

**EAST STAFFORDSHIRE LOCAL PLAN
EXAMINATION**

Hearing Session – Day 2

Wednesday 29 October 2014

The Town Hall, Burton upon Trent 10.00am

Issue 6 – Housing Need and Requirement

Issue 7 – Housing Land Supply

Agenda

General Notes

- i This agenda is provisional and flexible.*
- ii Item 2 – Issue 7 - will not be commenced before 1.00 pm.**
- iii It is not intended to repeat introductory matters covered in the Guidance Note [E.7], the PHM [E.16] and in other published guidance but to proceed as quickly as possible to the substance of Issue 6.*
- iv Participants including ESBC named in [italic square brackets] may be invited to open the item concerned but this is optional save where ESBC is asked to open with an update .*
- v Those with an interest in promoting, or opposing, allocated or alternative ('omission') sites are reminded that **no site-specific matters will be discussed unless they relate to the overall soundness of the Plan** in terms of the issues listed below; and that allocations now subject to an issued planning permission will not be discussed except as part of the housing land supply.*

Note on ESBC Written Housing Evidence updated post Submission and the approach to the discussion of housing matters:

Evidence On Submission:

*SHMA Update and Appendices 2014 [C.1]
SHLAA 2013 and addenda [C.10-12]
Housing Pipeline and Completions Data [C.9]
AMR 2013 [B.11]*

Evidence Post-Submission

*Answers to Initial Questions [F.14 as amended 18 Aug 14]
SHMA Update (19/9/2014) [F.24]
SHLAA 2014[C.109-118]
Housing Pipeline and Completions as at 31.08.2014 [C.121]
AMR 2014 about to be 'signed off' [C.122]
5 Year Supply Report August 2014 [C.120]*

Form of Discussion

The Inspector has notified ESBC that it will be necessary for the Council to review and explain the differences between the Submission and Post Submission evidence, taking the position on Submission as a baseline and noting the effect and implications for the ESLP of any subsequent changes. The requirements of planning law and policy regarding the Duty to Co-operate and the interrelated Objectively Assessed Need [OAN] for Housing are now established and the several previous Local Plans found unsound or open to question in this respect are well known and none of these matters needs to be recounted in detail.

There is no prescribed methodology for defining HMA or calculating OAN. The crux of the matter is whether the available evidence can provide assurance that the housing requirement has been objectively assessed and the DTC fulfilled in that respect. The case of the Council in defending the ESLP justifies discussion before any conclusion is reached.

ESBC is therefore invited to start the discussion by providing a brief review of the written evidence in the above terms together with the initial Council response to the assertions in representations and PSs that the HMA has not been appropriately defined or the housing need objectively assessed.

1. Issue 6 - Housing Need and Requirement

Is the requirement for the provision of housing identified in the Plan:

- soundly based on an Objective Assessment of Need (OAN) for market and affordable housing,
- based on an appropriately defined Housing Market Area,
- to provide an appropriate mix of size and type of dwelling, including Extra Care accommodation?

Update

- a. Review of Council evidence, update on housing need and requirement and initial response to representations asserting that need has not been objectively assessed and DTC not met in this respect
and
- b. is the statement that each Council believes that its SHMA takes sufficient account of housing markets beyond its boundary supported by evidence? *[ESBC]*

Housing Market Area

- c. Should the Housing Market Area have been differently defined
and
- d. what are the practical implications of the 'self-contained' nature of the Housing Market Assessment, including whether current uncertainties on housing need in neighbouring or nearby authorities (eg Derby, Derbyshire Dales, Stafford, Lichfield, Birmingham) can and should be taken into account?
[Gladman]

Needs Assessment

- e. Are the figures used in the HMA justified for
 - i. jobs growth (as taken at a mid point of two scenarios) *[Barwood - Alliance]*
 - ii. household formation
 - iii. migration/unmet need from Birmingham
 - iv. vacancy rates? *[HBF]*
- f. Apart from quantitative estimates, does the HMA take sufficient account of market signals including house prices/rents/affordability/overcrowding?

Additional Point

- g. Should the housing requirement be expressly stated as 'minimum'. [ESBC¹]

Participants Issue 6	Speaker(s)	Agent
Burton Civic Society	Mrs Shelagh Wain Ms Carol Palmer Mrs Valerie Burton	
Gladman Developments	Oliver Chapman	
Gleeson Strategic Land Ltd	John Acres	Turley Associates
Home Builders Federation	Sue Green	
Providence Land Limited	Dr Robert Wickham	Howard Sharp & Partners LLP
Staffordshire County Council	Mark Parkinson	
The Duchy of Lancaster	Rob Wells	Savills
Tutbury Parish Council	Stephen Powell Cllr William Crossley	
Mr B Morgan Walton Homes Bridge Farm Partnership MJ Barratt A and S Enterprises Mr C Davies	Tom Beavin	JVH Town Planning Consultants
Barwood Strategic Land II LLP and Mr and Mrs G Skipper	Keith Fenwick Roland Bolton	Alliance Planning

2. Issue 7 - Housing Land Supply

Not to be commenced before 1.00 pm unless all participants are present and agree otherwise

Is there robust evidence that the development locations and sites allocated in the Plan, together with windfall sites:

- can deliver the requisite number of market and affordable dwellings across the Borough in addition to current committed supply², and
 - will maintain a minimum five year housing land supply at all times, and
 - that the housing trajectory is realistic?
- a. Review of Council evidence and update on housing land supply, including with reference to ESLP allocations now subject to extant planning permission. [ESBC]
- b. Can a five year HLS be maintained throughout the Plan period as a whole and is the trajectory realistic in the light of deliverability of current supply and remaining ESLP allocations including:
- i. South of Branston
 - ii. Derby Road
 - iii. Brookside
 - iv. *other sites*, and
 - v. windfalls? [Gladman]
- c. Accepting that maintaining a 5 year HLS in the early years of the plan period will be difficult or impossible until current outline consents are converted to full permissions, is there a

¹ In response to PS-18 treated as a written representation

² Current committed supply necessarily includes several sites originally allocated in the Plan but now permitted and not subject to further consideration in this Examination.

need to consider broadening the supply by specifically allocating more sites, including in tier 1-2 villages?
[Gleeson - Turley]

Participants Issue 7	Speaker(s)	Agent
Barry J Edwards		
Burton Civic Society	Mrs Shelagh Wain Ms Carol Palmer Mrs Valerie Burton	
Gladman Developments	Diana Richardson	
Gleeson Strategic Land Ltd	John Acres	Turley
Home Builders Federation	Sue Green	
Mr Campbell	John Wren	JMW Planning Ltd
Outwood Parish Council	Josephine Samuels	BPUD Ltd
Providence Land Limited	Dr Robert Wickham	Howard Sharp & Partners LLP
The Duchy of Lancaster	Rob Wells	Savills
Tatenhill Parish Council	Robert Phillips	BPUD Ltd
Tutbury Parish Council	Stephen Powell Cllr William Crossley	
Mr B Morgan Walton Homes Bridge Farm Partnership MJ Barratt A and S Enterprises Mr C Davies	Tom Beavin	JVH Town Planning Consultants
Barwood Strategic Land II LLP and Mr and Mrs G Skipper	Keith Fenwick Roland Bolton	Alliance Planning
Staffordshire County Council	Mark Parkinson	