

## Home Builders Federation

### Matters 1, 2, and 4

## TANDRIDGE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

### Matter 1: Procedural/legal requirements

***Issue: Whether all Statutory and Regulatory requirements have been met?***

#### **Duty to Cooperate**

**Q.1.1 Is there clear evidence that, in the preparation of the Plan, the Council has engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities and prescribed bodies on strategic matters and issues with cross-boundary impacts in accordance with section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended [the 2004 Act]? Is there clear evidence that the Council has done all it reasonably could to maximise the effectiveness of plan preparation by cooperating with all other relevant bodies, particularly in respect of addressing unmet housing need?**

No. Our principal concern is with regard to how the Council has undertaken its duty to co-operate in relation to addressing the strategic issue of meeting housing needs not only within Tandridge but also arising within neighbouring authorities. In considering whether or not the Council has used the duty to co-operate to maximise the effectiveness of the local plan it is necessary to consider what the Government expects that local plan to achieve. In relation to housing that is succinctly established in paragraph 47 of the NPPF – to meet the full objectively assessed needs for housing in the housing market area as far as is consistent with the policies set out in the Framework. This is re-emphasised in relation to the duty to co-operate in paragraph 179 which outlines that joint work should enable development requirements not able to be met within their own area to be met elsewhere. What is evident is that the Council, and its neighbouring authorities, have failed to achieve this objective.

However, we recognise that the Duty to Co-operate is not a duty to agree. The Council cannot force authorities to work with them or take their unmet needs. As such it is necessary to consider whether the approach taken by the Council in seeking to work with its neighbours has been effective. Further guidance on what is considered to be an effective approach to the duty to co-operate is provided in PPG supporting the 2012 NPPF. This guidance requires “*active and sustained engagement*” (para 9-009) and the duty is “*unlikely to be satisfied by consultation alone*” (para 9-009). With regard to



the outcomes of effective co-operation inspectors are expected to test compliance against the “*outcomes of co-operation*” (para 9-010) and that effective co-operation will “*produce effective policies on cross boundary strategic matters*” (para 9-011).

The evidence presented by the Council in its latest Duty to Co-operate Statement (SDTC9) gives no indication that the Council has undertaken an active and sustained approach to the duty in relation to unmet needs. There are no policies in the local plan that provide any indication that unmet needs will be met in future through the review of plans in neighbouring authorities. There are no joint studies to suggest that the Council has worked with others to assess housing needs – a key starting point for meeting needs across a wider area – or that they have considered constraints other than on the basis of their own area. The evidence on co-operation submitted by the Council is that they have had meetings/ teleconferences to discuss emerging evidence and consulted on submitted plans – approaches PPG states explicitly in paragraph 9-009 are unlikely to be sufficient to show the duty to co-operate has been implemented effectively.

Alongside the duty to cooperate statement the Council have submitted a number of statements of common ground. These set out the key cross boundary issue and the actions to be taken by both authorities on that matter. However, none of the actions will lead to housing needs being met. We also note that no statements of common ground have been produced with Reigate and Banstead or Croydon – two of the authorities with the closest migratory and commuting links. These are surprising omissions and it will be important for the Council to explain why this is the case.

The failure to co-operate will effectively mean that there will be no boost to housing supply as expected by Government and articulated in paragraph 47 of the 2012 NPPF. This failure to boost supply is a key factor in the ever-increasing costs of housing in this area and the poor affordability for many who live and work in areas such as Tandridge. What is evident is that whilst the Council have identified housing delivery as key strategic issues, they have not then taken any serious steps to try and rectify this situation. In short, they have accepted, alongside their neighbouring authorities, the status quo and decided that housing needs will not be met, and the consequential issues arising from this decision will continue.

Finally, it is interesting to note that the Council state at paragraph 3.22 of SDTC9 that a failure to address unmet needs is not an instant failure of the duty to co-operate as this matter can be addressed through main modifications. We would agree where effective co-operation has taken place and failed to achieve an appropriate outcome. However, in the preparation of the Tandridge Local Plan there has not been any meaningful and sustained co-operation with a view to actually addressing this issue of unmet housing needs across the HMA. The Council cannot be said to have looked to maximise the effectiveness of the local plan through the duty to co-operate in relation the delivery of housing. This is a clear failure of the duty to co-operate that cannot be addressed though main modifications.

## **Sustainability Appraisal**

Q1.2 Is the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) adequate? Q1.3 Has the SA been undertaken on the basis of a consistent methodology and is the assessment robust? Q1.4 Has the SA taken into account the reasonable alternatives and has sufficient reasoning been given for the rejection of alternatives?

No. As set out in our representations the SA has failed to take sufficient account of the positive effects of the social and economic impacts of the Council's chosen spatial strategy and over played the negative impacts of those alternatives. The considerations made have not been justified and will have inevitably favoured the Council's chosen options.

Our main concern is the approach taken to considering the overall level of housing needs against the SA objectives. The results of the Council's considerations are set out in Table 11 on page 159 of Volume 2 of the Sustainability Appraisal (MD5). As we set out in our representations there is no justification for some of the assumptions made with regard to meeting higher levels of housing needs. For example, to suggest that higher housing delivery would impact negatively on the health of a community is contrary to current considerations that access to secure, good quality market and affordable housing that meets their needs is vital in ensuring both the physical and mental wellbeing of the country's population. As such not meeting housing needs in full could potentially have a far more negative impact on the population's health and well-being than those options that will deliver higher levels of growth.

Similarly, the considerations with regard to objectives 6 on economics and 7 on employment are equally perplexing. As set out in our representations we would suggest the opposite is true to the situation proposed on page 159 of MD5 by the Council. Not meeting housing needs through the allocation of sustainable development sites will put increasing pressure on the area to deliver housing on employment sites. If the supply of residential development land outside of urban areas is restricted this will lead to sites in the urban area in employment or retail uses becoming more valuable development opportunities. A lower housing requirement in the local plan does not reduce housing needs, it just does not plan to meet them. In addition, a growing and more diverse population resulting from meeting housing needs in full would support local businesses and provide the necessary workforce to support their growth thus securing such land uses in the long term. This would appear to be supported by the Council's own evidence on housing needs set out in HNS5 which indicates at paragraph 6.6 the need to deliver 379 homes per annum to meet baseline jobs growth. Considering the Council are proposing to deliver just 303 dpa there would appear to be positive economic benefits from meeting housing needs in full compared to Council's chosen option. These considerations also exclude the potential for improved jobs growth as a result of activities by the Coast to Capital LEP and proposed in the Council's "Growth Scenario" as set out in ECRT4.

It would appear from the Council's assessment that they consider meeting housing needs to be overwhelmingly negative on all SA objectives other than meeting housing needs. This fails to consider the significant positive impacts housing development can have in ensuring the long term social and economic sustainability of an area. We therefore consider the SA to not have undertaken an adequate or objective assessment of the reasonable alternatives. The justification given for the rejection of some options is limited and lacks appropriate evidence to support the statements made. We would suggest that the Council needs to revisit their SA to provide a more objective and reasoned consideration with regard to meeting housing needs in full and the sites required to achieve this objective.

### **Habitats Regulations Assessment**

Q1.5 Has the Habitats Regulations Assessment been undertaken in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and the People over Wind & Sweetman v Coillte Teoranta judgement C-323/17?

No comment

### **Local Development Scheme**

Q1.6 Is the Plan compliant with the Council's Local Development Scheme in terms of its form, scope and timing?

No comment

### **Community Involvement**

Q1.7 Has the Council complied with the requirements of section 19(3) of the 2004 Act and Regulations 18 and 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning (England) Regulations 2012 with regard to conducting consultation in accordance with their statement of community involvement?

No comment

### **Climate Change**

Q1.8 Are the policies of the Plan designed to secure that the development and use of land contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change in accordance with Section 19(1A) of the Act?

No comment

## **Matter 2: The provision of housing**

### **A: Calculation of the Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (OAN)**

#### **Issue: Is the basis for establishing the OAN for Tandridge consistent with national policy and guidance?**

##### **Q2.1 Is the preparation of the SHMA on the basis of a Housing Market Area (HMA) defined for Tandridge District justified? Is the definition of the HMA consistent with the Planning Practice Guidance?**

The NPPF establishes at paragraph 47 that Councils should use their evidence to ensure that their local plans meet in full the objectively assessed needs of the Housing Market Area (HMA). This requires not only consideration of the HMA within which the authority is located but also how many homes are required to meet needs in that area. Fundamentally the identification of an HMA is to ensure that local authorities do not work in isolation but co-operate to plan strategically across a larger than local level. However, the Council have considered their HMA and their assessment of housing needs separately. The justification for this position is set out in section 7 of 2018 update to the assessment of housing needs (HNS5) and suggests that as the other authorities have adopted alternative HMAs there was no other option but to focus solely on its own area.

We have some sympathy with the Council's position. Housing Market Areas are especially difficult to define around London given the complex migration and commuting patterns. Essentially each authority in this area form part of a Wider London HMA within which there will be more localised HMAs. Therefore, we do not have any particular concerns regarding the approach taken to defining the HMA. Our main concern is that the Council have not then looked to work with its neighbouring authorities to ensure housing needs are met in full. The Council should have taken a far more proactive approach with regard to the degree to which it co-operated with its neighbours to ensure housing needs are met in full and unmet needs are not ignored. As we highlighted in our Matter 1 statement there is no evidence of any form of strategic planning with regard to meeting housing needs in full across the HMA identified by the Council.

##### **Q2.2 Is the use of the 2016 based household projections justified in calculating the OAN for the District and is it consistent with the Planning Practice Guidance?**

The 2016-based household projections are the most up to date evidence on household growth and their consideration in assessing housing needs is consistent with the 2012 NPPF and its supporting guidance. However, there are some caveats that must be considered when it comes to plan preparation which are outlined below.

When considering the use of the 2016-based household projections the Council must take into account the concerns of Government with regard to these latest projections. The overarching concern is that the use of the latest projections will not support the

Government's intentions to build 300,000 homes per annum by the mid-2020s. Whilst this is an inherent risk of requiring Councils to base their assessments of need on the most up to date information there are valid concerns regarding the impact of certain methodological changes that have been made by ONS. In particular the decision to reduce household formation rates to only take account of more recent trends will, for a want of better term, 'bake in' recent trends that may have suppressed household formation and reduced the demographic starting point for housing in an area. The Technical consultation recognises this concern and included an acknowledgement form from ONS that:

*“Although the latest household projections are lower than the previously published projections, this does not directly mean that fewer houses are needed in the future than thought. This is because the projections are based on recent actual numbers of households and are not adjusted to take account of where homes have been needed in recent years but have not been available. Therefore, if more homes are built, the increased availability of homes may result in more households forming. The opposite is also true – if fewer homes are built then fewer households are able to form”*

In addition, the Government were adamant in their consultation document that the 2016-based projections were not a reason for lowering housing needs. This position was confirmed in its consultation response that the 2014-based household projections provided the most appropriate projections in the short term.

This concern is one that has been recognised elsewhere with local planning authorities using the household formation rates from the 2014-based household projections to assess household growth based on the 2016-based sub national population projections (SNPP). As the 2014-based formation rates use a longer time series more recent trends in household formation are not overly influential and, in part, their use would address some of the Government's concerns with the 2016-based projections. Such an approach would also be consistent with paragraph 2a-015 of PPG which requires LPAs to consider adjustments to the demographic starting point to take into account suppression of household formation rates due to under delivery of housing. Given the Council was seeking to meet a housing target that was constrained by the South East Plan this would seem to be an appropriate adjustment.

### Q2.3 Is the 20% Market Signals adjustment justified?

Yes. The Council's initial consideration was that no market signals uplift was necessary, and it is welcomed that the necessity for this uplift has finally been recognised. However, this should have been applied to the 2014-based household projections and formed part the consideration of preparing the local plan. The decision to apply this would appear only to have arisen once the demographic starting point had been reduced and the development strategy determined.

### Q2.4 Is the approach to defining affordable housing needs justified?

No comment

Q2.5 Are the assumptions made in respect of employment growth realistic?

No comment

Q2.6 Are there other relevant factors to be taken into account in calculating the OAN?

No comment

**B: The housing requirement**

**Issue: Is the plan positively prepared and justified given that the Plan provides for 6,056 homes in the Plan period, against the OAN of 9,400 as set out in the Publication Plan and the OAN of 7,960 set out in the document Updating the Objectively Assessed Housing Needs of Tandridge (HNS5)?**

Q2.7 Is the Plan justified in not meeting the full OAN for Tandridge and is it consistent with paragraph 14 of the Framework?

No. We recognise that Tandridge is constrained by the Green Belt designation however, unlike the other constraints set out in footnote 9 of paragraph 14, Green Belt is a policy designation that can be removed, in exceptional circumstances, from land by the local authority as part of the preparation or review of a local plan. The Council have identified that there are exceptional circumstances required to remove land from the Green Belt and whilst we would agree with this position, we would argue that more land could have been removed from the Green Belt for development without impacting on either the aims or purposes of this designation as well as enabling the local plan to achieve sustainable development for the Borough. As such we do not consider the plan to be consistent with paragraph 14 as the NPPF provides the necessary scope to amend Green Belt in Tandridge in order to meet housing needs.

Q2.8 Have all realistic options for meeting the OAN within Tandridge in full been exhausted?

No. As we set out in our representations the Council's Green Belt Assessment is fundamentally flawed. As a result the Council may have discounted sites that could have been removed from the Green Belt without harming the aims and purposes of that designation as it relates to Tandridge. In addition, the circumstances faced by the Council – both with regard to the need for housing, the nature and extent of any harm to the Green Belt and the consequences on sustainable development for the Borough are exceptional and could warrant the release of even highly performing Green Belt. Instead the Council have looked to restrain the supply of land for development rather than, as required by paragraph 14, positively seek to meet the development needs of their area.

Q2.9 What are the consequences of not meeting the OAN within the HMA for delivering a wide choice of high-quality homes, widening opportunities for home ownership and creating sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities which meet the needs of different groups in the community?

Limiting development in the manner proposed by the Council will have a profound effect on the type of housing provided and the cost of housing in the Borough. Firstly, by not meeting OAN in full the Council will not have any impact on the cost of housing in the Borough. Need will outstrip supply leading to the costs of housing continuing to increase over the plan period. There are also concerns that in restricting the supply of housing the Council will restrict the mix of housing that will come forward. The best way to deliver a good mix of homes is by allocating a range of sites both in terms of location and size.

Q2.10 Would and/or where would any unmet housing need arising in the Tandridge HMA during the Plan period be met?

The Council have not identified where the unmet housing needs of Tandridge will be met. The Council state that its neighbouring authorities are also constrained and as such no opportunities exist outside of Tandridge to meet their unmet needs. This therefore places an even greater emphasis on Tandridge meeting their own housing needs and should have been a key factor when considering the exceptional circumstances required to amend Green Belt boundaries.

**C: The overall supply of housing**

**Issue: Is the proposed supply of housing for the Plan period realistic?**

Q2.11 Does the housing trajectory set out in the Plan provide a sound basis for meeting the identified housing need?

No. The level of housing supply being proposed by the Council does not meet identified needs for the plan period. We consider it necessary for further sites to be allocated in order for the Council to meet its needs for both market and affordable homes.

Q2.12 Is the housing trajectory realistic and deliverable and are there any threats to delivery?

The HBF cannot comment on the delivery of the sites included within the Council's housing land supply estimates. However, we recommend that a cautious approach is taken when estimating delivery on strategic sites, which often take far longer to start delivering homes than is expected by local planning authorities. Whilst we welcome the allocation of strategic sites to deliver new, or significantly expanded, settlements in our experience indicates even when allocated such developments can take a considerable time to start delivering new homes. The reasons for this are manifold, from lengthy master planning process and delays in decision making on both applications and pre commencement conditions through to the resolution of complex



infrastructure requirements prior to delivery. In particular, the development of new communities is difficult and complex, especially for a local authority such as Tandridge with little experience of managing a development of this scale. The Council's reliance on the Garden Community delivering nearly 70% of all homes between 2026/27 and 2032/33 is a concern and could see the Council failing to even meet its reduced housing requirement during this period.

Q2.13 Is the contribution towards housing supply of housing from windfall, town centre initiatives and the predicted supply of 20 vacant dwellings per annum being brought back into use realistic and justified?

No comment

Q2.14 Is it justified that HSG20; North Tandridge: One Public Estate (NTOPE), Caterham is included in the housing trajectory?

No comment

Q2.15 In broad terms, is the housing development proposed in the Plan and set out in the trajectory based on a sound understanding and robust evidence of viability?

No comment.

Q2.16 Given that the proposed South Godstone Garden Community is intended to deliver around 1,400 new homes in the Plan period and the details of the development would be considered by an Area Action Plan (AAP), would it be effective to include within the Plan a Policy which commits the Council to a review of the Plan if the AAP is not adopted by a specified date in order to sustain the supply of housing?

We have concerns regarding the effectiveness of review policies to address short comings in a local plan. As highlighted above we are concerned about the ability of the Council to bring forward the Garden Community within the timescales indicated. Rather than require a review we would suggest the most appropriate response would be to identify development opportunities around the Borough's most sustainable settlements and allow a more appropriate time frame for the delivery of the Garden Community.

#### **D: Five-year housing land supply**

***Issue: Would the Plan secure a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites?***

Q2.17 Will the Plan provide for a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites on adoption?

The Council's evidence on land supply and the approach it is proposing with regard to the calculation of the five-year land supply and a stepped trajectory has changed between the regulation 19 consultation and the submission of the local plan. The Council's latest evidence on supply would appear to be set out in the Housing Topic

Paper with Appendix 3 providing the annual delivery expectations over the plan period. To start with, we would like to note that these are different to those set out in the trajectory in Appendix 1 of the submitted Local Plan. Inconsistencies such as these cause confusion and do not aid the effective scrutiny of the plan. We have used the evidence in the Housing Topic Paper in our response as this would appear to be the most up to date evidence provided by the Council. This updated paper indicates that the Council are proposing to use the Liverpool method as opposed to the Sedgefield approach as originally suggested. It would also appear that the Council no longer plan to use a stepped trajectory.

We disagree with some of the Council's assertions in this paper. To start we do not consider the use of the Liverpool methodology to be consistent with national policy and guidance. This approach spreads any shortfall across the remaining plan period and is contradictory to paragraph 3-035 of PPG which requires the Council to address any shortfall within five years. The Council should therefore state in the local plan its intention to use the Sedgefield approach when assessing its five-year housing land supply which spreads delivery of any shortfall over the subsequent five-year period

Secondly, disagree with the Council's assertion that they will only be required to apply a 5% buffer on adoption of the plan. We would suggest that they will continue to apply a 20% buffer. This would result in the Council not having a 5-year land supply on adoption.

	<b>Liverpool method with 5% buffer</b>	<b>Liverpool with 20% buffer</b>	<b>Sedgefield with 5%</b>	<b>Sedgefield with 20%</b>
Basic 5-year requirement 19/20 to 23/24	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515
Backlog 13/14 to 18/19	40	40	113	113
total 5-year requirement 19/20 - 23/24	1,555	1,555	1,628	1,628
Buffer applied (5%/20%)	1,633	1,866	1,709	1,954
Supply 19/20 to 23/24	1,870	1,870	1,870	1,870
Surplus/shortfall	237	4	161	-84
<b>Years supply in first five years</b>	<b>5.73</b>	<b>5.01</b>	<b>5.47</b>	<b>4.79</b>

Finally, whilst the latest evidence on supply, if accurate, shows that the Council would have a five-year supply of housing against the proposed housing requirement we are

concerned that supply in future years is marginal. As can be seen in in appendix 1 off this statement supply falls below the required 5 years at a number of points in the plan period. This is contrary to paragraph 3-030 of PPG which states that: "... *local planning authorities should have an identified 5-year housing supply at all points during the plan period*". The Council must allocate sufficient sites to ensure that the plan is deliverable across its plan period and is not considered out of date due to a lack of a five-year housing supply.

Q2.18 In the context of paragraph 47 of the Framework, is it justified to apply a buffer of 5% within the calculation of the five-year supply?

Whilst a 5% buffer would at first appear to be consistent with the 2012 NPPF with delivery consistently above the housing requirement in its adopted Core Strategy, it must be remembered that Core Strategy requirement was based on the rescinded South East Plan which severely restricted growth in Tandridge. When delivery since 2013 against the Council's OAN, a figure we suggest is too low, there has been a persistent shortfall in the delivery of new homes. The Council may suggest that they could not be expected to deliver the necessary increases without a plan. However, the speed at which a local authority brings forward a plan once it is evident that its current requirement is a key factor that must be considered within the context of paragraph 47.

<b>Year</b>	<b>2013/1</b>	<b>2014/1</b>	<b>2015/1</b>	<b>2016/1</b>	<b>2017/1</b>	<b>2018/1</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>S</b>
<b>OAN</b>	398	398	398	398	398	398	<b>2,388</b>
<b>Completions</b>	256	142	322	228	332	425*	<b>1,705</b>
<b>Shortfall/Surplus</b>	<b>-142</b>	<b>-256</b>	<b>-76</b>	<b>-170</b>	<b>-66</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>-683</b>

Q2.19 What are the implications of the Housing Delivery Test for the five-year supply of housing after the Plan is adopted, having regard to the application of the appropriate buffer as set out in paragraph 73 of the revised updated National Planning Policy Framework 2019?

At present the Council's Housing Delivery Test shows Tandridge to be at 65%. This requires the Council to plan for a 20% buffer as part of its five-year housing land supply assessment. The latest test will be published in November and on the basis of the transitional arrangements in paragraph 21 and 22 of the HDT rule book for 2016/17 and 2017/18. For the 2018/19 the requirement would be the local housing need as calculated using the standard method. Therefore, it is likely that on adoption the Council would be required to apply a 20% buffer. However, if the Council's proposed trajectory of 303 dpa is considered to be sound the Council would be able show that housing delivery was above 85% of expected supply. As such the Council would only be required to apply a 5% buffer as of November 2020.

## E: TLP:12 Affordable Housing Requirement

### **Issue: Is the OAN for affordable housing justified and in line with national policy and guidance?**

Q2.20 Does the SHMA's approach to calculating affordable housing need, comply with the stages set out in the Planning Practice Guidance?

No comment

Q2.21 Policy TLP12 sets affordable housing requirements for developments within the Tiers 1 and 2 of the settlement hierarchy, in respect of sites released from the Green Belt and elsewhere. Would the policy be effective in ensuring the OAN for affordable housing is met? Considerations include:

- Are the affordable housing requirements set at levels which maximise the delivery of affordable housing whilst not affecting the deliverability and viability of the Plan?

No comment

- Is there a need to increase the housing requirement to help deliver more affordable housing?

Yes. The Council are not meeting housing needs by virtue of the fact that they are restricting the amount of development land being made available. Further allocations that will enable the Council to meet its needs would allow for improvements in the delivery of affordable housing in the borough. The benefits of increasing the delivery of affordable housing in the Borough must form a key element in any consideration of exceptional circumstances.

- What is the justification for the 15 dwellings or over threshold in Tier 1 settlements?

No comment

- Is the policy justified in applying the affordable housing requirement to housing sites of five dwellings and over outside of Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements and sites allocated as Green Belt Releases and is it consistent with national policy set out in the Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) of 28 November 2014 and the Planning Practice Guidance (031 Reference ID: 23b-031-20160519) on support for small-scale developers, custom and self-builders (or the Framework 2019)?

As set out in our representations we do not consider there to sufficient justification provided by the Council to support this departure from national policy.

- *The Policy states that the tenure and size split will be determined by the Council's most up to date Housing Strategy. Is the Policy, in requiring compliance with the Housing Strategy consistent with national policy given that the Housing Strategy is not part of the development plan?*

Such an approach is not consistent with national policy and legislation governing the content of a local plan. The Council cannot require development to accord with standards set out in supplementary guidance. The policy could suggest that in setting the tenure and mix on sites an applicant should have regard to the housing strategy, but it cannot require compliance.

*Q2.22 Are the proposed Modifications to Policy TLP12 necessary for soundness?*

No comment.

## **Matter 4 Green Belt boundary alterations**

**Issue: Is the Green Belt Assessment consistent with national planning policy for Green Belts, is it based upon appropriate criteria and is it adequate and robust?**

**4.1 Was the Green Belt Assessment undertaken on the basis of a clear methodology consistent with national planning policy for protecting Green Belts?**

No. The methodology was not consistent with national policy. As we set out in our representation the consideration of purpose 1, 2 and 4 in the Green Belt Assessment were not consistent with the NPPF. In not testing these purposes on a consistent basis the Council have introduced local considerations that may have led to sites not being considered suitable for release.

**4.2 In terms of paragraph 84 of the Framework, have the proposed alterations to the Green Belt boundaries taken account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development and are they consistent with the Local Plan strategy?**

As we mentioned in our answer to question 1.4 of Matter 1 the limitations of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) will have fundamentally flawed the Councils consideration in relation to paragraph 84 of the NPPF. Throughout the SA the Council have overstated the negative impacts of housing development and underplayed the positives impacts arising from meeting housing needs in full. In doing so the Council cannot say that the patterns of development they are promoting are sustainable. In fact, by constraining development the Council are limiting their opportunities for delivering sustainable patterns of development. What the Council appear not to have considered is that the economic and social benefits of development are not subservient to the environmental impacts but sit alongside these to ensure that the approach taken in local plans is balanced. Constraining supply in the manner proposed by the Council will have severe negative impacts on the social and economic issues facing Tandridge in order to limit the loss of a minimal amount of Green Belt land. It must be also be noted that Green Belt land is not intrinsically valuable, its value as Green Belt is solely in relation to its openness. As we set out in our statement in order to meet needs the loss of Green Belt would result in reducing the Green Belt in Tandridge by less than 1%. A limited impact on the Green Belt in order to ensure sustainable patterns of growth.

**4.3 Have all realistic alternatives to releasing land from the Green Belt been considered, such as further development in the urban area or increasing development densities, and would the most efficient use of land proposed for release from the Green Belt be made?**

This is for the Council to answer. However, it is important to note that achieving the level of density required to meet needs in the urban areas of Tandridge will require a change in mindset from both politicians and the public. In considering how development is delivered it is important to remember that whilst urban areas can

accommodate higher levels of development it should not result in a degradation of those areas purely to maintain the Green Belt. Such an approach would be contrary to paragraph 84 of the NPPF.

*4.5 In overall terms, are there exceptional circumstances for the proposed alterations of the boundaries of the Green Belt, to accommodate the level development proposed?*

We would consider there to be exceptional circumstances to support not only the proposed amendments to Green Belt boundary. However, as we set out in our representations the acuteness of any needs, the actual harm to the extent of the Green Belt in Tandridge, the requirement to promote sustainable patterns of development and the lack of opportunities to meet needs elsewhere all combine to give the exceptional circumstances needed to make further amendments to the Green Belt and ensure development needs are met in full.

*4.6 In overall terms, are the proposed boundaries of the Green Belt defined clearly and would they be likely to be permanent or capable of enduring beyond the plan period?*

No. By not meeting needs nor showing any effective joint working with their neighbours to meet needs there can be no confidence that the boundaries will be permanent within the proposed plan period let alone beyond.

Mark Behrendt MRTPI  
Planning Manager – Local Plans SE and E

## Appendix 1

### Sedgefield

	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33
<b>Annual req.</b>	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303
<b>Cumulative</b>	303	606	909	1,212	1,515	1,818	2,121	2,424	2,727	3,030	3,333	3,636	3,939	4,242	4,545	4,848	5,151	5,454	5,757	6,060
<b>Delivery</b>	256	142	322	228	332	425	480	458	76	245	611	351	106	249	281	349	299	349	249	249
<b>Cumulative</b>	256	398	720	948	1,280	1,705	2,185	2,643	2,719	2,964	3,575	3,926	4,032	4,281	4,562	4,911	5,210	5,559	5,808	6,057
<b>Surplus/deficit</b>	-47	-208	-189	-264	-235	-113	64	219	-8	-66	242	290	93	39	17	63	59	105	51	-3
<b>Five-year req.</b>	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515				
<b>add deficit/surplus</b>	1,515	1,562	1,723	1,704	1,779	1,750	1,628	1,451	1,296	1,523	1,581	1,273	1,225	1,422	1,476	1,498				
<b>Buffer</b>	76	78	86	85	89	88	81	73	65	76	79	64	61	71	74	75				
<b>Total req.</b>	1,591	1,640	1,809	1,789	1,868	1,838	1,709	1,524	1,361	1,599	1,660	1,337	1,286	1,493	1,550	1,573				
<b>Five-year supply</b>	1,280	1,449	1,787	1,923	1,771	1,684	1,870	1,741	1,389	1,562	1,598	1,336	1,284	1,527	1,527	1,495				
<b>Surplus/deficit</b>	-311	-191	-22	134	-97	-154	161	217	28	-37	-62	-1	-2	34	-23	-78				
<b>5YHLS</b>	4.02	4.42	4.94	5.37	4.74	4.58	5.47	5.71	5.10	4.88	4.81	5.00	4.99	5.11	4.93	4.75				

### Liverpool

	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	26/27	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33
<b>Annual req.</b>	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303	303
<b>Cumulative</b>	303	606	909	1,212	1,515	1,818	2,121	2,424	2,727	3,030	3,333	3,636	3,939	4,242	4,545	4,848	5,151	5,454	5,757	6,060
<b>Delivery</b>	256	142	322	228	332	425	480	458	76	245	611	351	106	249	281	349	299	349	249	249
<b>Cumulative</b>	256	398	720	948	1,280	1,705	2,185	2,643	2,719	2,964	3,575	3,926	4,032	4,281	4,562	4,911	5,210	5,559	5,808	6,057





<b>Surplus/deficit</b>	-47	-208	-189	-264	-235	-113	64	219	-8	-66	242	290	93	39	17	63	59	105	51	-3
<b>Five-year req.</b>	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515	1,515				
<b>Deficit/surplus added</b>	1,515	1,526	1,567	1,565	1,588	1,584	1,550	1,494	1,437	1,518	1,543	1,405	1,370	1,463	1,491	1,503				
<b>Buffer</b>	76	76	78	78	79	79	78	75	72	76	77	70	69	73	75	75				
<b>Total req.</b>	1,591	1,603	1,645	1,643	1,668	1,663	1,628	1,568	1,509	1,594	1,620	1,475	1,439	1,537	1,565	1,578				
<b>Five-year supply</b>	1,280	1,449	1,787	1,923	1,771	1,684	1,870	1,741	1,389	1,562	1,598	1,336	1,284	1,527	1,527	1,495				
<b>Surplus/deficit</b>	-311	-154	142	280	103	21	242	173	-120	-32	-22	-139	-155	-10	-38	-83				
<b>5YHLS</b>	4.02	4.52	5.43	5.85	5.31	5.06	5.74	5.55	4.60	4.90	4.93	4.53	4.46	4.97	4.88	4.74				