

Agenda
Session 4 – 9.30 Wednesday 10 May 2017
Matter 4

How will the Housing Requirement be met and a Five Year Housing Land Supply Maintained?

This matter considers how the housing requirement of 6,440 or 5,680 dwellings (Policy S6) derived from the OAN will be met; whether those means of meeting the requirement have been justified and will be effective; and whether the LP will be able to maintain a five year housing land supply.

The Council has clarified some points on the components of the housing supply set out in Table 3 – the figures are ‘net’; the PDNPA contribution; the windfall allowance; and allocated sites (see EX/02). The table (as modified by MM26) indicates that 6,646 dwellings would be delivered from various sources some 3% above the 6,440 requirement or 17% above a 5,680 requirement.

The Council has proposed modifications to Policies S5 and HC1 to take into account the circumstances where housing land supply falls below five years (see EX/02, MM23 and MM52).

Delivery from individual sites will be considered during Stage 2 hearings.

Main Modifications MM23, MM25, MM26, MM51 and MM52 are relevant to this matter.

Issues

1. The extent of flexibility built into housing supply

As referred to above the Council refer to 3% or 17% flexibility depending on which housing requirement is taken forward.

1.2 Is there sufficient flexibility built into the housing supply such that the housing requirement is likely to be met, particularly given
(1) the characteristics of some of the strategic allocations and
(2) that the housing requirement is a minimum?

1.3 If required, how would additional flexibility be achieved e.g. additional allocations, increasing capacity from allocations, policy wording or a combination of these measures?

2. Housing supply and trajectory

The Council has provided an update of the housing land availability position in Appendix 1 to its statement which includes site commitments and a revised trajectory. This indicates a shortfall of 624 dwellings up to 31 March 2017. The Council suggests that, despite the need to increase completion rates significantly, their calculations

indicate that they can demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites, applying either the 'Sedgefield' or 'Liverpool' method to deal with the shortfall.

The Council point to evidence from national and local sources to support its assumption that larger sites will deliver 30 dpa.

2.1 Is the housing trajectory set out in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment¹ (SHELAA) and at Appendix 3 of the LP as updated by the hearing statement realistic taking into account past completion rates?

2.2 What method of calculation should be used to address the shortfall in housing delivery between 2013-2017, the Sedgefield method (undersupply addressed in the next 5 years) or the Liverpool method (undersupply addressed over the plan period)?

2.3 Taking into account 2.2 is the Council able to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites?

2.4 Are build rates of 30 dpa from larger sites realistic and supported by evidence?

3. Delivery from commitments and allocations

The Council advises that the SHELAA is based on engagement with developers and landowners as well as local knowledge.

3.1 Is the delivery of some 74% of commitments and 36% of allocations within the first 5 years of the LP realistic?

4. Constraints to delivery

The Council points to assessments within the SHELAA and viability appraisals as evidence that strategic allocations will come forward. Only Ashbourne Airfield and Middlepeak Quarry are crucial to the delivery of the housing requirement due to the scale of these sites.

4.1 In general terms are the strategic housing allocations deliverable having regard to the infrastructure requirements and constraints affecting them?

4.2 What are the implications for meeting the housing requirement if one or more of the strategic housing allocations do not come forward?

4.3 Should a greater range of sites be allocated at this stage to ensure that the housing requirement is met rather than undertaking a Local Plan review if site(s) stalled?

4.4 What, if any, are the implications of the Housing Delivery Test set out in the Housing White Paper?

¹ Figure 2 page 20

5. Housing implementation strategy

The Council refer to the indicators in Chapter 9 which will form the basis for inputs into the Council's Annual Monitoring Report.

5.1 Are the provisions of Chapter 9 of the LP (Implementation and Monitoring) sufficient to meet the requirement for a Housing Implementation Strategy?

5.2 Would such a strategy ensure a positive and robust response if a 5 year supply was not maintained, particularly in the light of the proposed Housing Delivery Test?

6. The wording of housing supply policies

Are the proposed modifications to Policies S5 and HC1 (and any other relevant policies) sufficient to ensure that sustainable sites will be able to come forward quickly in the absence of a 5 year housing land supply?

Do these or other policies need to include a mechanism where review of the Local Plan (full or partial) would be triggered?

Main Evidence Base

CD19 and CD20 – Viability Assessments

CD25 and CD26– SHELAA and appendices

SD11 – Council Monitoring Report

EX/02 - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions of 7 February

EX/05 - Council response to Inspector's Preliminary questions of 14 February

EX/13 – Schedule of proposed main modifications

Participants

DDDC

Roger Yarwood (2164)

Gladman Developments Ltd (3752)

Home Builders Federation (4794)

Acres Land and Planning for Goodall Family (5924)

PDP for FW Harrison (6212)

DLP for Chevin Homes (6222)

Statements

DDDC

Roger Yarwood

Gladman Developments Ltd

HBF

Acres Land and Planning for Goodall Family