

SCARBOROUGH LOCAL PLAN SITES AND POLICIES

EXAMINATION

Matter 3: Housing Supply

1. The following hearing statement is made for and on behalf of the Home Builders Federation. This statement responds to selected questions set out within Matter 3 of the Inspector's *Schedule of Matters, Issues and Questions* (exam ref: EX-10).
2. The Inspector's Issues and Questions are included in bold for ease of reference. The following responses should be read in conjunction with our comments upon the submission version of the Local Plan, dated 18th December 2015. The HBF has also expressed a desire to attend the examination hearing sessions to debate these matters further.

Issue 3.1: Extant planning permissions

28. How many homes are likely to be built during the plan period on sites that had an extant planning permission on 1 April 2016?

3. The *2016 Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment* (SHELAA) (examination ref: CSD-4) identifies a supply of 3,063 dwellings benefitted from an extant planning permission at 1st April 2016. This figure is discounted to take account of none implementation of small sites (less than 10). Larger sites are considered on a site by site basis regarding potential delivery. The HBF considers this approach to appropriate.
4. Figure 4.1, *Housing Background Paper* (examination ref: BP-3) identifies discounts of 46 units from small sites, from a total supply of 315, and 37 units from large sites, from a supply of 2,748. This provides a supply from planning permissions of 2,980. Whilst the HBF supports the methodology and has not undertaken a thorough assessment of large sites the discount of 37 units from this source appears low.

29. How many of these homes are likely to be completed within five years, bearing in mind that sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires unless there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long phasing plans?

5. Paragraph 4.9 of the *Housing Background Paper* envisages all 269 dwellings from small sites to be delivered in the first five years. This would appear reasonable.
6. In terms of large sites it is noted that the delivery from these sources is largely based upon discussions with landowners and developers, as illustrated in appendix G of the *Housing Background Paper*. Table 4.3 of the SHELAA suggests that 2,345 units will be delivered from this source of supply within the first five years. Whilst, at this stage, we have no reason to dispute this it is notable that this represents a healthier picture of delivery than has happen over the proceeding five years (1,589 dwellings, Table 4.1 *Housing Background Paper*).

Issue 3.2: "Other Known Sources"

30. How many homes are likely to be built during the plan period on the ten sites that did not have planning permission on 1 April 2016 but were expected by the Council to receive planning permission in the short term?

7. See below.

31. How many of these homes are likely to be completed within five years?

8. Table 3.7 SHELAA identifies a total of 348 dwellings from this source, of which 303 are anticipated to be delivered within five years (table 3.8). Included within this supply are 80 units from sites which do not yet benefit from a submitted planning application. These are Whitby Hospital Site and Filey Road Sports Centre. Given that both will require substantial site preparation works prior to development commencing the HBF query the likelihood of these sites delivering within the next five years.

Issue 3.3: Proposed Allocations

32. Have the allocated sites been selected utilising an appropriate methodology and proportionate evidence?

9. The HBF has no further comments at this stage.

33. Is the number of dwellings assumed to be built on each site (“indicative yields”) set out in policy HC2 reasonable and justified by the available evidence?

10. The HBF has no further comments at this stage.

34. How many dwellings on each of the proposed allocations are likely to (a) be “deliverable”; (b) be “developable”; and (c) remain uncompleted by 2032?

11. The HBF has no further comments at this stage, but refer to comments at paragraph 39 of our response to the consultation upon the submission version of the plan.

35. How many of these homes are likely to be completed within five years?

12. Table 3.10, SHELAA, identifies that 1,030 dwellings are anticipated to be delivered from the allocations within the first five years. The HBF acknowledges that the anticipated timing and delivery rates are based upon discussions with the relevant developers, this approach is supported. It is, however, noted that a number of the proposed allocations are anticipated to deliver within the first five years but do not yet have a developer on board (e.g. HA11, HA12, HA15, HA16). Delivery from these sites within the first five years is therefore questionable.

13. It is also notable that some of the allocations identified as delivering within the first five years are identified as being unviable (examination document EX-2R). It is therefore unclear how these can be relied upon to deliver within the five year period.

Issue 3.4: Windfall Sites

36. According to the Council, an average of 205 dwellings per year has been completed on windfall sites in the period 2005 to 2016. No allowance is made for future windfalls in the supply identified in policy HC2, the Council preferring to regard any such provision as providing a suitable level of flexibility. Is this an appropriate approach, or should an explicit allowance be made for windfalls in the assumed supply during some parts of the plan period?

14. The HBF consider the Council’s approach to be reasonable given the uncertainty over delivery from windfalls going forward. Whilst windfalls have provided a significant element of the supply in the past this was in the context of an aging plan and lack of allocations. This is likely to diminish in the future due to the provision of allocations and the more thorough evidence provided by the SHELAA.

Issue 3.5: Demolitions and Conversions

37. The housing requirement is described in paragraph 6.19 of the plan as a “net” figure, meaning that if any existing dwellings are demolished or lost to other uses then additional dwellings would have to be built in the gross supply of new

dwellings would have to be greater than that required by policy HC1. Is this an appropriate approach?

15. Yes, the objectively assessed need of the area is based upon the need for additional dwellings taking account of the existing stock. If the existing stock is reduced due to demolitions or lost to other uses it therefore stands to reason that the housing stock will need to be increased commensurately. A net figure is therefore appropriate.

Issue 3.6: Housing Trajectory

38. Should the plan contain a housing trajectory to illustrate the housing requirement (bearing in mind questions 16 and 23) and expected rate of housing delivery over the plan period?

16. Yes, this is considered to be an important element of the plan.

Issue 3.7: Five Year Supply

39. How many dwellings were deliverable within five years as at 1 April 2016.

17. Table 3.13 of the SHELAA identifies a supply of 3,870 dwellings in the first five years, although the validity of this supply is questioned (see our response to earlier questions). This table also provides the Council's calculation of the five year supply. The calculation adds the buffer on prior to the backlog, this is not considered appropriate. There are many decisions supporting the application of the buffer to both the requirement and shortfall. The following table provides a small sample of such decisions. Whilst each case should be judged on its own merits the Amber Valley Inspector provides useful commentary upon the appropriateness of the two methods.

Reference	Local Authority	Date
Land at Tilehurst Lane, Bracknell: S78 appeal decision (APP/R0335/A/14/2219888), paragraphs 93 & 94	Bracknell Forest	2 nd February 2015
Land at Goch Way, Andover: S78 appeal decision (APP/C1760/A/14/2222867), paragraph 32	Test Valley	15 th May 2015
Warwick Local Plan: Inspector's findings regarding initial matters and issues, paragraph 41	Warwick	1 st June 2015
Amber Valley Local Plan: Inspector's letter	Amber Valley	10 th August 2015
Land off Tanton Road, Stokesley: S78 appeal decision (APP/G2713/A/14/2223624), paragraphs 41 to 47	Hambleton	7 th September 2015
Horsham District Planning Framework: Inspectors Report, paragraph 49	Horsham	8 th October 2015

18. The *Five Year Land Supply FAQs* produced by the PAS¹ also identify that they;

“believe the preferred approach is for the buffer to be applied to both the requirement and shortfall. This is the most appropriate order because it ensures the buffer is applied to the full requirement which represents all the need that exists. The idea is that for every year you underprovide the amount adds onto the requirement to be met in the next five years.”

19. The effect of applying the 20% buffer after the backlog is included within our response to question 26. It is, however, clear that the supply identified by the Council is only marginally greater than the five year requirement (60 units). Given the uncertainties highlighted in our responses to previous questions there is a real

¹ http://www.pas.gov.uk/local-planning/-/journal_content/56/332612/7363780/ARTICLE

possibility the Council will not be able to demonstrate a five year supply upon adoption.

40. If the supply of deliverable dwellings (questions 34a and 35) on 1 April 2016 was less than the five year requirement at that time (question 26), should the plan be changed and if so in what way?

20. The HBF would support additional flexibility being included within the plan through additional sites. The benefit of such flexibility and its effect on the five year supply is clearly addressed within chapter 11 of the March 2016 Local Plans Expert Group *Report to the Communities Secretary and to the Minister of Housing and Planning* (LPEG report).

41. Does the plan identify sufficient land and opportunities for housing development, and contain appropriate policies and mechanisms, such that a five year supply of housing land is likely to be available throughout the plan period?

21. Within our comments upon the submission version of the plan, paragraphs 37 to 40 we highlighted the need for a greater buffer of sites to be provided to ensure that the plan delivers against its requirements and maintains a 5 year supply throughout. In accordance with the recommendations set out in the LPEG report we suggest a 20% buffer is required. This buffer could be included as reserve sites.

Issue 3.8: Potential Additional Housing Allocations (“omission sites”)

22. The HBF does not wish to comment upon the acceptability or otherwise of specific omission sites.

Issue 3.9: Potential Main Modifications

42. What specific changes, if any, are needed to ensure that the plan will be effective in meeting housing requirements by identifying an appropriate supply of “deliverable” and “developable” sites (as defined in the NPPF) and containing appropriate mechanisms to ensure that sufficient dwellings will be delivered in a timely manner over the plan period?

23. I refer to our responses provided above.

Yours sincerely,

MJ Good

Matthew Good

Planning Manager – Local Plans

Email: matthew.good@hbf.co.uk

Tel: 07972774229