



Gladman Developments Limited

Broxtowe Local Plan Part 2 Examination in Public

Hearing Statement in Respect of Matter 4: Housing Delivery, Trajectory and Land Supply

Issue: Whether the approach to the provision of housing is justified, positively prepared, effective, deliverable and consistent with the NPPF and the Aligned Core Strategy.

Questions

- 1) Does the Plan provide sufficient deliverable housing sites to meet the housing requirements of the borough to 2028? Does it accord with the spatial distribution set out in the ACS?
  - 1.1.1 The Housing Trajectory contained in Table 4 of the submission Local Plan identifies an overall housing land supply of 6,746 dwellings against a housing requirement of 6,150 dwellings over the plan period. The Council has since updated this position through proposed modifications which at table 5 identifies an estimated total projected completions of approximately 7,249 dwellings (including 300 dwellings as windfall).
  - 1.1.2 Whilst land has been identified above the minimum housing requirement, Gladman has concern regarding the deliverability of sites within the Council's land supply. These issues will be discussed in greater detail through this written statement in response to specific questions.
  - 1.1.3 Notwithstanding the above, it is important to consider the deliverability of sites against the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Although the Local Plan Part 2 (LPP2) will be tested against the requirements of the Framework (2012), **the Council's housing land supply (HLS), for the purpose of decision taking, will be assessed under the Revised Framework (2018) and it is therefore important to consider the Council's HLS against the Revised Framework and what implications this has on housing supply.** Indeed, the Revised Framework has brought about some fundamental changes to the definition of what constitutes a deliverable site, as set out in the Annex 2 Glossary. Sites with outline planning permission, allocated through the Local Plan or identified on a brownfield register should only be considered deliverable where there is clear evidence that housing completions will begin within five years.

1.1.4 **The Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2018)** identifies a total of 1,747 dwellings which are located on strategic site allocations or for which planning permission is pending but not granted. This amounts to 26% of the overall housing land supply. These sites should only be considered deliverable if sufficient evidence is available to demonstrate that they will come forward as the Council anticipates over the next five years. Gladman consider that **the Council's assumptions with regards to lead in times, build out rates and windfall allowance** are unrealistic and will be discussed in detail in response to specific questions. Given these issues Gladman consider the Council does not have a sufficient amount of deliverable housing sites to meet the housing requirement by the end of the Plan period and further housing land is required to meet housing needs in the short-medium term.

2) Does the Plan provide sufficient choice and flexibility of sites to meet current and future housing needs?

1.1.5 It is noted that the LPP2 seeks to direct the majority of growth towards the main built-up urban area and on previously developed land. Gladman consider further **diversification is required in the Council's housing land supply. This is particularly important** given the fact that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply based on its latest assessment contained in the SHLAA 2018<sup>1</sup>.

1.1.6 Whilst the principle of directing growth towards the main built up area/PDL is recognised, delivery of such sites can often involve complex planning issues and land remediation which may stall delivery. Furthermore, a wide range of sustainable opportunities exist across the settlement hierarchy that can support the development needs of the area in full. In order to ensure a sufficient choice and flexibility of sites are identified, it is considered that the site selection process is re-visited and that through this process, additional allocations are made to enable the Plan to deliver housing over the remainder of the plan period to meet development needs in full and support the delivery of the vision and objectives of **the Plan. This approach will contribute to securing the Council's 5-year housing land supply** and allow a wider range of housebuilders (including those that are small and medium sized) the opportunity to deliver sites across Broxtowe thereby increasing the range of products available and increasing housing delivery in the borough. It will also ensure that the LPP2 positively responds to the imperative to plan for thriving rural communities.

4) Is the Housing Trajectory realistic? Are the assumptions with regard to delivery and build out rates justified by the available evidence?

1.1.7 **The Council's housing trajectory contained in its proposed modifications** provides a prediction of the expected delivery rates of the proposed allocations over the plan period. Gladman has concerns regarding the assumptions made in the housing trajectory. Of particular note is that the suggested annual delivery rates

---

<sup>1</sup> 3.6 years if buffer is applied to both the housing requirement and the shortfall.

expect to achieve 100 dwellings per annum on larger sites. The assumptions made appear to be fairly generic and unrealistic as previous delivery assumptions contained in the SHLAA 2018 identified historic built out rates as follows:

- Sites of 10 or more dwellings equate to 27dpa on average;
- Sites of 50 or more dwellings equate to 42dpa on average; and
- Affordable housing delivery equate to 25 dwellings per annum.

1.1.8 The above evidence taken directly from the SHLAA 2018 clearly identifies that housing delivery has occurred at a much slower rate than what the Council is currently suggesting. Furthermore, it should also be noted that a number of larger sites appear to start delivering in 2020/21 at a rate of 100 dwellings. This is considered unrealistic as no regard has been given to lead in times. In addition, any land which is being considered to be released from the Green Belt once the LPP2 is adopted may also be effected by time lag whilst the necessary planning applications are being processed through the development management process. In both these instances development is therefore unlikely to occur at the rates suggested by the Council.

1.1.9 There are clearly a wide range of issues that can affect the delivery rates which are widely understood to have an impact on early and sustained delivery from strategic housing sites that are planned for within local plans. Many of these have recently **been reflected through Sir Oliver Letwin's 'Independent review of build out: final report', October 2018. In summary this review identifies the following issues:**

- Issues associated with S106 agreements/infrastructure delivery;
- Scheme design and reserved matters applications and approvals process;
- Discharge of planning conditions and other consents required to enable deliver i.e. highways and drainage;
- The availability of resources i.e. labour, materials and equipment;
- Site preparation and enabling works;
- Market absorption rates (the rate at which newly constructed homes can be sold into the local market without materially disturbing the market price);
- The number of sales outlets; and
- Wider economic cycles and circumstances.

1.1.10 Gladman are of the view that the peak delivery rates within the housing trajectory will need to be lowered to take account of the above factors. Furthermore, the continued over reliance on sustained levels of delivery of the remainder of the plan period will mean that any delays could result in further significant slippage of housing numbers beyond the end of the plan period.

6) If allocated sites do not come forward as anticipated, in particular the sustainable urban extensions, does the Plan adequately set out potential contingency measures? Is sufficient consideration given to monitoring and triggers for review?

1.1.11 Gladman do not consider that the plan provides sufficient contingency measures to deal with any under supply which may be experienced over the course of the plan period.

1.1.12 There are no mechanisms contained within the Plan to enable the Council to react quickly to changes in circumstances such as a shortfall in housing supply should **sites contained in the Council's housing land supply not come forward as fast as** the Council anticipates. It is noted that additional wording has been provided by the Council at paragraph 3.7 which states:

**"The extent of development beyond 2028 will be the subject for review of the Local Plan which will be undertaken with other Greater Nottingham authorities following the adoption of this Part 2 Local Plan."**

1.1.13 Gladman reiterate our previous concerns that further modifications are required in order to ensure that any shortfall in housing land supply that is observed over the plan period is addressed as quickly as possible. Suitable mechanisms with concrete actions and outcomes are therefore need to be built into the Local Plan to ensure the Council is able to demonstrate and maintain a continuous housing land supply.

1.1.14 At present, the suggested action merely seeks to defer the issue to a Local Plan Review. The preparation of a plan review can often be delayed due to the need for preparing evidence studies and to identify solutions to issues effecting the borough i.e. why housing shortfall has occurred. As currently worded the Plan does not provide an effective solution to deal with housing shortfall in the short-medium term.

1.1.15 In order to ensure that any shortfall in housing land supply that is observed over the plan period is addressed as quickly as possible, suitable mechanisms should be built into the Local Plan which will enable the Council to address delivery issues in its housing land supply. This is considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the LPP2. Accordingly, Gladman recommend that further modification through the inclusion of an additional policy is required which provides flexibility in responding to a failure in housing land supply and the following wording is submitted for consideration:

***"At any point in the Local Plan period where there is no longer a demonstrable supply of sites to fully meet the five-year land requirement, sustainable sites that would both make a positive contribution to the five-year supply of housing land and are well related to settlements identified as sustainable locations for future growth will be supported where these proposals comprise sustainable development and are consistent with relevant policies in the Local Plan."***

1.1.16 Furthermore, monitoring the LPP2 policies is central to assessing their effectiveness and whether or not the Council is meeting the objectives of the Plan. Gladman believe that the Plan would also be better served if it contained a review policy within the Plan which is clear, easily understandable, and effective, by setting achievable targets for the completion of a review should it become apparent that a shortfall in housing delivery occurs.

7) What is the current position with regard to five year housing land supply? Is the methodology for the calculation of the 5 year housing land supply appropriate? In particular should the buffer also be applied to the shortfall?

1.1.17 **Upon reviewing the Council's latest 5-year housing land supply assessment** contained in the SHLAA 2018, it is clear that the Council currently acknowledge that it is unable to demonstrate a 5YHLS. This is a significant concern meaning that upon the point of adoption the Council is unable to demonstrate a robust and responsive housing land supply position. As such, additional housing land is required.

1.1.18 To address housing shortfall, Gladman consider that the Sedgefield approach is the most appropriate methodology for calculating HLS. This approach closely aligns **with the Framework's approach to significantly** boosting the supply of housing by attempting to deal with any historic shortfall within the first five years over the shortest period possible.

1.1.19 Whilst Gladman support the fact that the Council adopt the use of the Sedgefield method for calculating housing land supply, the methodology used by the Council is considered inappropriate for the following reasons:

- The 20% buffer should be applied to both the housing requirement and the shortfall already accumulated;
- The use of windfall allowance should be removed as it is currently unclear what allowance should be included. See response to Q9 for further details.

1.1.20 Gladman reserve the right to comment on this issue should further evidence be provided.

9) How are windfall sites defined? Is the windfall allowance included in the supply trajectory appropriate having regard to the historic rate of windfall delivery in the borough? Should windfalls be included in the early years (i.e. the first 2 years) of the supply calculation?

1.1.21 The most up-to-date assessment of housing land supply is contained in the SHLAA 2017/2018. This identifies a windfall allowance of 40 dwellings per annum. However, the housing trajectory contained in the LPP2 submission version includes an allowance of 30 dwellings per annum. In addition, the Council's **proposed** modifications contained in table 5 now includes a windfall allowance of 60 dwellings per annum from 2023/2024. Paragraph 70 of the Revised Framework states **"any allowance should be realistic having regard to the strategic housing**

land availability assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends." **The use of a windfall allowance should only be used where it supported by robust evidence.** Given the discrepancies between the two iterations of the LPP2 and the findings of the SHLAA it is not considered that the proposed windfall allowance is supported by robust evidence.

- 1.1.22 Notwithstanding the above, whatever the windfall allowance is it is important that this figure is not included in the early years of the housing trajectory or the HLS calculation in order to avoid double counting.