



THE HOME BUILDERS FEDERATION

Pendle Core Strategy Examination
Nelson Town Hall
Market Street
Nelson
Lancashire
BB9 7LG
Email: ldf@pendle.gov.uk
Sent by Email only

Date: 10th July 2015
Consultee ID: 755915

Dear Sir / Madam,

Pendle Core Strategy: Main Modifications

1. Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on the Main Modifications consultation.
2. The HBF is the principal representative body of the house building industry in England and Wales and our representations reflect the views of our membership of multinational PLCs, through regional developers to small, local builders. Our members account for over 80% of all new housing built in England and Wales in any one year including a large proportion of the new affordable housing stock.
3. The HBF was a participant in a number of the examination hearing sessions, providing both oral and written submissions. We have not sought to duplicate our written submissions as part of this consultation, however we do make reference to a number of our previous comments. The HBF would like to submit the following additional comments upon the main modifications which have been structured to accord with the consultation document. **If required the HBF would also wish to attend any further hearing sessions.**

Modification number MM068: paragraph 3.97

The proposed amendment is unsound as it is neither effective nor positively prepared.

4. The amendments relating to Burnley Council being able to meet its own objectively assessed housing needs is a positive statement and its inclusion within the plan is supported. However the HBF do not consider that this overcomes our fundamental concerns in relation to ensuring the full objectively assessed needs of the housing market area (both Pendle and Burnley) are met (see paragraphs 11 & 12 of the HBF Pre-Submission Core Strategy). The proposed amendments do not identify any mechanism which would account for the possibility of Burnley being unable to meet its needs.

5. The following further amendments (**in bold**) are therefore suggested;

*'Pendle is bordered by six other authorities (Figure 3.1), but its strongest links are with neighbouring Burnley, with whom it shares a housing market area. Based on the levels of housing proposed in the Burnley Local Plan Issues & Options Report (February 2014), Burnley Council has indicated that it can accommodate its objectively assessed need within the borough. **Should the process of preparing the Burnley Local Plan result in a significant change between the presently assessed objective housing need for the combined authorities and how this is distributed between the two areas, then a review of the Pendle Local Plan will be considered. Pendle and the.....***

Modification number MM083: paragraphs 7.23 to 7.27

The HBF supports the proposed amendments.

6. The modification identifies that the development of previously developed land will be encouraged, rather than prioritised and recognises that greenfield development will be required. Furthermore it provides clarification that a review of Green Belt and settlement boundaries will also take place within Local Plan Part 2 (LP2). These amendments are considered consistent with the NPPF, particularly paragraphs 17 & 111. The identification that settlement and Green Belt boundaries will need to be altered provides greater clarity and should ensure that the plan is effective, this is also justified by the evidence.

Modification number MM059: Policy SDP2

The HBF supports the proposed modification.

7. The inclusion of the anticipated growth levels for the different settlement categories provides greater clarity to the policy, ensuring that it should be more effective in delivering the housing requirement. The recognition that development boundaries will need to be amended is also supported and justified by the evidence.

Modification number MM071: Policy SDP2

The HBF supports the proposed modification.

8. The modification identifies that the development of previously developed land will be encouraged, rather than prioritised and recognises greenfield development will be required. This is considered to strike the appropriate balance between re-using previously developed land and the recognised need for development on other sites. It is also consistent with the NPPF, particularly paragraphs 17 & 111.

Modification number MM062: Policy ENV2

The proposed amendments are considered unsound as they are not consistent with national policy.

9. The HBF considers the amendments are an improvement upon the previous policy wording. However, these, are not considered to fully accord with the ministerial statement, 25th March 2015, which clearly states that matters of energy efficiency in residential properties will be solely dealt with through the Building Regulations. In this regard the Council cannot seek to require the highest possible levels of energy efficiency nor seek to include on-site low carbon technologies. Whilst the HBF would not wish to stop the Council encouraging such developments it is recommended that the following further amendments (**bold** and ~~strikethrough~~) are made;

'Fabric Energy Efficiency

~~Seek to~~ **Where possible** design new development ~~to the highest possible levels of which~~ **improves** sustainability by;

- *Using materials that reduce energy demand....*

On-site low-carbon heat and power

Consider ~~seek to incorporate~~ **ing** on-site low carbon or zero carbon heat and power technologies, **including** ~~in order of preference~~

- a. *The installation of, or connection to,.....'*

Modification number MM084, paragraph 10.33

The HBF considers the proposed modification unsound as it is not considered positively prepared, justified or effective.

10. Within our comments upon the Pre-submission Core Strategy and Matter 4 examination hearing statement, the HBF considered that the housing requirement was too low. Our concerns have not been addressed by the proposed modifications and as such are still considered valid.

Modification number MM003 / MM004, Table LIV1 / paragraph 10.33

The HBF considers the proposed modification unsound as it is not considered positively prepared or effective.

11. Notwithstanding our comments upon the overall housing requirement (see MM084 above), the HBF consider that the amended wording is a positive inclusion which provides greater clarity to the plan and the forthcoming LP2. However, neither MM003 nor MM004 provide any flexibility should the existing planning permissions or proposed allocations fail to come forward as anticipated. The NPPF, paragraph 14, clearly identifies that the plan needs not only to meet its objectively assessed needs but respond flexibly to changing circumstances. In addition it is noted that the housing requirement is regarded as a minimum and as such the plan could reasonably be expected to provide more than the minimum housing allocations required.

12. To provide flexibility the HBF recommend the Council consider further housing allocations, beyond the quantum identified in MM03 and MM04. This is in addition to any buffer which may accrue from MM051 and MM052 (see below). The HBF consider that such an approach would be consistent with the NPPF and ensure that the plan is more positively prepared and effective

as it will seek to meet, as a minimum, its objectively assessed needs. The following amendments (**bold**) are therefore recommended to MM004;

*'Table LIV1 sets out the housing requirement for the borough over the plan period. It identifies the position as of 31st March 2014 taking account of completions and the reoccupation of empty homes. This leaves a residual requirement of 4,760 dwellings to be met through; the development of the Strategic Housing site; existing permissions; and the allocation of sites in the Local Plan Part 2. **To ensure that the residual requirement is met in full a buffer of sites will be included within the allocations, this will provide flexibility within the supply.***

Modification number MM051, Paragraph 10.33

The HBF supports the proposed modification.

13. The amendment provides clarity upon how empty properties will be counted against the housing requirement.

Modification number MM052, paragraph 10.33

The HBF supports the proposed modification.

14. The amendment provides clarity upon how windfalls will be counted against the housing requirement and takes account of the more detailed nature of the most recent SHLAA. In addition any windfall sites which do come forward will add to the flexibility of the plan.

Modification number MM085, paragraph 10.37

The HBF supports the deletion of paragraph 10.37.

15. The deletion of the staggered housing requirement is considered to better align with the NPPF requirement to boost housing supply and the evidence of housing need within Pendle.

Modification number MM086, paragraph 10.39

The HBF supports the inclusion of additional paragraph 10.39.

16. The paragraph identifies that the Council will positively consider SHLAA sites prior to the adoption of the Site Allocations and Development Policies document. This is a positive step which will aid delivery prior to the housing allocations being formally identified and adopted.

Modification number MM064, paragraph 10.41

The HBF supports the deletion of paragraph 10.41.

17. The paragraph placed unduly onerous requirements upon development which were not be justified by the NPPF.

Modification number MM065: Policy LIV1

The HBF generally supports the proposed modifications.

18. Whilst the overall housing requirement is considered too low (see MM084 above). The identification that the housing requirement is a minimum, the deletion of the staggered housing requirement and the positive stance towards releasing additional sites, including outside settlement boundaries prior to the adoption of the allocations document, represent a pragmatic and positive approach to assist in meeting the identified housing requirement over the full plan period.

Modification number MM090, paragraph 10.115

The HBF supports the proposed modifications.

19. The modifications are considered to better reflect the Council's evidence base, particularly in relation to viability.

Modification number MM091, paragraph 10.117

The HBF supports the proposed modifications.

20. The amendments provide greater clarity and certainty.

Modification number MM066: Policy LIV4

The HBF supports the proposed amendments.

21. The proposed amendments to Policy LIV4 take full account of the Council's evidence upon development viability. This policy is now considered consistent with the NPPF and PPG.

Modification number MM023, Policy LIV5, 5th paragraph

The HBF supports the proposed amendments.

22. The proposed amendments to the policy will provide greater clarity but also flexibility to enable developments to respond not only to the characteristics of the area but to the challenges associated with economic viability.

Notification

23. Please notify the HBF of the publication of the Inspector's report, the adoption of the Core Strategy DPD or any future hearing sessions.

Yours sincerely,



Matthew Good

Planning Manager – Local Plans

Email: matthew.good@hbf.co.uk

Tel: 07972774229