

From: Dominic Huber [mailto:]
Sent: 10 January 2020 19:02
To: Matthew Diamond <Matthew.Diamond@exeter.gov.uk>
Subject: PLEASE ADD TO OUR OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 19/1556/FUL

Attachment available until 9 Feb 2020

PLEASE ADD THIS EMAIL TO OUR OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 19/1556/FUL

Dear Matt,

We have been studying a new report regarding 'Co-living' compiled by Manchester City Council on 19th December 2019.

We would like you to consider the following summary of this report with regards to Planning Application 19/1556/FUL, Harlequin Centre, Exeter.

As you will find from in the conclusion of the report, Manchester City Council have grave concerns about the experimental use which is 'Co-living'. Manchester is a city of approximately 550.000 people. Please put this report into context with a much smaller city as Exeter with approximately only 119.000 people.

The Manchester City Council report on Co-living informs Members of the emergence of the Co-living concept and the issues and concerns raised by it. The report considers how the Council should respond to emerging market demand, on the basis that there is no current planning policy context at national or local level.

I. Key points in the report:

1. Co-living is new and untested in the Manchester housing market
2. Co-living would only make a limited contribution to the city's housing offer
- 3, Co-living is not required or appropriate as the housing market in Manchester is more accessible than in London
4. Although 'open to everyone' the demographic living in co-living schemes internationally tends to be weighted towards people in their 20's and 30's
5. Co-living is undefined in the National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF). This means that co-living development would be submitted as 'sui-generis' development which does not fall into any defined use class.

II. Key issues and policy considerations

1. Key principles on co-living schemes need to be developed, in the context of the new local plan, to ensure the right residential products, in the right locations are delivered for the city. Some co-living schemes may not meet Manchester's space standards and will not generally be seen as appropriate development in terms of providing permanent homes for our residents.

2. The impact of any new supply will need to be carefully managed, appraised and evaluated (as the market is untested in Manchester) before future co-living developments can be considered.

III. Space and living standards

1. Given the size and nature of the product, the smaller co-living spaces would not be considered acceptable as permanent homes for residents.

IV. Affordability

1. Co-living is NOT an affordable housing product on a price per sqm basis and cannot be seen as a mechanism for developers to meet affordable housing targets in Manchester. For example, a comparison of traditional Build to Rent 1 bed accommodation and co-living accommodation in London suggests that co-living is more expensive (£77/sqm compared to £32-£38/sqm).

V. Links to student market

1. The Council would not support students living in co-living accommodation due to the issues set out above in particular around space standards.

2. It is possible that without restrictions some postgraduate/ undergraduate students may become attracted to the emerging co-living accommodation and its similarities to Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) in terms of shared amenities and services.

VI. Criteria

1. Co-living represents a new, emerging sector. The market is ahead of policy and this represents challenges in appropriately appraising planning applications for proposed developments.

VII. Conclusion

1. There has been significant change in the residential housing market, including residential growth in the city centre, and a policy approach is needed to respond to the potential that co-living schemes could come forward from developers. As a result, a limit on new developments should be considered whilst the market is maturing, and in advance of planning policy on co-living being developed.

2. In addition, co-living should not be considered as an affordable housing product and should be clearly differentiated from Purpose Built Student Accommodation and should contribute to Council Tax revenue in the city.

As Exeter City Council will be aware, the Inspectorate highlights the risk of 'AD HOC' development as a result of Exeter City's current Planning Policy.

This must be strongly considered when advising ECC Planning Committee regarding planning application 19/1556/FUL.

Many thanks

Jonathan Palmer
Dominic Huber

39 Northernhay Street
Exeter
EX4 3ER

Please find attached the complete document, Manchester City Council 19122019