
More understanding of the impact of in-migration on the area	We hope so.
Views of in-migrants to sub region	We aim to gather these through the new household surveys, outlined in chapter 29.
Information on why in-migrants come here – Jobs? Retirement?	
Finding out peoples' interest in different housing types and why	
Level of inward migration identified	We have included this in chapter 10 on demographic change, and used in chapter 27 to identify housing need in future.

Table 4: The Housing Market Assessment: Fears and solutions

Fears	Solutions	Action / reaction
Affordability is an impossible problem to solve	More housing in the right places to meet demand	It is difficult but the SHMA needs to go as far as it can to quantify the issue, following the CLG guidance
Too focussed on drivers for DEMAND and not SUPPLY, e.g. of deliverable housing sites		Included some sections on housing supply, however accept these need more research in future to improve understanding and links, and to help remove barriers
Interest rates (rise) will distort		Will work on a model to try to analyse the different market forces in play
Unclear as how to take onboard local factors		The SHMA is written for the sub-region but has divided to local authorities at present. In future will investigate if it needs to go to a lower geographical level.
How much do community		An interesting question, one

Fears	Solutions	Action / reaction
services have an impact on housing market		which the New Household Surveys may help us identify (under the same model as the Cambourne survey)
Do not equate household size with house size		We have tried to be as clear as we can on this issue, and identify which we are referring to through out the SHMA.
Equity release by family		An area we need to understand better, along with savings, deposits and access to capital in general.
Never able to solve social housing need		The SHMA can only try to identify and predict needs, so as to tackle, if not to solve, them.
Rural needs hard to assess		Yes, a chapter is included on rural issues. This may need further work and mapping to try to show where separate rural markets exist and how they inter-link.
Relying on land registry data	Ensure that actual sales prices and numbers / % of properties sold at e.g. £120K are covered in estate agents survey (imminent)	We have started the SHMA process using Land Registry. We are looking to secure a second source of house price information to triangulate with Land Registry in future (e.g. HomeTrack).
Data will not be used effectively to plan	Best practice from other sub regions	We hope it will and are working with planners and other partners to try to promote it's use to plan for the future.
Assessment will not be taken seriously by planners and policy makers	Need to raise profile of HMA and get wide public support for increase in supply	
It will not involve the experts in providing new houses	Who are the experts? All parties can be involved in the HMA	We have involved a broad range of stakeholders, and are very pleased with the interest and level of input made by them.
Will be used inappropriately by policy makers / politicians	Engage all partners in results / use of results so it is not used inappropriately	
Doesn't have buy-in of all interests to results / conclusions		
May give unexpected results, that LAs or developers may not like		Such a huge body of work is bound to throw up some surprises, we hope the SHMA provides not only the data, but the means to challenge and check it so it can grow and improve in future.

Fears	Solutions	Action / reaction
Private sector involvement is currently underplayed. Must be included in the future, but ideally from the start of the process	Greater involvement of housebuilders and developers – through surveys and workshops on a regular basis Establish fit for purpose structure and process developed and operated by appropriate partnership	The Land Owners Group and Development industry Forum have been involved on the Project Team, builders, landowners and developers have been included in the Stakeholder Team, received briefings and been invited to events. Participation has been good and active, and the SHMA has been produced in the light of these comments and will develop further with these partners help, in future.
Will not reflect the views of the private sector	Make sure private sector (who exactly) included in project group	
Lack of private sector Private sector stakeholders feel excluded	Private sector buy-in through contribution Market to wider private sector Use local media to market HMA – radio, TV, local papers Tele marketing Newsletters Create a select list of private sector reps A longer notice when sending invitations for workshops etc	On these specific suggestion, have increased involvement in the project group, issues briefing notes electronically, included all private sector contacts on the stakeholder group, and provided “pencil it in” dates for workshops, so the date can be held and confirmation provided nearer the event.
Advise, in particular, the private sector what the HMA is and outcomes		Included in briefing notes and provided phone number and email to get in touch with any such questions
Different boundaries for housing and planning sub-region – how to gather information / plan?		Have clarified the boundaries in the text, and attempted to focus the SHMA on the housing sub-region, making this clear to planners who work on a different boundary.
HMA sub region is not consistent with planning sub-region		
Out of step with planning sub-region		
Out of step with national / regional approach	Consistent methodologies in different sub regions “Future proof” in collection of data	We do not accept this, and are part of a Regional Quality Assurance assessment which we hope will support our view, outcomes to be outlined in Appendix 11, <i>Quality Assurance</i>
Whether housing market areas properly defined	Clarify outcomes – “market areas”	We have provided mapping and definitions of market areas, and have followed the CLG guidance which provides options to identify your working area and the markets within it. However accept we can always do more to identify markets, overlaps and links in future.
Is unable to focus on relatively small “sub markets” due to data problems	Will have to develop “modelled” data using e.g. house prices, rents, earnings	Initial SHMA provides district-focussed data, in future we will look to provide data on smaller

Fears	Solutions	Action / reaction
Will the findings be available at sub-district level?		area basis as and when feasible.
Has problems in providing a "sub district" or rural / urban" analysis where needed		Have provided a separate chapter on rural housing issues, however accept criticisms on the smaller-area aspects of the SHMA and aim to improve this aspect in future.
Will it treat future economic growth as a "given", which it seeks to accommodate, or will it consider how housing provision influences economic development? (Diagram of circular link between jobs and population)		The SHMA is based on existing economic projections, however with changes to the relevant strategies and agencies involved, will need to keep a close watch on the information used and updates, and on the relationships between economic and housing growth.
It will tell us about need but won't be matched by the resources to meet the needs sustainability		We hope to develop our approach to the outcomes and implementation in future, however the SHMA has to restrict itself to providing an evidence base rather than seeping into policy work, particularly at the early stages.
Funding	Private sector asked for financial contribution (also contribute to buy-in and involvement)	Will need to keep under review, particularly as the first 5 year SLA comes up for re-negotiation.
Government guidance is still in draft	But we've got a copy of the revisions proposed	Now finalised and used the final version.
Transfer from housing need surveys not smooth, potential to waste money	Put in specific "handover" text on what HNS and HMA have in common	Have included in Section A providing context, guidance and approach
Will it satisfy planning inspectors?	Involve planning practitioners in the process (LPA planning officers and planning consultants)	Have included in the consultation.
That the HMA fails the "robustness" test. (Without a reliable source of information decision-making will be difficult!	County researchers should also consult other professionals involved in devising housing market assessments for designated growth areas	EERA has compared our approach to others in its quality assurance report. Robustness part of the consultation we undertook – for outcomes, see later sections in this Appendix
Will the HMA take account of needs of key workers? If included as a proportion of overall employment numbers this may underestimate actual numbers. As for health – proportion of key workers may become higher (%?) of overall employment market		Have included as part of two chapters on intermediate housing and housing for keyworkers (Ch 19 and 20). Also look to work with key worker employers more closely in future to develop this aspect of the SHMA, extend the information employers can use, and build this issue further into

Fears	Solutions	Action / reaction
		the assessment.
Won't link to other agendas, e.g. supporting people (SP) – revenue issues vs. housing market	SP happy to be involved – can we discuss the “mini market” in more detail? Individual budgets allows choice of care and support, needs to be reflected in housing options available to such customers	Plan to include a further section on SP and the markets this may create for a variety of customer groups. First iteration covers the household groups identified by CLG, will look to extend this aspect in future.
Disabled people and other vulnerable groups will be an afterthought	Through inclusive assessment using tools and methods accessible to disabled and other vulnerable groups – use existing methodologies that work, use accessible media formats	Have combined work of the county disability forum on their housing strategy, and will consider specific research as part of our future plan to update or extend the SHMA. However an area not to be treated lightly and felt vital to include existing data via existing experts with plans to extend, rather than do a half-hearted job and draw the wrong conclusions through rushing it.
Housing needs of people with disabilities will be marginalized		
Fail to fully understand the needs of BME groups, thereby having shortfall in appropriate housing	Special surveys needed Identify as diverse a set of housing market users as possible, e.g. disabled, old, adult children living with parents, migrant workers	Have structures chapters on specific issues as suggested. BME issues outlined in Chapter 31, however further work needed to ensure appropriate housing solutions are found.
Hidden households, particularly amongst migrant population, not identified		We have included as a specific chapter (number 32) however data is not easy to obtain and we will need to carefully monitor changes over time, and housing implications.
That Park Homes will not be considered as “affordable”		Section on Park Homes included in Chapter 36, outlining their place and role in the market. May look to develop this section further in future.
HMAs cannot handle developments creating greater inward migration		It is true that large in-migration to new settlements are difficult to model in a SHMA. We may need to look to a separate issues paper on this subject if it becomes a greater issue than the SHMA can contain.
That it will not take account of those who have recently moved out of the sub region – and the reasons why they moved (information source: GP / NHS records for those who have recently moved out)		We have some misgivings about the GP / NHS data but will look into it in future and work with our partners and neighbouring SHMA areas to see if we can identify the household and their reasons for

Fears	Solutions	Action / reaction
Not finding out why people move away		moving, in future. This is a question we need to include in our New Households Survey, and feed back to the areas people have move in from.
That there may be conflicts in information when HMA crossover areas, leading to lack of credibility and challenge		We will look to tackle these issues as and when they arise.
It will not provide information about key sectors of the market i.e. do not respond to surveys		We undertook an interview survey to reduce levels of non-response. However we will re-assess the use of primary research and surveys after our first SHMA, to make sure we only carry them out when essential.
Loads of data: who will analyse it, how and by when? What market input?	Involve people who operate in, an understand, the housing market	We have tried to involve as wide a group of stakeholders as possible, though there is always room for improvement and to extend that coverage. The County Research Group has analysed the data and produced the SHMA, and continue this work as a priority in future.
Assessment cannot cope with changes in the market	Treat social rented and intermediate tenures as different markets	Will look to different data sources to try to respond to this challenge, and if we can continue to engage partners from across the housing market, draw in their experience and expertise to overcome this potential problem.
Won't keep pace with changing market	HMA should not be a static study, continue to update and evolve	
Wrong questions resulting in lack of holistic understanding	Broad range of data considered	
Survey and data will not be robust	<p>Ensure sampling of survey is representative and statistically reliable</p> <p>Get INSIGHTS from the survey not just data i.e. the reasons behind the responses</p> <p>Questions and answer sheet for stakeholders e.g. how you ensure survey stratification</p> <p>Ability to drill down</p> <p>Consider having focus groups in addition to survey (to drill down)</p> <p>Ongoing research and continuous review of data peculiarities</p>	<p>Survey was considered robust, as outlined in Appendix 2.</p> <p>However will look to improve and re-assess before repeating in its current form.</p>
Process is overly complex, outcome unclear	HMA needs to be accessed easily	Have worked hard to make format and structure clear and uncomplicated, however
Gets too complex		

Fears	Solutions	Action / reaction
I fear it will not be able to be used in a hands-on, understandable, practical way		welcome feedback on whether this has worked or not.
Initial results are not available to inform the strategic development in the Cambridge Sub Region – resource initially focussed on City and South Cambs		Fair criticism, it has taken some time to put the SHMA together and is still a growing, building and working document. However we worked hard to launch the consultation draft as soon as possible and understand it may have been used as a guide to the housing market.
That the information and analysis will be published too late to be taken into account in the preparation of the Northstowe outline planning application (need this by the end of April 2007)		

Table 5: Get involved, keep in touch

The groups were lively and presented a wealth of ideas and inspiration. Many issues were highlighted which will help us focus our efforts in the HMA, and perhaps more importantly, ensure we have involved of have plans to involve what everyone see as the key players.

For this exercise, delegates were asked to “vote” on a variety of options to get involved and keep in touch, at the various stages of the assessment.

	Emails	E-newsletters	Regular meetings	Events like today	Total	%	
When household survey is complete	17	11	2	8	38	20%	
When HMA is in draft form	15	13	3	14	45	23%	Focus groups for hard to reach groups e.g. BME, disabled, young people, travellers etc.
When first HMA is complete	6	8	1	24	39	20%	Get together a huge e-mail mailing list Press launch, LEN, Look East News etc
Detailed input to future development of HMA	9	9	6	14	38	20%	Involve specialists in focus groups for hard to reach groups e.g. BME, disabled, young people, travellers etc.
Overview of future development of HMA	10	11	3	9	33	17%	
Total	57	52	15	69	193		
Percentage	30%	27%	8%	36%			

Other suggestions	Hidden data. Environmental groups? Residents / school children. Data from private sources. Estate / Letting agents	Sub groups covering the mini markets Keep the public profile / PR at a high level
-------------------	--	--

Feedback to the group

Each of the three groups fed back some of the main issues highlighted to the whole group. There were some common hopes and fears between groups, and some interesting and imaginative solutions proposed to some of the barriers identified.

This pack includes the comments made in each category, and will also be used to create an “action plan” for the future of the HMA to make sure both the project team and the sub regional housing group, which is commissioning the assessment, are aware of the issues being raised, and responding to the concerns and issues delegates have highlighted.

Plenary discussion

Although the workshops were designed to ensure everyone could participate and present their views openly and honestly, there was a request from the floor that we should continue at the end of the morning with a brief discussion of any issues and concerns, there and then.

Some brief notes of the points raised are included in this feedback, though it is evident that in future we need to organise events which allow open discussion as well as participative methods.

Q: How to fund affordable housing in future is a major issue. HC funding is not increasing, yet planning percentages are. And if for example SCDC requires 50% won't this cause a hold up at each stage of the development of new homes?

A: Await CSR to see what's available. Look for efficiencies to “stretch grant” e.g. Cambridge Challenge. Need to ensure look at all funding streams, HC, s106, direct subsidy etc. Investment-led, not subsidy-led approach, might help. (John O'Mahoney, Housing Corporation and Dinah Roake, English Partnerships)

Q: Need to consider the period of affordability, effect of right to buy and to acquire, yet still specify “perpetuity”. New definition may help but unsure.

A: Cave Review looks at the assumptions for affordable housing, including what perpetuity means. Website invites comments. (Dinah Roake, English Partnerships)

Q: Is a sample of 600 in each district enough? Still needs to be reliable.

A: Will be reliable for + or – 4% but must be a random selection for this reliability. Survey only one small aspect of the HMA, must remember wealth of other information feeding in to it. Also guidance is focussing off primary research, so we are being very cautious in continuing with primary research. Will be robust for whole districts but need other data to go to smaller areas wherever possible. (Jill Tufnell and Trevor Baker, County Research Team)

Q: Cambourne survey is interesting – planning other similar surveys elsewhere, e.g. at Brooklands Avenue or York Street?

A: Yes, at Brooklands Avenue in the City, and in Huntingdon. Process is ongoing. Can do baseline testing over time. Commitment to fund in future is designed to keep annual commitment up and keep adding new data. (Jill Tufnell, County Research Team)

Q: Not involving delivery of homes. Many landowners hold on to sites. What about actual building of homes? Problems of skilled workforce and construction, training, availability. If want quality need to work on how to build. Pleas for comprehensive inclusion.

A: Accepted, strong message from the morning of wider involvement to be acted on. (Sue Beecroft, Horizons)

Table 6: Feedback Sheets

Around 47 people attended the workshop, of which 24 returned feedback sheets, a 51% return.

Please tick the boxes...	☹		☺		☺
Arrangements					
Event arrangements	1	1	4	9	9
Venue			1	10	13
Arrivals and registration			2	12	10
Refreshments			2	10	10
Presentations					
Introduction		1	6	11	3
Our housing market assessment			4	10	7
Household survey			1	14	6
Demography, planning and affordability			3	13	7
Learning from Cambourne		1	1	10	11
Workgroups					
Exercise 1: Hopes and fears		1	6	11	4
Exercise 2: Get involved, keep in touch		1	6	11	4
Overall		1	1	12	6
Totals (excluding "overall") = 247	1	5	36	121	84
Percentages	0%	2%	15%	49%	34%

Do you have any issues you would like to raise, or questions as yet unanswered?

- Workshop identified issues, but need to have the opportunity to debate and discuss these issues
- Needs of key workers and how these needs are included in HMA
- In light of recent evidence about our contribution as a race to global warming etc, how much will the environmental agenda be taken into account in this exercise?
- Would be useful for meetings to start later in the day to allow people to attend from outside the sub region.
- Should include house builders, mortgage lenders, planning consultants, surveyors etc who can assist in analysing and interpreting the findings.
- Useful event. Buy to let / private sector issues are increasingly important in Cambridge. HMA needs to take full account of this. Also issue of migrant workers. HMA needs to be a dynamic / iterative piece of work to ensure that it stays relevant and up to date.
- Mortgage ratio needs to take account of variations in incomes.
- Projection beyond 2021 to meet PPS3.
- Effects of migration on private rented sector.

- Handover between HNS and HMA especially commonality that seems to have been missed.
- There was a lot of talk about “involving” the private sector. I think it is absolutely essential not only to involve the private sector, but to ensure that supply side analysis of the housing market, and thus the key drivers affecting housing delivery from the point of view of developers, form part of the evidence base for the HMA. I have not seen any evidence of analysis of the delivery of housing and the risks involved – it would be very good to see this in particular in the light of government policy such as PPS3 and the recommendations of Kate Barker’s latest report.
- How will the housing needs and aspirations of disabled people be included in the HMA?
- Will it be an inclusive process or will wheelchair accessible and supported housing needs be tagged on at the end?
- Will it link to existing surveys carried out, e.g. Cambridge / S.Cambs “Pathways to Accessible Housing” study?

A10.3 **Second Cambridge HMA Partnership Event, 26 April 2007**

The feedback on our 26 April 2008 workshop was included and circulated in our third SHMA briefing note, see Appendix 8.

Our second partnership event was a great success, to update the Partnership on progress with the assessment, describe the final Communities and Local Government (CLG) guidance and gain more of your experience and knowledge about our housing market.

Some 29 people attended the workshop, although only 5 completed feedback sheets which gave us less reaction to the workshop than we would have hoped for. However the afternoon seemed to go well overall, with lively discussions which did not want to end, which must be a good sign!

Some useful suggestions to improve our approach in future included:

- Giving more notice of the subjects to be discussed would help delegates to prepare.
- Earlier notice of dates would encourage better attendance.
- More discussion time.

As with the first event, delegates came along from a variety of organisations, including

- Private developers
- Housing associations and the Housing Corporation
- Local authority planners
- County Council teams
- Estate agencies
- Housing enablers
- Other housing sub-regions

Delegates heard about the new CLG guidance on SHMAs and about our resident, estate and lettings agents surveys and about mapping travel to work areas. After a break there were 3 discussion sessions, summarised below...

Discussion Group 1: The intermediate market & how to define housing markets by geography

- Demand for intermediate rent in Cambridge is mainly taken by people working locally.
- Current schemes are missing the Government's target of moving people from social housing and off needs registers into intermediate tenures.
- Some schemes are in the wrong locations or wrong eligibility criteria.
- Limited lenders for Low Cost Home Ownership - problems for re-sale?
- A new market for many housing associations - rapid growth and rapid change.
- Issues of location and marketing, need to streamline the application process and a big marketing campaign will be required.
- We know there will be a market, but need the HMA to say exactly what the intermediate market will be. How much is required and the split of intermediate rented and low cost home ownership.
- The market is new and growing rapidly, so need updates from providers on their experiences.

Discussion Group 2: Delivery and resource pressures

Skills

- Want to improve speed of development control / planning decisions. Need to make a career in planning more "glamorous". How do council job evaluation schemes and key worker definitions help recruit and retain planners and other essential skills?
- Builders will be busy on the Olympics—where will they work and live? Will they have to travel to work? Want to recruit and retain skills in the Cambridge sub region.
- Migrant workers and non-English speakers may take up building work, but lack language skills needed and hard to access courses if in work.
- Shortage of specialist skills, e.g. assessing for flood risk, environmental impact etc. Courses may be improving but will take time to filter through.
- SMARTLife trains in modern Methods of Construction, and CITB active in the region with training and other initiatives.
- Need to attract young people in to make sure they get skills and skilled work. Need links with secondary schools and careers choices.
- Set up local apprenticeships with a tie-in to the area? Hold a Cambridge area careers fair for the skills we need most?

Land ownership and permission to develop

- May not be a land shortage, but there is a "permissions" shortage.
- Takes a long time to get major sites included in strategies.
- What about sites with permission but not developed? Might have changed hands, might be to prevent "flooding the market".
- With all the major development going on, who will buy them? The rate of development affects the affordable housing, especially if infrastructure issues, major effect on delivery.

- Effect of Planning Gain Supplement—how quickly will it come in? Will it be workable? Option agreements already being used.
- Is our aim (and the aim of the HMA) a generally stable market?

Quality, design, sustainability

- Very difficult to meet the HC standard on a s106 site because of the cost. HC design code seen as ambitious, some developers may choose not to go for grant so don't have to meet the standards. Code for Sustainable Homes. Definitely an additional cost to reach Level 4.
- Strategic sites need to be at the cutting edge. Will be a cost, could affect value of land and thus supply coming forward.
- It's presumed the developer will carry the cost. Little evidence purchasers will pay for increased energy efficiency. Will Home Information packs help?
- Innovative architecture can affect speed of delivery, though people may pay more for high quality design. How does this relate to the volume market?

Discussion Group 3: Property as an investment, including buy to let

- Estimate 22-23% properties are buy to let, more in apartments (30-50%).
- Concerns for communities because of transient populations. However proximity to the Station is not an issue!
- Motivation is that capital investment gets a good return, with young professionals taking up short contracts at high prices.
- Interest rates affect popularity.
- View it's not too much of a problem if homes stand empty for a while, but are companies or individuals buying?
- Are developers building specifically for the buy to let market? If so, what types of homes are they aiming at this market?

Each discussion group fed back and the afternoon closed on a positive and challenging note. This event was more discursive, and gave the SHMA project team plenty of food for thought.

The SHMA included significant sections on each of these areas:

The intermediate market & how to define housing markets by geography:

- Two chapters in the final SHMA on intermediate housing and homes for key workers, plus a further chapter comparing current incomes to current entry level process, to try to identify broad "areas" of the market occupied by the various tenures.
- Two separate chapters on defining housing market areas, and more mapping included to try to help people with the geographical spread of specific issues

Delivery and resource pressures

- Strengthened link to land availability assessments as a result of these discussions
- Issues around staff and skills may need to be investigated as part of further work on factors affecting the building industry, and how to overcome barriers

Property as an investment, including buy to let

- Buy-to-let included as a specific chapter, and the approach of the workshop groups was accepted as positive and constructive for the SHMA.

A10.4 Formal consultation on the draft SHMA

The draft SHMA was launched on 10th December 2007 on the Cambridgeshire Horizons website. This was followed by 8 weeks of consultation, allowing extra time for the Xmas break and to finish adding the draft chapters to the website. Towards the end of the 8 weeks, an event was held to enable partners to give their views on the draft SHMA in person.

This section sets out responses to the consultation via the website, which took the form of a questionnaire and an open invite to e-mail the Team with views. The following section sets out feedback from the workshop held in January 2008.

All these views were gathered together, and the draft SHMA updated and amended. The Cambridge sub-regional housing board considered the overall outcomes at its meeting in early March 2008. Specific consultees were contacted to develop ideas and thinking for future improvement of the SHMA. The final stage was to gather all the consultation together throughout the process, write an account of the effect of stakeholders' comments, and to publish this in this Appendix to the SHMA.

A10.5 Responses to draft SHMA

The consultation questionnaire is provided in full, in Appendix 12.

Following formal consultation from December 2007 to Feb 2008, a number of responses have been received. We received responses from:

- Prospect Row, on behalf of The Fairfield Partnership, in association with the Luminus Groups and their advisor Januarys Consultant Surveyors.
- Tetlow King Planning, on behalf of Trumpington Meadows Land Company Limited
- Accent Nene Ltd
- Appleacre Park
- Cambridge Housing Society
- Boyer Planning
- Flagship Housing Group
- Cambridgeshire County Council via Chief Planning Officers.
- Gallaghers (and Development Industry Forum / Cambridge Land Owners Group)
- Addenbrooke's NHS Trust
- BPHA (Zone Agent)

In December 2007, as part of the enquiry into the possibility of a major new development at Mereham in East Cambridgeshire, some comments were made on the draft SHMA which provided useful feedback on it and how we could clarify various parts of the SHMA before it was launched. The firms providing these responses (though not directly to the project team) were Principal Consultant and Associate Director at Levvel Ltd, and Managing Director, David Couttie Associates.

These (and other comments made in letters and emails, rather than in the questionnaire format) are summarized in a separate table to avoid complication with analysis of the forms. Some Districts also took the opportunity to consult colleagues and send further comments, in addition to their input via the Project Team.

Eight formal questionnaires were completed, other responses came in letter or e-mail form. Over 100 points raised during the consultation. Below are set out the numbers of responses on each "tick box" question, and a table showing all the "longhand" comments, our response and actions arising against each point raised. Overall these responses fell into six major groups:

- **Process** – comments about level and amount of consultation, timescales for delivery, realism of our plans for the future.
- **Further Explanation Required** – not a fundamental comment but points where further clarity would help.
- **Further Minor Work** – minor adjustments and amendments to improve readability and accessibility, also changes to text to improve.
- **Further Research / Major Work** – more fundamental issues which we need to investigate in future. Our response will be to add the approved future programme of work into the relevant appendix in the SHMA, to make clear our future plans for improvement.
- **Compliments.**

Feedback on the Cambridge SHMA

Table 7: Please indicate which sections of the SHMA you are commenting on...




(Please note the chapter numbering has changed in the final version of the SHMA, this table uses the original numbering of the consultation draft)

	Total
1. Introduction and context, what is a SHMA?	5
2. Links between planning policy and SHMAs	6
3. Project structure and accountabilities	2
4. The participation ladder	3
5. Using CLG guidance to make our SHMA robust and credible	2
6. Background and context for the sub region	2
7. Defining housing markets using commuting patterns	3
8. Defining housing markets using postcode sectors	2
9. Economic context and forecasting	6
10. Demographic context and forecasting	6
11. Dwelling profile	3
12. Housing stock condition	3
13. Current property prices	5
14. Changes in house prices over the past 6 years	3
15. The private rented market	3
16. The buy-to-let market	3
17. Social rented housing turnover, housing registers and lettings	2
18. Homelessness	3
19. Intermediate housing including key workers	4
20. Affordability in current market	4
21. Planning context for housing delivery	5
22. Past and future housing delivery	4
23. Links to strategic land availability assessments	6
24. Key drivers of the housing market and building industry	4

	Total
25. Developing balanced, mixed communities	5
26. Future homes	4
27. Audit trail for numbers and summary of outcomes	2
28. Relating this information to the Forest Heath and St. Edmundsbury	2
29. Sub-regional housing need patterns and policies	4
30. BME housing needs	2
31. Introduction to migrant worker housing issues	2
32. Gypsy and Traveller housing needs	3
33. Housing for different household types	3
34. Disability and housing	2
35. Rural housing (including park homes)	2
36. Change log	
37. Summary of learning from first SHMA and plans for new research	2
Appendix 1 Research brief	2
Primary research write-ups:	
Appendix 2 Household survey	2
Appendix 3 Private rented survey	2
Appendix 4 Estate agents survey	2
Appendix 5 Lettings agents survey	2
Appendix 6 to 9 Briefing notes 1 to 4	2
Appendix 7 Outcomes of consultation throughout the process	2
Appendix 8 Quality assurance	2
Appendix 9 Consultation form	2

Table 8: How robust and credible do you think the SHMA is?

Please give your reaction to whether we have fulfilled the criteria for a SHMA, by rating each of the criteria on a scale from "poor" to "good".

	Poor 	Average 	Good 
Core Outputs			
1. Estimates of current dwellings in terms of size, type, condition, tenure	1		4
2. Analysis of past and current housing market trends, including balance of supply and demand in different housing sectors and price/affordability. Description of key drivers underpinning the housing market	1	3	3
3. Estimate of total future number of households, broken down by age and type where possible	1	1	3
4. Estimate of current number of households in housing need	2	1	2
5. Estimate of future households that will require affordable housing	2	2	3
6. Estimate of future households requiring market housing	3		3
7. Estimate of the size of affordable housing required	1	4	2
8. Estimate of household groups who have particular housing requirements e.g. families, older people, key workers, black and minority ethnic groups, disabled people, young people, etc.		4	2
Total core outputs	11	15	22
Percentage (of 48 responses)	23%	31%	46%
Process Checklist			
1. Approach to identifying housing market area(s) is consistent with other approaches to identifying housing market areas within the region	1	2	3

	Poor ☹	Average ☺	Good 😊
2. Housing market conditions are assessed within the context of the housing market area	1		5
3. Involve key stakeholders including house builders	2	2	2
4. Contains a full technical explanation of the methods employed, with any limitations noted	2	2	1
5. Assumptions, judgements and findings are fully justified and presented openly and transparently	1	1	4
6. Uses and reports upon effective quality control mechanisms		3	2
7. Explains how the assessment findings have been (or will be) monitored and updated	1	3	2
Total process	8	13	19
Percentage (of 40 responses)	20%	33%	47%
Total overall	19	28	41
Percentage (of 88 responses)	22%	32%	46%

1. You may have noticed some chapters include summaries, do you think that helps?

Yes 6 No 0

2. Would you like an executive summary added for the whole SHMA?

Yes 6 No 0

3. Is there anything specific you would highlight to include in the executive summary, or do you have any other suggestions?

See tables below

4. Are you willing to get involved, or to continue to help us, in future?

Yes 6 No 0

Detailed feedback

5. Please use this space to add any specific comments you have on the SHMA.

See tables below

About you

6. Have you been involved in the SHMA before now?

Yes: 7
No: 0

7. If yes, have you:

Participated in workshop(s) 5
Seen / read briefing notes 4
Made direct contact 1
Other (please add here)

8. Are you from:

Local government within our housing sub-region 1

Housing Association or RSL	3
Development Industry or Property Services	1
Land owner	1
Other partner	2
<i>1 x research and intelligence</i>	
<i>1 x planning agent</i>	

Table 9: Comments made on the form, comments and actions arising

Feedback	Comment	Action
Core outputs		
1. Estimates of current dwellings in terms of size, type, condition, tenure		
<p>The population and number of households does not accord with official government statistics/ the secondary data sources are reliable except for the CCRG projections.</p> <p>The secondary data sources here are reliable except for the use of CCRG household numbers for 2006 as this does not tally with official government data.</p>	<p>You are right to highlight that the population and number of households does not accord with official government statistics/ the secondary data sources are reliable except for the CCRG projections. They are different but we would assert they are more accurate. The CLG guidance suggests data sources, but allows for flexibility if people have better information at their disposal.</p>	<p>The Office of National Statistics (ONS) use household projections produced by CLG, which in turn are based on population projections from ONS. ONS use a trend based population model rather than one based on growth. By using housing-led forecasts, the CCCRG figures are based on expected growth rather than theoretical trends. Therefore the CCCRG figures can be expected to be more accurate at the local level. The robustness of a housing-led approach is reflected in the guidance released in August 2007 (p39) which discusses housing-led forecasts as a respectable approach. On the same page, the guidance discusses the Chelmer population model. Though not always the case, the Chelmer model tends to produce broadly similar figures to the CCCRG model as they are based on similar assumptions.</p>
2. Analysis of past and current housing market trends, including balance of supply and demand in different housing sectors and price/affordability. Description of key drivers underpinning the housing market		
<p>Land Registry and earnings data are used to establish affordability but credible active market evidence from estate agents is lacking. More information is needed on changes in demand and supply for different types of market housing across the sub region and why people buy the kind of housing they do. Agents can provide £/ft2 data, length of sales voids, difference between asking and selling price and are best placed to advise on demand for market housing in any given area.</p> <p>The survey of estate agents (annex 4) had a very low response rate and is skewed by the lack of participation, e.g. only 4 responses from 30 questionnaires sent to agents in Huntingdon</p>	<p>We are re-thinking the questions we would like to ask estate agents and the way we ask them. We are also purchasing Hometrack which uses estate agent data to build a better picture of the housing market. We would welcome your input on how best to tackle this issue and to improve on the information we have started with, as a priority in 2008.</p>	<p>Work plan</p>
<p>The effect policy has on the market should also be considered. For example, the Market Housing SPG in Huntingdonshire is resulting in too few 3 bed family homes in new developments, despite this being the most sought after size of property in this district. Current active market</p>	<p>We need to emphasise that the SHMA will need further development to support specific, local housing market issues. Having purchased Hometrack we will be able to drill down further than postcode and district level, and welcome this comment to ensure we can respond</p>	<p>Future work plan</p>

Feedback	Comment	Action
data suggests this is fuelling houseprices, and an oversupply of 1 / 2 bed units, which are proving harder to sell.	to these issues in future	
The SHMA to date has been created in a housing environment encouraging economic growth. It would be interesting to see an additional chapter that is theoretical in looking at future projections depending upon different scenarios the economy may follow.	We would like to build on this aspect, and to strengthen our links with the world of economic development to outline different future scenarios. We would look to do this as part of our future development of the SHMA and within the framework of forthcoming changes to regional economic and other strategies.	Future work plan
A comparison of House Price Inflation by property type across Cambridgeshire against surrounding sub regions/regions may be helpful in identifying house price hot spots.	For the past couple of years, the County Research Group has produced house price analysis for the East of England region, for EERA. The SHMA could include this research in future updates, either by providing a link or a summary. We are also subscribing to Hometrack which will help with price comparison in future.	Add Hometrack data as and when
The presented demand for Intermediate Housing will change over time, for example there are now over 2000 qualified applicants on the HomeBuy Agent register as opposed to the 800 mentioned in the HMA. The register is updated every six months and provides profiles of applicants' housing needs that can then be extrapolated to provide potential demand.	We receive data from BPHA monthly, which will be analysed regularly. Further work will be required to update the work schedule and add to CCRG's future work plan. We would welcome the opportunity to work with BPHA to try to reduce the administrative burden of cleaning the data received, and how we can ensure the data used is as reliable and updateable as possible in future.	Have added an update section at the end of Chapter 19 on intermediate registers, and added to chapter 30 indication of affordable tenures. Will look to continually update in future and revise chapters as appropriate.
The reported increased in number of single households due to increased longevity may not necessarily mean that there is a reduction in economic activity. People living longer may also continue to work longer.	This is an interesting point, and the kind of analysis we hope will become possible as we build, update and consult on various aspects of the housing and economic markets, and the links between them.	As part of updating the SHMA in future we will look to build in demographic and economic trends and changes, and will seek to identify lifestyle changes linked to housing and economic needs and markets.
Aspirations for tenure change, different tenure types, green agenda?	All very interesting issues to investigate further	Consider for future workplan
3. Estimate of total future number of households, broken down by age and type where possible		
Estimates are derived from RSS and Local Plan 'housing-led' projections. Practice Guidance clearly states that official government projections should be assessed 'as a starting point' but this appears to have been disregarded. These projections are higher, particularly in Huntingdonshire, where official government projections show 4,200 more households in the district by 2021 than the SHMA. Too few homes built will adversely affect affordability, having a disproportionate impact on poor and vulnerable households.	Similar to the comment on population sources, the CLG guidance suggests data sources, but allows for flexibility if people have better information at their disposal. As outlined in the Chapters on economy and demography at some length, we have used housing-led projections which are embodied in the draft RSS and includes regional economic strategy input.	The ONS population projections for Huntingdonshire and therefore the CLG household projections are disputable. These are trend-based on past assumptions of high growth in population. However, the kind of household growth that the ONS/CLG model predicts for the present time is not being seen in Huntingdonshire. The current population change in Huntingdonshire is primarily due to natural growth rather than in-migration. One consequence of this is that Huntingdonshire population is ageing. That could increase the need for more one-person properties, which is contrary to what is projected on the ONS model for larger properties.

Feedback	Comment	Action
<p>The SHMA notes the increase in output of homes needed to cope with the increase in coming population. But if there are gaps in supply where are they? It should surely be possible with the information available at County and District level plus Cambridgeshire Horizons own work on the delivery of growth in jobs and houses for us to generally comment on this so there is a link with the section on the future housing market. Major development sites are yet to come forward in the next two to three years around Cambridge</p>	<p>SLAA summaries added for first SHMA to launch, however suspect this is an area for significant future work as we move from the Structure Plan to the RSS and adjust our targets, alongside specific development programmes. However it's a useful point to raise and we would welcome further thoughts on what we produce, and how to improve it, in future</p>	<p>Future work plan</p>
<p>4. Estimate of current number of households in housing need</p>		
<p>The MRUK survey data has been used to determine numbers of concealed households, however it is questionable if the sample size is sufficient to give an accurate assessment at a local level. Triangulation of this data with past trends (on P1(e) returns and previous Housing Need Surveys) plus further local surveys targeted at this needs group, would give a more robust assessment of the numbers of concealed households, income levels and aspirations.</p>	<p>By adding the Technical Appendix we hope to answer questions around triangulation and comparative information used to support the approach taken. We have made every effort to follow the CLG guidance and refer to the data sources highlighted in the guidance, however we do accept that future refinement and improvement will always be a possibility.</p>	<p>Future work plan.</p>
<p>Some of the information, such as the Keyhomes East info, is currently a year old and it would be useful to have this updated.</p>	<p>We appreciate that some information used in the SHMA needs updating as a priority, and have included this specific item in our work programme for May 2008. Having employed a full-time researcher, we look to update all the secondary information as soon as is practical following new releases of information. However the data may need cleaning and re-organising to provide the type of data we can use in the SHMA, so there will be delay in some cases while this takes place.</p>	<p>Have added a March 2008 update, and plan to update more comprehensively in 2008/9</p>
<p>Despite the masses of information collected and the apparent sophistication, the estimates are no more plausible than those of the housing needs assessments previously carried out by Fordham and Couttie</p>	<p>We would like to highlight the change in approach adopted by the SHMA. Even if this assertion is a fair one, the SHMA creates a basis for future work and further investigation, with partners' input, enabling us to follow the spirit of the CLG guidance in building skills and understanding locally, which will enable us to grow and build our understanding in the longer term. Many of our consultation partners have offered further support and information in their areas of expertise, which is an approach we value and we will take up these offers in the coming year.</p>	<p>Continue to invite feedback on the first SHMA and look to improve, refine, edit and focus more in future.</p>
<p>5. Estimate of future households that will require affordable housing</p>		
<p>Although the secondary data sources used here are sound, the MRUK survey data is used to forecast newly arising need at district level.</p>	<p>By adding the Technical Appendix we hope to answer questions around triangulation and comparative information used to support the</p>	<p>Future work plan.</p>

Feedback	Comment	Action
The concern here is that the sample size is too small to achieve the same confidence interval (95%) claimed for the whole county. Why the previous HNS data for Huntingdon in particular, which is relatively recent having been updated in 2006, has not been used or critiqued in any way is not justified.	approach taken. We have made every effort to follow the CLG guidance and refer to the data sources highlighted in the guidance, however we do accept that future refinement and improvement will always be a possibility.	
However we generally agree that the proportion of intermediate housing in new developments should be around 50% of all affordable housing provision in order to meet future housing need in South East Huntingdonshire	We would not want to support this assertion specifically, it is for planning policy-makers to decide on the appropriate mix for individual sites in their districts, and to use the evidence in the SHMA when setting any guideline in planning policy. We would like to add an overall tenure and size guide as requested by other consultation respondees, to help readers with this data, however it is important that the SHMA does not step over the line into policy decision-making itself.	Need to consult on how to improve the SHMA in future, and whether additional information, methodology or analysis might help clarify these issues more in future.
There is no doubt that the SHMA has undertaken a comprehensive analysis of future housing need. But the SHMA would be strengthened by undertaking a scrutiny and moderation exercise to ensure that the needs figures are not overestimated e.g. they do not include any overlap or double counting and that issues such as student housing needs and the durability of backlog need have been adequately addressed. For example, a specific review of the Cambridgeshire figures could supplement the regional testing that is being undertaken by EERA.	By adding a full technical appendix we aim to address this suggestion. Although we had included an audit trial for the needs calculation, several consultation responses have led us to provide a more complete and detailed explanation, which we hope will assure partners of the completeness, reliability and robustness of our calculations.	Adding technical appendix. Validation exercise for Technical Appendix planned.
Allied to point 3 above for example para 11.7 in Ch 11 states there has been an 8% increase in social stock in S Cambs in the last 5 years. A strategic assessment emanating from Ch 23 and Ch 24 as mentioned above is in our view essential for the SHMA to have credibility.	Need to add links and evaluation of SLAAs, and update as further assessments become available.	Links and summaries have been added
6. Estimate of future households requiring market housing		
The is little evidence to show how market household types may change in future, for example the extent to which the population is aging in the region and the impact that will have on the demand for different housing types in the future at district level....	We feel a full account has been included in chapter 10, demographic context, and chapter 29 about future sizes of homes, which look at the types and ages of households and projected changes to 2021. However we would like to work with partners, particularly English Partnerships, in future as they commission new research, referred to in chapter 29, to identify the links between housing availability and choices across the UK. This will be included in future once EP's research reports back. We would also prioritise more detailed work on the effects of the ageing population in future.	Work plan

Feedback	Comment	Action
Chapter 22 looks at AMR trajectories to 2016 but is more concerned with market than affordable	It is an important aspect of the SHMA, as compared to previous housing needs surveys, that it looks at the whole market rather than just focussing on affordable. However we have tried to cover all aspects in the Assessment. We have focussed our use of the AMR on the overall housing market as we are working with districts and the County Council to develop and agree the figures provided for affordable housing completions. As this work progresses we will look to use the AMR for monitoring all aspects of housing provision.	Continue to work with CCC to align housing and planning delivery figures, especially affordable. Have added an advisory table for each district in Chapter 27, Identifying housing need, to show how the needs figures identified align with proposed RSS targets to make this link clearer.
Chapter 33 does address the role of private sector in sheltered and extra care housing for the elderly, but there is little investigation into the appropriateness or otherwise of other products such as leasehold retirement accommodation and equity release.	We would seek to build in the information provided and look at alternative models, in the future, including via a new chapter on supported housing and Supporting People.	Work plan
Regional context insufficiently recognised	We had added a technical appendix to provide further information on the figures we have used to identify estimates of future households requiring market housing. However we also recognise that we need to work more closely with sub-regional and regional neighbours, to spot links and trends across boundaries. The EERA quality assurance work goes some way to looking at this issue, and we await the outcomes to see how we can join work up across the Region more effectively.	Adding technical appendix. Included Ch 22 <i>Planning for housing delivery</i> , and strengthened Regional Housing Strategy within this to make the links clearer.
Under Housing Corporation Guidance applicants for Intermediate housing are allowed one more bedroom than they need.	Thank you for the clarification, we will add this in to chapter 24, <i>Future sizes of homes</i> , to make this clear.	Added to chapter
7. Estimate of the size of affordable housing required		
Chapter 26 does not describe the size of affordable housing required, in terms of number of bedrooms. this is required so that the correct size, type and mix of social rented and intermediate housing can be supplied on new developments.	We will add an overall tenure and size guide as requested by other consultation respondees, to help readers with this data, however it is important that the SHMA does not step over the line into policy decision-making itself.	Need to consult on how to improve the SHMA in future, and whether additional information, methodology or analysis might help clarify these issues more in future.
It might be worth seeing whether there is any secondary data that has looked at aspirations of private and affordable households to see how these differ from Local Authority waiting list projections. Clearly from the need angle there should be a large number of single person accommodation built over the next decade, but already there are rumours circulating that the single occupancy dwelling market is drying up.	We are looking to include further research in to aspirations and the relationship to needs, in 2008/9.	Future work plan
8. Estimate of household groups who have particular housing requirements e.g. families, older people, key workers, black and minority ethnic groups, disabled people, young people, etc.		

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
More work needs to be done to understand the future housing needs of an aging population, particularly in urban / rural fringe housing sub markets such as Godmanchester	Accepted, though smaller area analysis make take some more time.	Work plan
We agree strongly that further research is required to understand migrant population.	We will look to build on this basic information in future.	Future work plan
Process		
1. Approach to identifying housing market area(s) is consistent with other approaches to identifying housing market areas within the region		
The market area is very heavily dominated by Cambridgeshire with the appearance that St Edmundsbury and Forest Heath have been 'tacked on'. In particular the wealth of data within the Suffolk district's Housing Needs Assessments of 2005 have been largely disregarded.	This is a fair assessment, by necessity we have grouped into a housing sub region of 7 districts, as explained in the introductory chapters. As Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury have recently completed housing assessments, they joined with the SHMA as "observers" but we hope they can be more fully involved in the future. Data from their assessments is included in Chapter 28 however this is not easy to compare directly with the other 5 districts due to the differing research methods used.	Look to extend Suffolk district involvement in 2008. Seeking CACI data already.
2. Housing market conditions are assessed within the context of the housing market area		
Extensive use of secondary data has been used to comment on market conditions but the input from planning professionals, independent researchers, estate and letting agents is minimal and indirect. Practice guidance recommends that these disciplines are included within the core of the 'partnership', but they are not at the 'core' and have no role or influence over the development of this SHMA. In particular both the active market and past trends in market housing, the private rented sector and buy-to-let are available from estate and letting agents that could be more involved at the 'core' of the partnership	We accept we would like to involve more partners in the SHMA in future, however feel these remarks are a little unjustified given our approach to consultation and involvement as set out in full in Chapter 4 <i>The participation ladder</i> . However we can always do better and welcome these comments in pushing us onwards.	We plan to run issue-specific consultation and research in future, engaging relevant stakeholders on "their" issues, when developing the SHMA in future. We also want to use more imaginative consultation methods in future, and to engage estate and lettings agent partners when consulting these agencies on the private market, around the issues highlighted. The Housing Board can review Project Team membership and may find it helpful to broaden membership as per this suggestion to ensure they are part of the "core".
Contact with planning professionals, independent researchers, estate and lettings agents have not been has not been adequate. Contact is through events and seminars rather than allowing these groups to sit on the core steering group. The events are briefing sessions and don't allow for the wider partnership to make any decisions on how they SHMA should be managed, what approach should be used or what further survey work should be commissioned	We are looking at better ways of consulting estate and letting agents. We have representatives of English Partnerships and Land Owners on the steering group. We have tried hard to use feedback form the workshops to shape the SHMA, and to listen and learn form the comments and suggestions made. However we accept this is not a criticism we can robustly refute, we can only try to do better in he future, and are planning a different approach for 2008 to try to involve people more fully and transparently.	Priority for 2008 – suggest on CRHB workplan
3. Involve key stakeholders including house builders		
Involvement is restricted to participation at dissemination events and seminars, rather than allowing house builders, developers and property professionals onto the	The project team is led by Cambridgeshire Horizons to help ensure it takes a balanced view of involvement, which has helped us engage membership from the	Seek feedback form exiting parties on level and effectiveness of involvement. Review the Project Team membership.

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
<p>steering group which is entirely controlled by the public sector. At these events a description of work is given to date and participants invited to comment, but they are not allowed to make decisions on the future direction of the SHMA, how it should be managed, what approach should be used or what further survey work should be commissioned. Doubts exist therefore as to the ownership of this assessment, as private sector 'partners' do not have any opportunity to have meaningful influence on the research methodology, methods of data collection, quality of data used and analytical rigour. The risk is that the SHMA becomes a contentious document, resulting in outstanding issues being presented alongside the assessment at the independent examination.</p>	<p>Building Industry and English Partnerships, and to keep in contact with the Development Industry Forum and Cambridge Land Owners Group to assist with the "balance" of our approach.</p> <p>We would therefore reject these comments, and although we can always do better and would welcome more involvement by other stakeholder representatives, we do not accept the abject failure this response alludes to.</p> <p>The SHMA document expresses this involvement and the process taken to develop the first SHMA, however if doubts exist we need to ensure the SHMA in future does better and goes further in engaging and involving all interested parties.</p>	<p>Continue to develop the SHMA in 2008 onwards, and involve partners in this process, to build relationships and understanding, And use this consultation process to invite new members to the project team in future, with the sub-regional housing board's support.</p>
<p>I've offered to share the results of research conducted in the private rented market in Cambridge City but these have not been taken up. I haven't been invited to/ able to attend any of the events.</p>	<p>Apologies for not getting in contact sooner. I know you emailed to let us know you could not attend the 2008 SHMA workshop but have added you to the invite list for future events and for any further briefing notes, which we hope will prove helpful.</p> <p>We would be very interested in bringing this information in to future iterations if you are still willing to share it and would like some advice on the best way to make contacts with estate and lettings agents to improve the way in which they are consulted. We would like to get in touch to discuss how to involve you in future.</p>	<p>Ensure invite to launch, send notes and invite to specific issue-based discussions with the CCRG.</p> <p>Put on Partnership List.</p> <p>Invite to help plan our further investigation of the private market in 2008.</p>
<p>This issue has consistently been raised, for example at the SHMA workshop in February 2007 but the response has been insufficient. We reiterated our concern about the failure to involve private-sector stakeholders in our letter of 15 February. Subsequently we have neither been kept informed of progress on the SHMA nor have we been invited to become involved in other workshops, leading us to conclude that the SHMA has failed on this fundamental test. The SHMA fails to identify which particular house builders have been directly involved, if any.</p>	<p>We apologise for any oversight in adding you to the consultation list, and for failing to invite you to consultation events.</p> <p>We were keen to involve house builders in developing the SHMA, and have made contact with the Cambridge Development Industry Forum and Land Owners Group to invite feedback as the process has developed. Thankfully a representative offered to sit on our project team, which meant we could include the builder perspective and insight into the project. English Partnership have also helped and supported our understanding of private market issues and influences throughout the whole project, for which we are also very grateful.</p> <p>These partners are identified in Chapter 4, the participation ladder.</p>	<p>Ensure we include and report the inclusion of house builders further in future, and specifically this respondent.</p> <p>Improve publicity of the SHMA and events around it so a broader audience is aware of them, and of their opportunities to get involved.</p> <p>Make sure we explain the parties involved clearly in the executive summary and any publicity of the SHMA in future, to try to combat this feeling of exclusion, and keep the membership of the project team under review.</p> <p>Ensure in future we invite as broad a range of stakeholders and partners as possible to help us develop the SHMA.</p>
<p>Could be more house builder involvement. Hard to motivate</p>	<p>See above, though we have in fact found house builders highly motivated and interested.</p>	<p>Continue to engage and (as above) draw in more partners to developing the SHMA</p>
<p>Some further information from house builders on the profiles of the</p>	<p>As a result of our workshop in January 2008, we are looking to</p>	<p>Future work plan</p>

Feedback	Comment	Action
people purchasing their homes would be useful if available.	invite developers to contribute such information, if they are willing. We are also running our own surveys of new developments, following the model of the Cambourne survey, to find out more about people's future plans and previous housing, to add to our understanding of housing movements and housing choices. These will be very useful to help build our picture of who does and does not move in and out of the sub-region, and hopefully help us build our understanding of who maybe attracted to the different housing developments currently being planned or in train.	
We haven't been invited to or involved in any of the workshops which leads us to conclude that the SHMA has failed on a fundamental test.	Apologies for failing to invite you to our consultation events over 2007/8 on the SHMA. We will make sure you are added to our contacts list and sent any information forthcoming in the future. However we have involved a number of builders, landowners and planning consultants on both our partnership and project teams, full list is provided in Chapter 4, the Participation Ladder. We hope this is sufficient to have gathered views from this section of the housing market, though we are keen to expand involvement in future. We have added you to the stakeholder group and look forward to further discussions with you on the SHMA in future.	Add to Stakeholder group list. Invite to future events. Send briefing notes. Ensure involved in any future consultation and development of the SHMA.
4. Contains a full technical explanation of the methods employed, with any limitations noted		
Explanations do exist of some of the research methodology used but there is not a rigorous approach to the research which is in general descriptive rather than analytical. The MRUK survey, whilst using a sound methodological approach for a broad view of the sub-region, is flawed in that the sample sizes are too small to give reliable data at district level. For example in Huntingdonshire the household incomes of those expressing a wish to move in 3-10 years is based on responses from just 28 households. As this base data is then extrapolated in other chapters to determine the need for affordable housing the error becomes compounded.	By adding a full technical appendix we aim to address this criticism. Although we had included an audit trail for the needs calculation, several consultation responses have led us to provide a more complete and detailed explanation which we hope will assure partners of the reliability and robustness of our calculations.	Adding technical appendix
Are copious explanations set out at various points throughout the very lengthy text. But the lack of any comprehensive critical overview again constitutes a fundamental failing.	We are producing an executive summary which we hope goes some way to meeting this criticism. However we do accept that in the year to come we may well be able to add more of an overview to each section of the SHMA.	Producing executive summary. Work plan
Updating the SHMA will need to be systematic, i.e. every 3 months, 6 months, or annually say, in order	Agreed, we want to review specific issues and update with new secondary data through the year, re-	We have added this into Appendix 15, <i>Change Log</i>

Feedback	Comment	Action
that the SHMA remains credible and can be used for the purpose of S106 negotiations etc. Once this is decided it needs to be explained within the document.	publishing whole chapters as and when (with careful version control) and to undertake an annual review to ensure all the threads are drawn together and an executive summary captures significant changes over the course of the year. In addition every 5 years the SHMA will be fundamentally reviewed.	
5. Assumptions, judgements and findings are fully justified and presented openly and transparently		
Very few judgements and findings that would lead to policy outputs were noted, other than those related to core output 5 (future households requiring affordable housing). In many cases observed phenomena were taken at face value without a rigorous analysis testing the findings through the technique of 'triangulation' (Practice Guidance, P17).	We are adding an account of the triangulation used in the Technical Appendix. However we would also add that this SHMA is a "first step" and by it's nature, needs to provide a basis for future work. We would welcome your input when we seek to look more closely and understand more fully, what we see as our "starting point" in assessing the market.	Adding technical appendix.
Assumptions and findings are generally explained but often not very clearly. Judgements made are much less transparent.		
Yes, but all things open to interpretation without section / exec summary to underline findings and trends	Added highlights at end of all the longer chapters. Accept need for executive summary	Preparing an executive summary
6. Uses and reports upon effective quality control mechanisms		
Generally there was consistency between the chapters, although some were numbered differently in the headers than they were in the text and title (see chapters 26 and 28) and there were many grammatical errors throughout the whole draft.	Thank you for the comment, a final read and edit is planned prior to finalisation, to ensure headings are appropriate and grammar corrected.	Done, subject to future improvement and feedback.
7. Explains how the assessment findings have been (or will be) monitored and updated		
It is not clear how these comments will be taken on board or what potential there is to have any future influence over the development of the SHMA. We are not confident that the SHMA will develop into a 'robust and credible' Development Plan Document unless 'partners' such as Prospect Row LLP and Januarys, along with housebuilders and property professionals are able to balance the public sector bias of the core members.	The SHMA is NOT a development plan document itself, it provides an evidence base which DPDs may build upon. However we accept that private sector representatives could be more fully involved in the future, and welcome the input you are offering.	As to consultation on the SHMA, we hope this Appendix provides a full account of all the relevant consultation - what partners said, and what effect this had on structuring, drafting and finalising the first SHMA.

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
More ideas from session 30/1/08	All workshop ideas have been considered and either responded to (in this appendix) or had an effect on the SHMA, it's approach or it's workplan for the future	Appendix 16 sets out a summary of learning and plans for the future SHMA which adds detail on what we will do differently in future. Section A10.6 in this appendix sets out our response to the workshop held 30/1/08 in more detail
How readable did you find the SHMA?		
It was reasonably easy to read although there were a lot of grammatical errors. Generally the text was more descriptive than analytical. Lots of grammatical errors, text too descriptive rather than analytical, more transparent methodology in some places than others, data between chapters poorly linked	We welcome the feedback Document undergoing a review to link better. Summaries and technical appendix being produced.	Have undertaken a further proof read, made numbering of chapters, tables and paragraphs more consistent in the launched version, and tried to improve cross-referencing and content index.
The draft SHMA is a welcome addition to the available evidence base on housing issues within Cambridgeshire. Generally, we found it a very comprehensive and informative document.	Excellent, thank you.	None
Unwieldy and exceptionally difficult to digest. The current format, whereby the document is divided into over 30 chapters plus Appendices, means that the document does not flow and is very difficult to read. Needs a comprehensive edit by one person with an analytical overview. At present it is all too apparently an amalgam of motley contributions.	We are sorry the SHMA is so difficult to use. The reason for separate chapters and appendices is mainly to help with future updating, so that we do not have to re-paginate hundreds of pages whenever one addition is made. This also helps with version control, as we plan to change different chapters at different stages with partners' input. <i>Following consultation we are undertaking a "whole document" review to address these criticisms. We want to improve the understandability of all the data provided, overcome the editing issues which arise when working in a team of authors, and to continually refine the SHMA in the coming year.</i>	We have undertaken a further proof read, made numbering of chapters, tables and paragraphs more consistent in the launched version, done a spell and grammar check and tried to improve cross-referencing and content index. We hope this helps, but will continue to seek feedback in future and hope people will help us by pointing out errors as they read through the documents. <i>Work plan</i>
Quite readable.	Thank you	None
The executive summary is very useful although we appreciate that the draft stage of the SHMA at this point means the chapter referencing needs further editing.	Accepted.	We have finalised the chapter referencing now and are producing a draft executive summary to accompany the first launched SHMA
Good – I would benefit from sectional summary – beginning – summary of findings from research – end = summary of judgements from them?	Accepted	We have added summary points at the end of the longer chapters, and highlighted research points using the symbol ® throughout. We hope the executive summary will also help with the points raised.
How understandable did you find the SHMA?		

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
In some parts the approach was well explained, whereas in others it was less clear. For example, it was difficult to follow the exact process used to determine the backlog and newly arising need for housing. Generally it was difficult to track how the findings from one chapter had informed another, making reviewing the SHMA a difficult and time consuming exercise.	By adding a full technical appendix we aim to address this. Although we had included an audit trail for the needs calculation, several consultation responses have led us to provide a more complete and detailed explanation which we hope will assure partners of the reliability and robustness of our calculations; where judgements had been made and where triangulation was used and to what effect.	Adding technical appendix
Individual chapters are understandable but there is no clear sense at the moment of what the key conclusions are overall.	Accepted.	We are producing an executive summary to accompany the first SHMA
Due to the presentation of information in so many chapters, as noted above, it is especially difficult to gain a concise understanding of need and demand in the sub-region and in the individual local authority areas.	Accepted.	We are producing an executive summary to accompany the first SHMA
Quite understandable.	Thank you	None
We found the assessment very understandable.	Thank you	None
Do you have any suggestions to make it easier to read or to understand?		
In future perhaps findings from each section could be clearly linked so that it is easier to understand how the core outputs had been reached?	What a good idea.	Will look to implement this in future as the SHMA develops and is reviewed/
The SHMA could be improved by providing a summary of the key findings. This would make it more readable and accessible. Such a document does not need to stray into policy matters but it would greatly assist policy makers and interested parties if key findings are clearly signposted in a summary section. This would need to be updated regularly as individual chapters are changed.	Accepted.	We are producing an executive summary to accompany the first SHMA. The plan is to re-publish every year, to take account of changes to chapters made during that year, and drawing out key themes and trends to help people keep a track of the market. However we will keep this timetable under review once the first SHMA is launched, and if it needs to be reviewed more regularly we will certainly look at that option.
Please can we have a proper executive summary (could be up to 30 pages) including a summary table identifying need and demand in the sub-region and within the individual local authority areas.	Accepted.	We are producing an executive summary to accompany the first SHMA
Some precisising of paragraphs relating to tables and graphs could take place in order that the key information remains and can be quickly accessed.	We have tried to put this into effect in a final "whole document" edit, however the SHMA may need further editing in future to help clarity and conciseness.	Keep chapters under review and seek feedback on detail such as this when carrying out reviews, with partners
Overall exec summary	Accepted.	We are producing an executive summary to accompany the first SHMA
What did you think of the content of the SHMA?		
Generally the SHMA followed the framework set out in practice guidance, although there seemed to be a basic lack of understanding that the guidance and annexes, linked to PPS3, PPS12 and associated	We have tried very hard to follow the guidance, and have included planners on the project team to help ensure the links were made to all relevant planning policy statements.	If we have failed to express this clearly, or if we have missed linkages, we need to work on this, with partners, in future.

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
guidance, from the conceptual framework that should guide the research.		
An example of these poor linkages between the SHMA and associated PPS3 guidance is evidenced by the weak link between future housing needs at district level and the capacity of sites being identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (Chapter 23). It follows that the capacity for future development within each district should be placed on the same trajectory as future and emerging affordable housing need and demand for market housing in order that the most sustainable sites can be identified and promoted at an early stage.	We have added a good deal more detail to Chapter 24, providing not only links to, but also a summary of outcomes to SHLAAs. We have also, in response to comments made in the consultation, projected needs information and tenure balance proportions forward both 5 and 15 years, and compared the housing needs figures to the draft RSS targets. As the SHLAAs will work to the same timeline, it remains to incorporate updated SHLAA figures as they become available in future.	Update SHLAA data in future as they are finalised, and bring this data together with the RSS targets (once adopted) and the needs data projected to 2021, to complete the circle.
The primary research was poor, with a general lack of rigor applied to the design of the research. The methodology used by MRUK was sound although the confidence interval they claimed could only be achieved using the sample for all of the Cambridgeshire districts combined, as the sample sizes were too small at a district level. Further household research will probably be needed in areas where future housing growth is anticipated, such as to the area south east of Huntingdon.	In the spirit of the CLG guidance we are moving away from a primary research approach, and towards secondary data more and more. If we do commission primary research in future we will take these issues on board, however we would also highlight the addition of the Technical Appendix to make clearer where we used the MRUK survey, and to the summarised write-up of the survey results which provides a better assessment of the relevant data which we used in the SHMA.	Bear these points in mind when commissioning new research, as appropriate.
The review of existing research was poor and uncritical. There was little justification for using the County Council data and no critical assessment of why it does not tally with official government data. Similarly the Housing Needs Assessments from each district were largely ignored (except for Forest Heath and St Edmundsbury who were excluded from the MRUK survey) with no discussion as to why the findings of these reports, which contained larger samples of data, were not compared to the MRUK research.	We feel this has been adequately expressed in Chapter 3, project structure and accountabilities, which provides the difference between levels of participation and the reasons behind them. However there are issues we can clarify further and we will work to do this in future.	Add further clarification as needed on all these points in future updates of text.
Where secondary data was presented it was usually only described, rather than analysed and triangulated with findings from other research in a critical way.	This should be fully covered in the Technical Appendix	Add Technical Appendix
The secondary data supplied by the County Council in relation to household growth forecasts is different to the official government statistics, which is of fundamental concern as it will affect the trajectory for housing growth and could have serious impacts on the affordability of housing in the future, which in turn would disproportionately affect the vulnerable and elderly. For example the SHMA projection for	However there are issues we can clarify further and we will work to do so in future.	The ONS population projections for Huntingdonshire and therefore the CLG household projections are disputable. These are trend-based on past assumptions of high growth in population. However, the kind of household growth that the ONS/CLG model predicts for the present time is not being seen in Huntingdonshire. The current population change in Huntingdonshire is primarily due to natural growth rather than in-

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
Huntingdonshire is for 4,200 fewer households by 2021 than shown in official government forecasts on the CLG website.		migration. One consequence of this is that Huntingdonshire population is ageing. That could increase the need for more one-person properties, which is contrary to what is projected on the ONS model for larger properties.
Thorough and comprehensive.	Thank you	None
Cannot be faulted on comprehensiveness of information and research. Appears to cover the basic elements as set out in the CLG guidance. Root and branch edit however required plus more rigorous analysis and interconnection of the various discrete sections. Much more work is required than could conceivably be completed in time for the full amended SHMA to be further considered by the Cambridge Sub-Regional Housing Board in March 2008	Thank you. The interconnections need continuous development, as part of building the SHMA in future. We have tried to improve this greatly e/g/ land availability assessment outcomes, feeding RSS draft targets into comparison alongside "need" figures, however partners' views on this will be valued to help with this work	Include these questions when consulting partners on specific chapters in future – ensure we also build links as well as data.
Good.	Thank you	None
Ch 23 and Ch 24 require to be completed to give a holistic understanding of the market. Do we have an exponentially expanding demand for housing in all forms which is not to be matched by the current supply. If the answer is no when does supply catch up with demand. We appreciate that this requires assumptions on rates of build, but indicators in this area would be useful to inform future policy.	We have tried to add to these two chapters in the final stages, and welcome any further feedback on them as they stand. However the SHMA needs to work harder on this aspect and we will look to develop it in future.	We want to build new insights to our sub regional markets, built on the foundation of the SHMA, and incorporating information on housing market activity and affordability levels. We would like to develop this aspect of the SHMA in partnership with housing developers, builders and land owners.
Very robust and detailed	Thank you	None
Chapters 24 and 25 do not appear to relate to a core output so could be removed	If we follow the CLG guidance strictly, this sounds like a reasonable suggestion. However chapter 24 "reviewing the housing industry and building supply" was included to try to demonstrate the link between the mechanism of the building industry and the delivery of homes across the sub-region, acknowledging input of our Development Industry Forum when drafting the SHMA, and the importance of providing at least a foundation to look at practical delivery issues.	We accept this chapter may not be all it could be, however it has been updated following the outcomes of the Callcutt Review and we feel provides a first step in the future consultation and investigation needed around this very real issue. Chapter 25 "Mixed balanced communities" aims to help remind readers of the existing policy and good practice available, so that when considering the mix and balance of new developments, a range of factors are taken into account. Other feedback suggests we could do more in this section to move the emphasis away from existing good practice, and more onto local experiences and the outcomes of new resident surveys, which is something we plan to build in, in 2008.
Ch 24. Makes links to a number of national documents and initiatives. Are these not better as a separate bibliography of references? We had expected this chapter to refer to regional practical experience of achieving the step change in housing delivery drawing on e.g. examples from Cambourne etc.	This is a useful suggestion, it has been a difficult balance to strike between the SHMA providing an evidence base and helping policy-makers. Although we have referred to one specific aspect of the Cambourne study in chapter 29, <i>Future sizes of homes</i> , we agree that learning from that experience and	Part of our work programme 2008/9

Feedback	Comment	Action
	from other new developments will add to this section of the SHMA.	
No.	Thank you	None
General simplification would assist greatly. An executive summary document setting out the headline findings would also be beneficial, for example see the summary prepared for the Exeter & Torbay SHMA : http://www.dshg.org.uk/2007_07_20_executive_summary.pdf . Here housing need/demand data is usefully displayed in a map format.	Accepted.	We are producing an executive summary to accompany the first SHMA. We have looked at this website provided, and agree this is a short and concise summary. However we are not sure this does justice to our SHMA but would welcome feedback on the executive summary and its effectiveness once launched.
Ch 24 references to a number of national documents and initiatives. Are these not better as a separate bibliography of references? We had expected Chapter 24 to refer to regional practical experience of achieving the step change in housing delivery and drawing examples from say Peterborough ,Cambourne and other projects such as Milton Keynes,Swindon or Didcot	We may need to develop this aspect further in future, however it is a fine line between dictating policy and setting out some principles of good practice in the SHMA.	Consider the suggestions made as part of the future work plan, and in partnership with the consultee making this suggestion.
The amount of detail is good and only need be accessed to answer specific questions – so should remain	Thank you	None
Is there anything missing which you would like to see added?		
Chapter 6 should set out clearly the current position of the sub region as required to meet core output 1. Wherever official government data is disregarded this should be fully justified. In particular the future population and household projections are housing-led, whereas those on the CLG and ONS website are migration led.	Chapter 11 entitled "Dwelling Profile" provides this information	None, however would consider merging these chapters together in future versions, especially once BRE sub-regional stock condition info is available
Research and intelligence experts along with estate and letting agents have a great deal of research data available. Some of this is commercially sensitive but could be made available if these agents were given the opportunity to use it to promote their clients sites	We would welcome this information and would like to work together to add it in, in 2008, if possible.	Future work plan
(i) A clear set of key findings. (ii) Further scrutiny of estimated housing need through a moderation and scrutiny (see Points 1 and 5 in the Detailed Feedback section on Page 7).	(i) Accepted. (ii) See response above	(i) We are producing an executive summary to accompany the first SHMA (ii) See response above
The SHMA to date has been created in a housing environment encouraging economic growth. It would be interesting to see an additional chapter that is theoretical in looking at future projections depending upon different scenarios the economy may follow in the future.	We would like to build on this aspect, and to strengthen our links with the world of economic development to outline different future scenarios. We would look to do this as part of our future development of the SHMA and within the framework of forthcoming changes to regional economic and other strategies.	Future work plan
An underlying focus on sustainability should be useful as part of the next round of research – ege effect of CSH4, 5 and 6 on affordability	Interesting, however need to ensure we are not repeating other existing work.	Consider as part of future work plan

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
Do you have any suggestions to add, build on or otherwise improve our SHMA in future?		
The partnership needs to be extended so that the private sector has some control, ownership and influence over the development of the SHMA. At present the approach is one-sided and lacks the multi-disciplinary approach promoted by Practice Guidance	Thank you for your comments. A full response is provided above.	See above
Better communication and wider consultation with all sectors especially the private sector.		
An annual review of the future SHMA work stream should also involve stakeholders. Involving stakeholders in the work stream planning process would go some way to ensuring that the SHMA remains responsive to customer needs and up-to-date	An excellent suggestion, we have added a section in Appendix 16 on our future plans to update and consult on the SHMA in future.	CCRG and Horizons to ensure future research plans are consulted upon in future.
More information from housing need surveys undertaken by the Rural Housing Enablers at Cambridgeshire ACRE and Suffolk ACRE could be used to show levels of local need for affordable housing within the villages, along with tenures required etc.	We accept we need to do further work on rural housing, in partnership with our Rural Housing Enablers. The village needs studies are useful and interesting, however we need to ensure caution is used due to their (natural) focus on small geographical areas within the sub-region. However the studies could be used more in future to help build a picture of rural housing issues and the coverage and headline outputs of the surveys across the sub-region.	Future work plan
Strategic Land Availability	Added significantly to this chapter, but welcome further feedback.	Improved.
How do you think this would improve the SHMA in future?		
The results would be more credible and robust, less contentious and not so open to challenge from disaffected developers and landowners.	Agreed	We want to aim for this goal in future, though as stated (add ref) we do not feel we have been quite as inadequate as suggested.
Involving stakeholders in the workstream planning process would go some way to ensuring that the SHMA remains responsive to customer needs and up to date.	An excellent suggestion, we have added a section in Appendix 16 on our future plans to update and consult on the SHMA in future.	CCRG and Horizons to ensure future research plans are consulted upon in future.
By meeting the CLG requirements in a more efficient, economical, effective and timely manner. Provision of information, newsletters and other updates on a centralised website in a user friendly form, which everyone can obtain access to.	Excellent ideas	Incorporate into future workplan

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
At present there is limited information within the SHMA on local rural housing needs and how the situation many villages find themselves in is not a one-off, but typical of many villages across the sub-region. By doing an analysis of local housing need surveys that have and are being undertaken on a regular basis in many villages across the sub-region, could help demonstrate the justification for funding from the Housing Corporation under the 'rural' theme.	We certainly want to develop our "rural housing" chapter further in future, and village housing needs surveys may provide some useful information. We do have to be aware of their coverage across districts and to work with rural community councils / ACRE to understand, apply and draw sub-regional or district-wide conclusions about rural housing need.	Look to extend this chapter in future, in partnership with relevant stakeholders.
If you'd like to see something added, please put any details down here of where you think the information could come from and who we might work with to develop this information?		
More than enough information included	Thank you	None
Louise Wilby, Rural Housing Enabler, Suffolk ACRE. David Hookham, Rural Housing Enabler, Cambridgeshire ACRE.	Thank you	Include in future consultation and development
English Partnerships info on major projects.	We will look to add this information as and when it becomes available, and to consult the Partnership and Project teams on its use, relevance, application and implications for the Cambridge sub-region once it is available.	Future work plan
Research and intelligence experts, along with estate and letting agents have a great deal of research data available. Some of this is commercially sensitive but could be made available if these agents were given the opportunity to use it to promote their clients sites. In any given district there will be competition between developers to provide evidence that supports their scheme. This competitive environment would benefit the SHMA as the amount of data and analysis available would increase. For example developers could be persuaded to provide resources to fund or commission primary research to identify future demand for housing in the sub-market concerning their proposed development.	These are excellent ideas we will look to work on in future	We plan to increase "topic-specific" involvement in future, building on the positive reception stakeholders have given the SHMA to date. This may take the form of workshops or specific task and finish groups to update the various sections and aspects of the SHMA.
Other data sources are available from NDPBs within the region, such as Sport England, who have taken their own survey data from 1,000 households each year within each district and combined it with MOSAIC and Experian data. This is a useful source for triangulation techniques, to critically review for example average earnings, demographics, age of population and size of households.	Again, very valued suggestion we will look to assess and incorporate as appropriate in future	Once the first SHMA has been published we would like to broaden the range of people involved in the SHMA and look to other data such as that suggested, to build up, challenge or and support the SHMA's outputs
Housebuilders, RSLs, LAs, other such as ARUP, BRE	Thank you	Ensure all included in consultation and development

Table 10: Other comments made with comments and actions

Some comments were received by e-mail, by letter, during the “Mereham enquiry” while the SHMA was still being developed, but which provided some useful comment and insight which we could respond to and use to improve our clarity and approach, in some parts of the SHMA.

The comments are summarised below, where they repeat the issues raised during the formal consultation we have tried not to repeat the same issues and responses.

Feedback	Comment	Action
As part of the Mereham process		
The analysis should go down to the smallest level possible and data should be consistent with other housing sub-regions in the East of England	We recognise that we need to work more closely with sub-regional and regional neighbours, to spot links and trends across boundaries. The EERA quality assurance work goes some way to looking at this issue, and we await the outcomes to see how we can join work up across the Region more effectively. We are also looking to use Hometrack for smaller level analysis of housing market factors, which we will look at and build into the SHMA in 2008.	Look into Hometrack. Look at outcomes of EERA QA work in April 2008 and add in as necessary. Put on SHMA workplan
There are inconsistencies in the data reporting and a lack of transparency in the datasets used for analysis, compounded by an inadequate technical explanation of the methodology employed.	In response to this consultation exercise we have added a further Technical Appendix to ensure all data and its use is fully explained. As the SHMA need to be accepted and published at one point in time, and as it incorporates both "snapshot" and trend information, there will be some variation in the dates used. However we will work to clarify the dates for all data and to ensure it is as standard as possible in future e updates.	Checked all quarter labelling is clear, try to ensure dates are either explained or standardised, and if will be updated in future to form a trendline, this is highlighted in introduction. Adding technical appendix to address data issues.
The affordability testing wrongly ascribes need to sections of the housing market, in essence people who are not in need.	Under the definition of affordable housing in PPS3 and the SHMA, intermediate housing is identified as affordable. However there is a difference between eligibility and affordability. Further work is required looking at price by number of bedrooms and different levels of equity share. We have tried to clearly lift the PPS3 definition into chapter 21 (affordability of tenures) which analyses the housing market into tenure sections, and attempts to focus efforts of the intermediate market on those households most likely to need or benefit from such tenures.	The SHMA identifies households in need in Ch 27, the chapter referred to (Ch 21) draws a picture of current house prices in relation to current incomes, to help extend understanding of the links and overlaps between tenures in our sub-region.
The treatment of backlog need results in very high numbers of households in need which are not representative of the population	Unfortunately we found the CLG Guidance was poorly drafted on this issue, but having tested our reading of it, came up with almost exactly the same figures.	Added both sets of figures in Chapter 27, to ensure differences have been clarified.
The survey wasn't used which suggests a lack of confidence in it	By adding a full technical appendix we aim to address this comment. Although we had included an audit trial for the needs calculation, several consultation responses have led us to provide a more complete and detailed explanation which we	Adding technical appendix.

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
	hope will assure partners of the reliability and robustness of our calculations.	
Letters and emails		
Generally the SHMA followed the framework set out in practice guidance although there seemed to be a basic lack of understanding that the guidance and annexes linked to PPS 3, PPS12 and associated guidance form the conceptual framework that should guide the research. An example of the poor linkages between the SHMA and PPS3 guidance is evidenced by the weak link between future housing needs at district level and the capacity of sites being identified in the SHLAA. It follows that the capacity for future development within each district should be placed on the same trajectory as future and emerging affordable housing need and demand for market housing in order that the most sustainable sites can be identified and promoted at an early stage	Naturally we would like the SHMA to link closely with the SLAAs. Unfortunately not all SLAAs were approved / adopted at the date of the first SHMA. However we have strengthened and improved this link in the first iteration. I do not think it is fair to say this shows a lack of understanding, but a lack of concurrent and accepted statements from districts at December 2008, which provide the information we need to join up the issues.	Produce an updated and improved SLAA chapter and invite feedback. Look to develop the link further in future.
The data quoted in the various chapters has necessarily been collected at different points in time and the SHMA cannot be regarded as a snap shot in time	We have tried to emphasise that some data is a snapshot and some provides a trend over time - for example chapter 13 <i>Current prices</i> and chapter 14 <i>Changes in prices over the past 6 years</i> . We will review the data in each chapter and its labelling, and make sure we explain the approach taken and whether it's a snapshot or a trend.	Make sure data dates are clearly explained in each chapter, and quarter references are converted to "month and year" to help with comparison.
Also the private market is a very dynamic variable and can change rapidly. It is useful to recognise that it cannot serve as the only tool for decision making for local councils	We hope we have made clear that we don't aim this to be the only tool used to assess the market. The purchase of Hometrack is likely to be useful in monitoring market conditions on a more regular basis, though we will need to assess how useful it has been after one year's trial.	Monitor effect of Hometrack, review Jan to April 2009. Put on the SHMA workplan
Link implied between balance of homes and jobs with spatial strategy and commuting patterns	There is a strong link between homes and jobs as described in the draft RSS and districts' core strategies, and this directly affects commuting patterns. The CCCRG population projections are housing-led, so if those houses are built, three things can happen: (1) People come into the area and take jobs here (commuting around the County). (2) People come here then have to commute out again (to London, Milton Keynes, other settlements) because there are not enough of the right jobs here. (3) People do not move into the area because there aren't enough jobs or because they have better jobs elsewhere. All these demonstrate the relationship between housing	None, we accept the principle and hope that is expressed in Chapter 9.

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
	commuting and jobs. Of course, the houses may not get built or the economic situation may be so lively that more houses need to be built, but these just go round the circle again.	
Comments on individual chapters		
Chapter 1		
Definition of the sub-region as housing and planning sub-regions are different	Apologies for the lack of a map for the planning sub region, we will provide on in section A, chapter 1 to clarify the difference, and will work to ensure that chapters are clear on which sub-region is being referred to as appropriate	Maps added in chapters 1 and 6.
The SHMA needs to be clear about the geographic area it's covering (planning vs. housing sub-region)	Apologies for the lack of a map for the planning sub region, we will provide on in section 1 chap 1 to clarify the difference, and will work to ensure that chapters are clear on which sub-region is being referred to as appropriate	Add planning sub-region map, check all references to sub regions to ensure clear if housing or planning. Added map to Sec 1 Chap 1 showing planning sub region and explaining how we have aimed to use whole district data.
1.12 The CLG guidance from March 2007 was updated in August 2007. Need to demonstrate most recent guidance has been assessed and its implications reflected in the document.	Thank you for the suggestion, we have used the August version of the guidance but will make sure our referencing includes this clearly to avoid any confusion.	Added reference to August guidance update throughout the SHMA
Chapter 2		
2.9 This paragraph (on RSS14) is very important but not effectively presented.	Thank you for the note, we will re-draft this text to clarify.	Have re-drafted hoping this will help, however appreciate we may be able to do more in future versions.
Chapter 9		
Is the low labour supply predicted for Huntingdonshire realistic?	CCRG has checked the source of the figures.	Have added further explanation in Chapter 10, to make this calculation clearer.
Do the job projections take into account the significant localised impact of the construction and delivery services (including migrant workers)?	The figures in Table 4 of Chapter 9 are based on the ONS Annual Business Inquiry, which surveys a sample of businesses, down to district level. Therefore it should pick up migrant workers just like any other workers, though it may not identify them separately. So the labour demand is based on what jobs will be needed including local factors such as construction sites. And the labour supply will take some account of migrant workers, specifically those working here legally.	None
9.1 References to the RSS process are out of date and need revising to reflect expected finalisation in Spring 2008	Thank you for highlighting this issue, will change all references to make sure all are up to date.	Changed ref in 9.1 and checked all RSS date references
9.5 and 9.7 We have serious concerns about the Oxford econometrics forecasts that inform the RES which have been used in the forecasts for the Cambridge sub-region	RES not within our scope of study. Other sources presented to balance	Review in future a plans for new regional agency and integrated strategy develop.
Chapter 10		
What are the implications of the very high growth in families and work age population in and close to	Cambridge City will continue to have a younger age profile than rural areas leading to a need for more	None

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
Cambridge compared to the growth in elderly households elsewhere?	family homes in the City and its surrounding area; there will be a need for more housing, support, services and facilities for older people in the rural areas than in the City; there will be a need for suitable public transport in the City area to avoid congestion; there may be more commuting out of the City if the businesses that these people work in are based on the edge or outside the City.	
10.3 The SHMA should include the latest available information on population and household projections. Updated 2004-based projections were issued in March 2007. Table 6 and subsequent analysis should be updated to reflect these higher household projections.	The chapter was written before March, but will be updated in future iterations as part of our Researcher's work programme in future.	Priority for update
Chapter 19		
There is no specific mention of the wealth of information sent by us about keyworkers during the course of the preparation of this work.	Many apologies for not getting in touch sooner. We have included a summary of the data you provided on keyworker housing, and would like to get in touch to discuss how to involve you and other key worker employers further, in future to extend our understanding of this housing market across the sub-region.	We would like to build upon and extend this work for other KWEs across the sub-region in future. CCRG to get in touch to plan a meeting and how best to extend KWE surveys / information gathering.
19.3 This paragraph discusses demand at April 07. While it is acknowledged later in the chapter that the numbers have increased in recent months, the level of increase is not identified. The feeling is that the number of applications has risen significantly. If this is not amended/updated, any forecast requirement for intermediate housing will be understated by at least 100% undermining the credibility of the whole SHMA	Added a summary of the change as at March 2008 in Chapter 19, Applications for intermediate, and used the updated figures in Chapter 30, Indication of affordable tenures.	A high priority for update as part of the future SHMA work plan. Would like to improve the data we receive and to build in to future updates on the SHMA.
19.4 This notes that demand from key workers living in Fenland or Forest Heath is very low. The Trust's view is that because people know this sort of accommodation is not provided people don't tend to apply in these areas. We can't speak for other key worker employers (teachers, police) but I understand that some people actively look to live outside the area in which they work and living in these districts whilst working in Cambridge or West Suffolk would be a popular choice if the opportunities were available. There are plans to move some Addenbrooke's services off-site and into the community, so again this could affect demand for keyworker properties in other districts.	We would like to run further research in 2008 to look at housing aspirations and particularly key workers, to try to see how this market works and whether we can build on existing research to find out more about a variety of employment groups, and the housing solutions people might take up and where.	Welcome discussions with Addenbrooke's to further this work in 2008+
There's a comment about high demand for 3-bed houses. Our experience suggests otherwise and	Thank you for sharing this insight. We need to look into this, as well as the relationship with both	Will add to future work plan to look at, alongside use of savings and family support to access housing.

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
three bed shared ownership are harder to sell and don't represent good value. The demographic data showing an increase in single people at the expense of couples with and without children also supports a greater demand for more two bedroom properties with a few one bedrooms.	affordability and availability, in future (i.e. is there low demand due to high prices / more competitive "other products", is the poor value related to affordability due either to income levels or to prices to access?	
Chapter 21		
21.4 Too much emphasis on RSS 14	Will look to change the emphasis slightly if appropriate in final re-drafting, however we do feel RSS14 is an important element to consider and other consultation respondents have supported this view.	None
21.2 Whilst reference is made to the success of the economy it is felt this could be elaborated on. Also, while recruitment difficulties faced by employers are referred to the implications of this could be made more explicit in terms of impacts on housing provision requirements even just in terms of sign-posting where this important issue is addressed elsewhere in the SHMA	Will take this into account in future development of the SHMA, including linking to the new strategies being planned regionally which will incorporate the RSS and RES in future. Thank you for the suggestion.	Future work plan
Chapter 23		
23.7, 23.8 This section needs further elaboration	Unfortunately the chapter which went out to consultation was not as complete as it could have been. We have not added to this chapter and will consult on the more complete version just after its launch in April / May 2008. This provides links to SLAAs and provides a better basis from which to build the links between the SHMA and the SLAAs.	Produce an updated and improved SLAA chapter, and welcome feedback following its launch. Will look to develop the link further in future.
A key issue for the planning authorities in Cambridgeshire will be making the connection between the need and demand for housing shown in the SHMA and assessing the availability of land for housing identified in district based Housing Land Availability Assessments.	Unfortunately the chapter which went out to consultation was not as complete as it could have been. We have not added to this chapter and will consult on the more complete version just after its launch in April / May 2008. This provides links to SLAAs and provides a better basis from which to build the links between the SHMA and the SLAAs.	Produce an updated and improved SLAA chapter, and welcome feedback following its launch. Will look to develop the link further in future.
St Edmundsbury, Forest Heath and Mid Suffolk are carrying out a joint assessment, starting in April. Also the Urban Capacity study of 2003 was updated in 2005.	Thanks you for the comment, we will include this in the first iteration	Done
Chapter 24		
Callcutt is now published, so do we need to change this?	Thank you, will look to try to add a summary.	Added Callcutt outcomes
Chapter 26		
This chapter contains useful information but the evidence hasn't been translated into a recommended size mix for future affordable properties or general market properties. Without a mix, local authorities will be left trying to muddle through and work out a preference mix for themselves. This is not ideal and could result in different methods being used by	The SHMA should be an evidence base and allow for flexibility, however we aim to include this information in the launched version.	Need to consult on how to improve the SHMA in future, and whether additional information, methodology or analysis might help clarify these issues more in future.

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
different authorities. If it isn't included could it include some methodology?		
Chapter 27		
We would like our annual shortfall figure to be expressed as a percentage requirement for rented and LCHO and for bedroom requirement.	Chapters 29 and 30 provide information which we hope would be useful in supporting authorities in deciding their own percentages but these need refining	The SHMA should not dictate policy decisions; we may want to consult on how to improve the SHMA in future, and whether additional information, methodology or analysis might help clarify these issues.
The SHMA would be strengthened by undertaking a scrutiny and moderation exercise to ensure that the needs figures are not overestimated. A specific review of the Cambridgeshire figures could supplement the regional testing that is being undertaken by EERA	We plan to review the technical appendix to the SHMA, which details the original source of all data used in our affordable housing calculations, following its launch in April / May 2008. We feel satisfied that the EERA quality assurance assessment of SHMAs has not highlighted any specific issues or faults with the process we have adopted, and are clear we have followed the CLG guidance. However some external verification by a university-based research team cannot harm the reliability of our SHMA results.	CCRG preparing a technical appendix to be verified following launch of the SHMA.
This chapter includes tables giving a predicted shortfall calculation but I am not sure where the basic info comes from.	There is some information provided in this chapter, however in the light of consultation responses we are working on a full technical explanation of the need calculations and will include this in the first SHMA to be launched.	Addition of Technical Appendix for formulae, and sources against each table throughout.
The survey has been used to estimate the number of concealed households however the survey sample size is too small and data needs to be triangulated against previous surveys and P1E returns	The only instance in the government guidance where survey work is recommended as a data source is for concealed households as they are (by their nature) difficult to identify. Other surveys would also have a small sample size and while P1E forms provide data on "homeless at home", these are slightly different from concealed households. We have added a further explanation of the figures we have used in the new Technical Appendix.	Adding technical appendix.
The MRUK survey is used to forecast newly arising need and the sample size is too small. You haven't looked at the previous survey data for comparison.	You say that the MRUK survey is used to forecast newly arising need and the sample size is too small, and that we have not looked at previous survey data for comparison. This is not strictly true – our figures for newly arising need has mostly come from CCRG projections, with apportioning tenure and affordability mostly from the MRUK survey. Again, we have added a Technical Appendix to provide further detail on exactly where we have, and have not, used the MRUK survey to help clarify these issues.	Adding technical appendix.
The annual level of housing need identified in most districts is well above potential supply. As there appears to be no hope of meeting these figures we suggest a scrutiny and moderation exercise be undertaken to ensure that the	We accept this feedback, and although the Research Group has worked hard with the Project Team including housing and planning colleagues, we suggest an audit of the technical appendix currently in production would help provide the	Future work plan

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
figures are not over-estimated e.g. don't include any double counting and that issues such as student housing needs and durability of backlog need have been adequately addressed	reassurance and constructive criticism this comment suggests. As the SHMA is a learning and building process, any feedback on our methodology and weaknesses within it can be tackled and incorporated into chapter reviews and a review of the full SHMA, each year.	
A planner review of the outcomes should be undertaken to form a reasonable and pragmatic approach for responding to the high levels of need identified.	The Planning Policy Forum is providing more specific feedback on the SHMA, which we anticipate will cover these issues. We look forward to gaining this feedback and to working closely with planners in future to address any concerns and issues raised.	Future work plan
The title of this chapter doesn't match the link title	Thank you, we will rectify this in our final edit.	Rectified
Chapter 29		
We agree that there is a need to take into account a range of considerations when deciding house size and tenure	We will work on this in 2008.	Future work plan
Chapter 32		
32.6 Needs to mention the East Cambridgeshire Sub-district Gypsy Needs Assessment carried out by the council in 2007.	Added a reference in paragraph 32.6	Done
Chapter 35		
35.4 Planning and housing definitions of rural exception appears to vary slightly. This needs to be clarified.	Added a paragraph to explain further in Chapter 36	Done
35.5 Please add the word "new"	Thank you, we have added the word "new" for clarification.	Added
35.5 This section is very sparse and more information needs to be included. The East Cambridgeshire Mobile Home Assessment highlighted Mobile Homes as an important source of affordable housing in rural parts of the district. The SHMA should set out more detail on the location, type of occupants and their role in LCH provision and key challenges.	Accepted, this first SHMA is a basis to build upon in future. However we wanted to include Park Homes while not over-emphasising their place and effect on our sub-regional housing markets. We plan to add a map of Park Homes across the sub-region, and will look to include further information such as East Cambridgeshire's Assessment as part of our revisions in 2008.	Work plan
Further work needed		
We are concerned that further local survey work may be required to assess the need for future market and affordable housing. The SHMA used a small sample size of 600 households per district. While this would give a reasonable snapshot of the needs and demands for housing of various tenures across the sub-region, we feel that the assessment of the affordability of households planning to move within the next 3-10 years in Huntingdonshire based on the responses of just 28 households across the whole district seriously questions how sound and robust the assessment's findings are.	We have mostly based our analysis of the housing mix on analysis on secondary data. We feel that this is a better approach for precisely the reasons given – basing things on the responses of 28 responses across the district isn't very robust. We have included references to all data sources in the Technical Appendix.	Adding technical appendix.
Would be good to have a link to the	We have included an extract from	Add in to chapter 26 on Cambourne

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
Cambourne study and other similar study	the Cambourne study in chapter 26, <i>Patterns of housing consumption following the new development survey(s)</i> along with a link to the full report, however appreciate we could include some more background information in the SHMA to assure people if it's use and reliability, and to set out plans for future surveys of a similar nature. Will aim to (a) clarify and (b) add more information in future.	and the timetable for future development surveys Need to add to work programme for future
We feel that if they can afford it people prefer homebuy products because they are not clustered and there is more choice – two different markets for shared ownership and homebuy?	A good point, we will look to incorporate this in the relevant chapter and to use the information we gather wherever possible to see if it supports this view of the intermediate market.	Future research – can we ask customers and potential movers about this?
There is too much emphasis on housing need and there needs to be more about the interplay between provision of market housing, affordability and need	We will work on this in 2008.	Work plan
The SHMA raises questions about future shared ownership and what current shared ownership leaseholders will move onto. Therefore we think it would be good to do some aspirational research	Will look to incorporate in 2008 work programme	Work plan
Some of the data in the SHMA is only available at sub-regional or county level – we would welcome further analysis to district level	We will work to extend the information used, and to analyse at "smaller than district" level wherever possible. We hope subscribing to Hometrack will assist with this in future and as the SHMA develops.	Use Hometrack to extend / improve price and market activity data across the sub-region, to as small a level as possible.
Further research is required to ascertain the impacts and appropriate policy responses to maintain economic vibrancy and respond to any adverse impacts on the housing market	Build in, in future?	Future work plan
House prices in Fenland have risen at the highest rate in the sub-region but the SHMA is not able to identify who is purchasing these homes at higher prices. IS this due to inward migration of older people/ BTL targeting migrant workers? What about the government assumption that addressing under supply by building more homes lowers prices? What about the impact of interest rates? We would like to see further examination of the influence of BTL as we believe is it very important to better understand the influence of these factors in Fenland and the whole of the sub-region.	Good points which do require further investigation.	Future work plan
It is noted that 33.9% are unable to access shared ownership products at 50% equity share. We would welcome new HomeBuy products that will allow a smaller equity purchase or small rent charges. At the time of writing the SHMA, the register in Fenland was very small and this data set must therefore be regarded with caution. The register has recently been promoted in the	50% was chosen because it was the average purchase. Refined modelling is required, looking at different equity shares, and also comparison of different sizes of properties.	Future work plan

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation

Feedback	Comment	Action
district and future analysis may prove to be more useful. We would welcome further work on size and affordability of deposits for house purchase. We are concerned about the quality of life for people who have no option but to rent on the private market. Long term security of tenure is important in the promotion of stable and secure communities.		
Once adopted the SHMA should turn its attention to developing an appropriate balanced housing market model that compares supply and demand for dwellings by size. We suggest that this is done by tenure to allow comparison between affordable and market.	A welcome suggestion, we will look to build on this suggestion in 2008	Future work plan
The points raised towards the end of the plenary session possibly moving the research towards more qualitative areas such as aspiration surveys was really interesting to me – I believe the answers to the “why questions can carry more weight than the “how many” question (why people don’t downsize, why renting privately isn’t a preferred option). Would the SHMA be an appropriate document to publicise the realities of inadequate housing, homelessness etc – is it the right forum for stories from real people about how their lives are blighted?	We agree that aspiration studies should form part of our 2008 workplan and hope to programme these in, for future SHMA development. However your suggestion about case studies on the effects of housing issues for individuals may best sit in a partner document to the SHMA. The SHMA need not provide a factual evidence base for housing and planning policy, although we would not (of course) the impact of the effects of these facts and figures on individuals’ lives. This is an area we could explore in future with our Partners, to discuss how and where such case studies can be most usefully presented.	Work plan for aspiration studies and discussion of the case study idea – where best to place? Consider in future work plan.
The East of England plan is quoted as having the expectation that 35% of all completions will be affordable, but the site size thresholds set out in PPS3 limit the ability of authorities to achieve this together with historical permissions at lower percentages or no percentages from periods when there were higher thresholds.	Accepted, unfortunately we have to accept that any percentage imposed or suggested, will take time to adopt and apply to individual development. We hope that by setting a framework for monitoring completions and numbers of affordable homes, and by working with planning colleagues to ensure housing and planning monitoring align, we will be able to see these changing proportions in future.	Future work plan
We also need to identify the affordability gaps between market low cost home ownership and affordable intermediate tenures	A good suggestion, however this is difficult as low-cost market housing is poorly defined, which makes finding information on it hard to come by. However will try to develop as part of your previous suggestion in 2008.	Future work plan
We have concerns regarding the mix of market housing, currently constrained by the SPG in Huntingdonshire as our research shows that this policy is not encouraging the development of sufficient numbers of three bedroom family housing to meet demand and that this shortage is fuelling house prices for this type of property. Similarly the same policy is creating a surplus of one and two bedroom homes which are proving difficult to	We do not feel this is criticism of the SHMA, rather on Huntingdonshire’s SPD which we will pass on the Hunts Planning Policy team for their consideration. Our section on market housing gives demographic data and data from the Cambourne survey. We are also carrying out surveys of other new developments, currently mainly in Huntingdonshire, which we hope will add to our understanding of the Huntingdonshire housing market	Future new settlement surveys on work plan

Feedback	Comment	Action
sell	and about people who settle in new developments, in future.	
Specific issues		
In the discussion group we thought it would be helpful to readers to provide a map of where the 62 park home sites are located in Cambridgeshire	Thanks for the postcode data, we will try to add a map to Chapter 35.	Create map and add to chapter 35, possibly soon after first version once IT issues resolved.
The SHMA needs to make linkages to the Supporting People Strategy - this will serve as a guide to identifying special needs groups, existing services and identifying current priorities in both the districts and sub-region for revenue and capital funding. We agree there is a need for long term funding for move on floating support services to ensure good outcomes from the intervention of our specialist support services for young people.	We aim to include a new chapter on support and supported housing in 2008, with the help of the two relevant Supporting People teams and any necessary further research needed.	Future work plan

Table 11: Compliments

Feedback	Comment	Action
3,000 household interviews is a large sample and we have no concerns about its statistical validity in terms of volume.	Good.	None
The methodology appear to follow government guidance and the results are well set out and clearly explained.	Thank you.	None
Appears to cover the basic elements as set out in the CLG guidance	Thank you.	None
Thanks for the invitation. It was informative and enjoyable The SHMA is and will be a great tool for housing providers in the sub-region	Thank you.	None
Thanks for giving me the opportunity to participate in the consultation event which I found both interesting and informative	Thank you.	None
The framework of the SHMA provides a good first attempt framework for attempting to understand the housing market. It is the ambition of the government that we be in the position of influencing the future housing market - addressing the needs of those currently in housing need and who may be in need in the future. The SHMA is a useful first step We welcome the Cambridge approach to the calculation of housing need. The modifications to the CLG guidance appear sensible.	Thank you.	None
The SHMA is a welcome addition to the available evidence base on housing issues within Cambridgeshire	Thank you.	None

A10.6 Third workshop feedback, 30 January 2008

“The end of the beginning”

On 30 January 2008, our third half-day workshop on the SHMA was held at Buckingham House, New Hall, Cambridge. Some 36 people attended from a variety of agencies including housing associations, district and county councils, housing developers, the Land Owners and Development Industry groups, Addenbrooke's, Supporting People and park Homes.

Following a welcome by Liz Bisset, Chair of Cambridge Sub Regional Housing Board, Trevor Baker of the Cambridgeshire County Research Group gave a summary of the SHMA's progress to date, the consultation process, how this workshop fitted in with the formal consultation period, and some early outcomes. Four workshop groups were then formed and convened to discuss the draft SHMA, under the following questions:

- Does the SHMA do what you need it to?
- How do you plan to use the SHMA?
- What should happen next and who is key to this work?

After a break, delegates fed back to the entire group and provided a forum for discussions and questions.

Dinah Roake from EP summed up at the end and thanks everyone for coming and giving their opinions and promised ongoing consultation in future, along with a similar annual consultation event to keep everyone up to date with the SHMA's progress.

General comments

- All fine, very useful
- Very good event. Good exchange of information and views
- Should have had a few more housebuilders in attendance.
- An overall very informative and productive afternoon

Table 12: Group feedback and actions/reactions arising

Feedback	Action / reaction
Does the SHMA do what you need it to?	
• Business tool	Agreed
• Social and demographic profile	Agreed
• Having forecasts and delivery	Agreed
• Trends in current market	Agreed
• Realism of future housing delivery targets (AMR)	Agreed
• Requirement of mix according to a specific site and viability	Agreed
• Mix of both need and demand, by size and by tenure	Agreed
• It makes a start...	Agreed
• Is it going to result in more money for the sub-region? e.g. SP support (Extra needs from growth sites).	We hope so

Feedback	Action / reaction
• Impenetrable document – key points	Need to add executive summary and highlight summary points within each chapter more clearly
• Executive summary	Need to add
• Almost!	Agreed
• Should it inform strategy?	Yes
• The summaries in any event draw out conclusions.	Agreed
• It needs to link to policy and assist policy debate	Yes
• Policy/evidence (e.g. in tenure mix)	Yes
• Levels of need/numbers, size (CBL?)	Yes
How do you plan to use the SHMA?	
• Might use projections and trajectories to 'spot' potential markets	Agreed
• Use to inform discussion with development control officers	Agreed
• Use it to get together tenures "on the map"	Agreed
• Flag up the importance e.g. of park homes (and boats) with local authorities	Yes, section added in Chapter 36
• Make people aware of wider options	Agreed
• To support the case for e.g. new gypsy sites	Agreed
• Support for planning decisions/ LDF	Agreed
• RSLs to use to formulate their own strategies	Agreed
• Support wider policy decisions e.g. BME	Agreed
• Strategic how it affects Policy → RSS. Aids communication.	Agreed
• Sub market tenures. Tool for discussions. Sustainability	Agreed
• More accessible (different audiences – less technical). More user friendly	Agreed
• Document helpful for negotiation	Agreed
• Eco-Towns (Waterbeach) informs future strategic policy.	Agreed
• SHMA evidence base for future housing strategy informs cross-boundary requirements of LA's	Agreed
• Coverage of whole spectrum of issues. Informs strategy. Underpin market appraisals. Stronger emphasis on implications for the future. Part of the future work?	Agreed, need to build on implications in future work
• How do we deal with summaries: key issues? or different summaries for different reasons	Adding an executive summary, plus facts and figures for each district
• Executive summary preferred, but also district based	Adding an executive summary, plus facts and figures for each district
• Inform amount of affordable housing.	Agreed
• Inform development required / S106	Agreed
• Local vs. Regional	Agreed
• LDFs and AH strategies	Agreed
• Provision for particular groups	Agreed
• For negotiation e.g. with H.C.	Agreed

Feedback	Action / reaction
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Making 'affordable' housing affordable. 	Agreed
What should happen next and who is key to this work?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Info on build to let and buy to leave 	Add to workplan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could house builders provide ongoing monitoring or purchaser profiles? 	Need to speak to builders and add to workplan if agreed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What people choose including number of beds/spare beds, and why 	Future new development surveys and EP research on housing choices to cover, and add to future SHMA updates
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How do you quantify what people prefer? 	Hope to identify using new development survey and EP research on housing choices
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effect on criteria on home buy etc. 	Need to feed our results into discussions on future of intermediate tenures, priorities and accessibility
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make clearer how we move from statistics to policy 	Need to devise how best to do this, and consult on the results.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would want developers to "sign up" or accept it - could ask HBF 	Need to speak to builders and add to workplan if agreed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More info on new estates: Who's going into which type of property and guidance for sites on what size and type to deliver 	Need to add as appropriate, following further research and discussion on what to develop and how best to link the SHMA to policy decisions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More detail within districts - scenarios? 	Key facts and figures to be drawn out. May want to develop a scenario tool in time.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ward level? 	Will look to try to do at as small a level as is useful, reliable and economic.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improve section numbering 	Improved. Sections now have letters, paragraphs, table and charts are all numbered, and glitches rectified.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map sharing e.g. park homes and other supported housing 	To be added
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> JRF type 2-page summary 	Plans to produce an executive summary, will need to develop a 2-page summary after that.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues revised about affordability, especially re shared ownership 	New information has been added. A key priority for future research and review.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Look at sub-market rent / other tenures 	Agreed to add more detail and changing definitions of new products in future.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interpretation for other services e.g. environmental health, migrant workers network etc. 	Summary should help. Will seek further feedback.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More discussion with planners about what they need. 	Chief Planning Officers and Planning Policy Forum preparing formal feedback
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Park homes 	Added
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tied accommodation (migrant workers) 	Need to develop and extend this chapter as appropriate.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supported housing is featured but needs its own section 	New chapter to be added in coming year
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rural housing and viable rural businesses - less dormitory effect 	Could look to extend the rural chapter, but need to be aware of links to other agendas and strategies too so not to over-extend the SHMA.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design of houses – what do young single people actually want? 	New developments and EP surveys should help us identify some common factors. Need to see how much and whether specific research is needed in future.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quick start guide like IKEA pics 	Suggestion to create a user-guide to help different interest groups access and use the vast array of




Feedback	Action / reaction
	chapters – akin to assembly instructions or a route map. Will look to produce a route map for executive summary and possibly website, will need feedback on whether these do what was being suggested in the workshop once published!
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Smaller tenures don't know/don't flag themselves up 	Need to add further investigation into work programme
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How many have given up specifying small villages which they would really like? 	Need to monitor as part of CBL and try to identify trends like these
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable development – requires greater research. Needs to underpin policy. New towns vs. urban extensions. (Future consumer aspirations). 	Research around such issues could be added in future work programme, possibly as part of the new developments or planned EP surveys
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have we missed anything? Resident aspirations in the next phase, i.e. tracking movements for the future. Tenure. Quality of Life. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surveys that inform balanced /mix /communities. Future signposts. That could be included in future reviews of SHMA. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much are RSLs subsidising special/supported housing across the sub region? Measure this to support argument for more SP funding? 	Could form either part of the new SP chapter, or feed into SP strategists in Suffolk and Cambs teams
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public transport links. 	There is a link between housing delivery and infrastructure, summarised in chapter on planning and housing delivery, however do not want to provide too much detail in the SHMA itself.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular updates of exec summary needed as the data is updated. Executive Summary District based summaries 	Plan to update annually as part of the SHMA review, however individual chapters to be updated within years and consulted upon and publicised as needed / appropriate, Being produced Key district facts and figures to be produced
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research into info on disabilities and special needs (need to develop it to the same level as for older people) 	Agreed, to be built in in future iterations and with support of County disability strategy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop thinking in new tenures? 	Agreed, need to extend understanding to produce feedback and suggestions for new products or application.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demographics - feed into tenure types (primary research) UK or Europe examples worthwhile? Central govt. research; private developers' experience – input needed. SHMA captures data. Policy development elsewhere. 	Agree need to use the data to extend policy reactions, also keep to gather data from alternative sources to add to and triangulate data in the first SHMA.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effects of depressed housing market. Iteration on existing data. 	Agree, need to build into updates and look at other ways to monitor factors that quickly affect our housing markets
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing consultation on future work – early warning. 	Agree, want to involve, consult and publicise to partners, and to continue to build our Partnership Group to help us with this work.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of need (size) CBL 	Agreed, need to monitor this and feed into the

Feedback	Action / reaction
	SHMA.
• BPHA data priority for update	Agreed, update as at March 2008 has been added, plus priority area for update in future and to devise a more efficient system to handle the data.
• Making it up-to-date and dynamic	Agreed.
• Housing for older people - feed up to govt.	Agreed, look to use SHMA as part of regional and national policy consultation in future
• Inappropriate housing for migrants	Need to investigate this area further in future.
• Executive summary	Agreed, in process of adding.

A10.7 Overall feedback on event

The following pages provide the feedback provided by the four workshop groups. These are followed by notes on how the comment have been taken on board. Some nine delegates completed the overall workshop feedback, the feedback is summarised below:

Table 13: Feedback sheets

					
Event arrangements	-	1	2	1	5
Venue	-	-	1	1	7
Arrivals and registration	-	-	1	1	7
Refreshments				2	7
Introduction	-	-	2	3	4
"The end of the beginning"	-	-	-	4	3
Your discussion group	-	-	-	-	7
Feedback from discussion groups	-	-	1	2	4
Plenary discussion	-	-	3	1	2
Event overall	-	-	1	2	3
Total	-	1 (1%)	11 (14%)	17 (22%)	49 (63%)