

Outcomes of formal consultation – 2009

A10.1 Formal consultation on the draft SHMA, 2007/08	1
A10.2 Responses to first draft SHMA	1
A10.3 Third workshop feedback, 30 January 2008	31
A10.4 Formal consultation on 2009 update to SHMA	36

Outcomes of formal consultation – 2009

A10.1 Formal consultation on the draft SHMA, 2007/08

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.

A10.2 Responses to first 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.**

Formal feedback on the 2008 launched SHMA

Table 1: 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
25. Developing balanced, mixed communities	5
26. Future homes	4

	Total
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 2: 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
2. Housing market conditions are assessed within the context of the housing market area	1		5

	Poor ☹	Average ☺	Good ☺
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
1 x research and intelligence	
1 x planning agent	

Table 3: 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		
The population and number of households does not accord with official government statistics/ the secondary data sources are reliable except for the CCRG projections. 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.	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.	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 CCRG figures are based on expected growth rather than theoretical trends. Therefore the CCRG 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 CCRG model as they are based on similar assumptions.
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		
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 £/ft ² 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. 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	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.	Work plan
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 data suggests this is fuelling houseprices, and an oversupply of 1	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 to these issues in future	Future work plan

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation - 2009

Feedback	Comment	Action
/ 2 bed units, which are proving harder to sell.		
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 SHMA. 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.
The SHMA notes the increase in	SLAA summaries added for first	Future work plan

Feedback	Comment	Action
<p>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>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>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. The concern here is that the sample</p>	<p>By adding the Technical Appendix we hope to answer questions around triangulation and comparative information used to support the approach taken.</p>	<p>Future work plan.</p>

Feedback	Comment	Action
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.	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
Chapter 22 looks at AMR trajectories	It is an important aspect of the	Continue to work with CCC to align

Feedback	Comment	Action
to 2016 but is more concerned with market than affordable	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.	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.		
More work needs to be done to understand the future housing needs	Accepted, though smaller area	Work plan

Feedback	Comment	Action
of an aging population, particularly in urban / rural fringe housing sub markets such as Godmanchester	analysis make take some more time.	
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 steering group which is entirely controlled by the public sector. At these events a description of work is	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 Building Industry and English Partnerships, and to keep in contact with the Development Industry	Seek feedback form exiting parties on level and effectiveness of involvement. Review the Project Team membership. Continue to develop the SHMA in 2008 onwards, and involve partners

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation - 2009

Feedback	Comment	Action
<p>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>Forum and Cambridge Land Owners Group to assist with the "balance" of our approach. 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. 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>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. 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. Put on Partnership List. 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. 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. 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 resposdee. Improve publicity of the SHMA and events around it so a broader audience is aware of them, and of their opportunities to get involved. 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. 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 people purchasing their homes would be useful if available.</p>	<p>As a result of our workshop in January 2008, we are looking to invite developers to contribute such information, if they are willing. We are also running our own surveys of</p>	<p>Future work plan</p>

Feedback	Comment	Action
	<p>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.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Add to Stakeholder group list. Invite to future events. Send briefing notes. Ensure involved in any future consultation and development of the SHMA.</p>
<p>4. Contains a full technical explanation of the methods employed, with any limitations noted</p>		
<p>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.</p>	<p>By adding a full technical appendix we aim to address this criticism. 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 reliability and robustness of our calculations.</p>	<p>Adding technical appendix</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Producing executive summary. Work plan</p>
<p>Updating the SHMA will need to be systematic, i.e. every 3 months, 6 months, or annually say, in order that the SHMA remains credible and can be used for the purpose of S106 negotiations etc. Once this is</p>	<p>Agreed, we want to review specific issues and update with new secondary data through the year, re-publishing whole chapters as and when (with careful version control) and to undertake an annual review</p>	<p>We have added this into Appendix 15, <i>Change Log</i></p>

Feedback	Comment	Action
decided it needs to be explained within the document.	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 / executive 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.
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

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation - 2009

Feedback	Comment	Action
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?		
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

Feedback	Comment	Action
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 guidance, from the conceptual framework that should guide the research.	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.
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	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	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.

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation - 2009

Feedback	Comment	Action
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.	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.	
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 Huntingdonshire is for 4,200 fewer households by 2021 than shown in official government forecasts on the CLG website.	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 immigration. 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

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation - 2009

Feedback	Comment	Action
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 from other new developments will add to this section of the SHMA.	Part of our work programme 2008/9
No.	Thank you	None

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation - 2009

Feedback	Comment	Action
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
Do you have any suggestions to add, build on or otherwise improve our SHMA in future?		

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation - 2009

Feedback	Comment	Action
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
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 eneds 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, aply and draw sub-regional or district-wide conclusions about rural housing need.	Look to extend this chapter in future, in partnership with relevant stakeholders.

Cambridge Sub-Region's Strategic Housing Market Assessment
Appendix 10: Outcomes of consultation - 2009

Feedback	Comment	Action
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 4: 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 - 2009

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 CCCR 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 - 2009

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 - 2009

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 - 2009

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 - 2009

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 - 2009

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 - 2009

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 needs 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 - 2009

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 5: 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

A10.3 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 6: 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.

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 7: 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%)

A10.4 Formal consultation on 2009 update to SHMA

In 2009, a workshop was held to launch the formal consultation of the SHMA and to gather reactions to the first SHMA, published in 2008.

“A difficult first year...responding to the challenge” was the workshop held on 7 July 2009 at Homerton College, Cambridge.

Agenda

13.30	Arrivals, registration, tea and coffee
14.00	Welcome
14.10	A difficult first year: update on the SHMA
14.30	Responding to the challenge: introduction to discussion groups
14.35	Discussion groups: how can the SHMA help us respond to the challenge in future?
15.35	Tea and coffee
15.50	Re-convene, feedback from groups
16.05	Plenary discussion
16.20	What happens next?
16.30	Close

Attendees

Jerry	Jackson	Appleacre Park Ltd
Karen	Beech	Bidwells
Michael	Hendry	Bidwells
Roy	Hind	BPHA
Helen	Reed	Cambridge City Council
Catherine	Shilton	Cambridgeshire ACRE
Wendy	Hague	Cambridgeshire County Council
John	Onslow	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Sir David	Trippier	Cambridgeshire Horizons
Elske	Janssen	Cambridgeshire Supporting People Team
Jerry	Harkness	Circle Anglia
Juliet	Richardson	East of England Development Agency
Karen	Wickham	Fenland District Council
Steve	Clark	Forest Heath District Council
Dinah	Roake	Homes & Communities Agency
Jo	Emmerton	Huntingdonshire District Council
Andy	Chapman	Luminus Group
Steve	Sillery	Marshalls
Kofi	Dzorkplens	Papworth Trust
David	Ousby	Prospect Row LLP
Julie	Fletcher	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Schuyler	Newstead	South Cambridgeshire District Council
Jonathan	Fife	University of Cambridge Accommodation Service

Three workshop groups discussed:

How can the SHMA help us respond to the challenge in future?

1. How have you used the SHMA over the past year?
2. Where has this been positive/helpful? And conversely are there issues the SHMA lacks? (e.g. issues, levels of detail or geography, up to date information).
3. What is missing? What can we do to improve it, develop it, add missing data, or create further "spin offs" to help meet your needs and respond to the new and changing housing market we are faced with?

Outcomes of group discussions:

Blue Group

- Should we pause?
- Use existing data e.g. the SQW study for RSS review
- Incorporate feedback from Mereham and other
- Are planners using it?
- EEDA is starting to use SHMAs to inform advice on the RSS review, especially from areas of high housing pressure
- Use evidence for s106 sites
- For HCA bids for resources
- For mix of tenures needed
- Private sector house sizes – SHMA not clear on this
- Changing times, and pace of change very fast
- Where are we now, in an economic / housing market "cycle"?
- Big hole is the funding needed for any development
- How long with this last?
- Equity not the use it used to be as LTV so low
- Priority is to develop, and to enable house purchases, want to be able to take the available opportunities (RSLs and developers)
- Sales volumes have a big effect
- Cambridge City is a very specific market
- No need for 800 pages of anything! Could a 50-page version be created?
- A difficult range of housing markets – very diverse – some buoyant, some not.
- Have to appreciate the SHMA itself is useful context but not necessarily "core business" itself, for the SHMA partners.
- Like the sticks!
- Need to keep marketing it
- The test is maybe yet to come, as planning applications start to pick up again, and as the Single Conversation with the HCA takes root.

- Interesting to look further / deeper into commuting patterns
- City Fringe sites – evidence the market is looking more positive, but an Inquiry possible
- Need to involve national financial reps of some kind, and rep from Cambridge Building Society, to build the financial aspects in more.
- Financial world is a parameter which needs to be better acknowledged / built in
- Public funding likely to reduce a lot in future.
- Must not lose the SHMA regardless of its governance
- Local evidence is totally crucial – but not fixed in time – must be “living” evidence
- Funders have black and white rules, hard to get flexibility from them.
- University and Addenbrooke's create churn and turnover in the market, more buying and selling than in other places, and bio-medical campus creating lots of jobs
- Elderly and supported housing – lack of join-up between revenue (SP and NHC) and capital (HCA) – can't deliver the strategic need.
- Don't seem to be able to have a long-term strategic discussion on supported housing, only scheme-by-scheme
- Need to consider existing sheltered housing, levels of dependency, new provision, effect on domiciliary care, ageing population trends.
- Park homes aimed at specific ages too.
- Have a Park Manager, sense of community, tends to be older people, easy to adapt.
- Can the SHMA do demography compared to age, compared to equity, to help find a revenue stream / stair casing?

Green Group

Have used the SHMA for:

- Consultation on funding required by the HCA
- South Cambs referred to in SPD
- South Cambs used for appeal with planning inspectors
- Used by County planners to inform EERA of ARUP report on the location of strategic settlements
- Used in Extension to Cambourne report
- In support when specifying s106 requirements to developers

Was helpful / positive for

- Mereham inquiry – helpful, though difficult to figure to the right level of analysis
- Different spatial analysis across the region
- Affordability needed to be more location-specific to be useful in i.e. ARUP report response

What is missing?

- Sizes of all properties – exploring use of the Size Model - population structure vs. market behaviour – plus or minus range suggested to take model forward

- Hot and cold spots of affordability – for where urban extensions are mooted – analysis would be particularly useful
- Needs to be mindful of Variable Tariff – other financial initiatives which are evolving from s106
- Consider possible to use housing needs survey data undertaken by rural housing enabler to feed into SHMA rural chapter
- Info on disabilities – improvement planned – could add home improvement agency information
- Linking with JSNAs
- Links on district websites to SHMA
- Cited as data for scoping work being undertaken by EERA for review of RSS

Yellow Group

- Size
- Titles for sections not very intuitive
- Access – a forum to identify “hot topics” to lead the research would help
- Useful to have more up-to-date info, especially info on sales, suggest a map to float mouse over to give key facts?
- Needs to link better to SHLAAs
- Effect of infrastructure on the market
- Access: have used it, but it is daunting!
- Like the fact it's web-based
- Baseline is useful
- Suggest more specialism is needed
- Need to use the SHMA to make judgements on the future, but always using backwards looking data to do this.

Plenary discussion points

- Usefulness of the workshop itself:
- Need to get in the diary earlier
- Need more people contributing to increase diversity of input
- Finance in the housing market is a big issue – could invite a speaker on this specific topic
- Perhaps a whole day event with lunch?
- Move location out of Cambridge as long as good transport links - possibly Ely?
- Option to comment on-line and ask people in the SHMA team where to find stuff amongst all the pdf's
- Forums to pose questions on topics or areas
- Comment and share debates – but requires maintenance and monitoring
- Blogs? Not twitter!
- HM Bulletin

- Could be 4 or 6 monthly?
- Would be good to use mapping to bring data from CAA, hometrack and ONS together – would increase accessibility
- Heath service data and priorities need to tie in – but a challenge to align them
- SHLAAs and JSNAs useful ingredients to the SHMA? If so, need to draw the links more clearly. (TB: JSNA was “separate” but now working hard to draw them SHMA and JSNAs together. SHMA would benefit from clarifying this link)
- Need to join up the infrastructure research between City and South Cambs – forms into the integrated delivery plan (?)

Feedback sheets

Total number of delegates:	26	Total number of sheets:	8		
			Poor	Average	Good
Arrangements					
Event arrangements				5	3
Venue				2	6
Arrivals and registration				1	7
Refreshments				4	4
Activities					
Introduction (Stephen Hills)				1	5
“A difficult year”				4	4
Your discussion group				1	7
Feedback from discussion groups				4	4
Plenary discussion				2	6
Event overall				2	5

Any general comments or suggestions?

- Not aware of invite till several days before
- Useful event
- Thank you!
- Need to focus debate to ensure you get what you want from such workshops.
- Need to try and widen your audience
- The prospect of easier parking and a good lunch would encourage more people to attend
- Very good workshop

Summary:

- Given the small number of forms completed, some overall conclusions:
- All average or good ratings, none poor.
- Event arrangements and joining instructions need to be better (and earlier) in future.
- The venue and sign-in were good.
- Discussion groups were very popular as was the plenary discussion.