



Broxtowe
Borough
COUNCIL

Broxtowe Borough Council

Response to Matter 4:

Housing Delivery, Trajectory and Land Supply

November 2018

BROXTOWE LOCAL PLAN PART 2 EXAMINATION

MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS

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.

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. Yes, the housing requirement as set out in Policy 2 (3) of the [Aligned Core Strategy \(PD/01\)](#) sets a minimum number of 6,150 new homes to be delivered in Broxtowe Borough by 2028. The Part 2 Local Plan as shown in Table 5: Housing Trajectory [\(CD/01\)](#) makes provision for 7,249 homes within the borough up to 2028, this equates to an uplift in housing numbers of 18% and demonstrates that the Plan is positively prepared and consistent with the NPPF (paragraph 47) requirement to ‘boost significantly the supply of housing’.
- 1.2. This also allows sufficient flexibility in the supply so that, if sites do not come forward at the pace anticipated, the Council will still be able to meet the minimum requirement as set out in the ACS.
- 1.3. Policy 2 (2) of the ACS sets out the settlement hierarchy to accommodate growth, in Broxtowe this is primarily in the main built up area of Nottingham and then secondly in the Key Settlements identified for growth of Awsworth, Brinsley, Eastwood (including parts of Giltbrook and Newthorpe) and Kimberley (including parts of Nuthall and Watnall).
- 1.4. The spatial distribution in Policy 2 (3a & 3c) of the ACS in comparison with the Part 2 Local Plan is shown in the table below:

Table 1: Comparison between the spatial distribution in the ACS and that detailed in the Part 2 Local Plan (not including windfalls in the Part 2 Local Plan).

Settlement	ACS Spatial Distribution	Part 2 Local Spatial Distribution	Difference
Main Built up are of Nottingham	Minimum of 3,800	4,829	+1,029
Awsworth	Up to 350	355	+5
Brinsley	Up to 150	153	+3
Eastwood	Up to 1,250	1,023	-227
Kimberley	Up to 600	532	-68

1.5. The Council considers that these differences in the spatial distribution (shown in Table 1) accords with Policy 2 of the ACS for the following reasons:

- The requirement in the ACS for the main built up area of Nottingham was an approximate figure and, in line with the settlement hierarchy, the strategy primarily directs growth to within or adjacent to the main built up area of Nottingham, therefore an increase in housing numbers in this settlement area is fully consistent with the ACS.
- Awsworth and Brinsley have marginally exceeded their requirement however the addition of 5 and 3 homes respectively is not considered to be a significant deviation from the ACS policy.
- Eastwood and Kimberley have both seen a lower housing figure than the ACS 'upto' maximum, and therefore the anticipated housing delivery is consistent with the ACS. This is fully compliant with both the overarching strategy of urban concentration with regeneration (ACS Policy 2) and the search sequence for sites described in the [Site Selection document \(CD/26\)](#) and amounts to sustainable development, as concluded within the Sustainability Assessment ([CD/12](#)).
- In Eastwood and Kimberley there are significant urban regeneration challenges and it was not considered appropriate to release additional land from the Green Belt beyond that already allocated in this Part 2 Local Plan as this could hinder the delivery of other sites within the existing urban area of Eastwood and Kimberley.

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

- 2.1. Yes, the selected sites comprise a range of size, type and geographical location in different sub-markets. As required in the ACS there is a focus on securing deliverable sites within the urban areas of the Borough such as Chetwynd Barracks. However, there are significantly smaller sites allocated in a variety of locations throughout the Borough and a mix of both Previously Developed and Greenfield sites ([see the SHLAA \(HO/02\)](#) for full details).
- 2.2. There is a provision in Policy 15 for an amount of custom/self-build plots and the overall housing availability in this Part 2 Local Plan exceeds the ACS minimum by close to 1100 homes ensuring sufficient flexibility and choice.

3. Should the housing sites denoted as Housing Commitments on the Policies Map form allocations in this Plan?

- 3.1. No, it is not considered necessary for housing commitments to form allocations in this Plan. The housing commitments as shown on the Policies Map have been granted planning permission or have a resolution to grant subject to S106, they have therefore all been through an additional level of public scrutiny and assessment (including neighbour consultation and viability assessment where required) and have

been deemed suitable for development. The sites are not located in the Green Belt and so are not restricted by Planning Policy. It is not considered that allocating the sites in the Plan would assist with delivery.

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

- 4.1. Yes, the evidence comprises a [site selection strategy \(CD/26\)](#) with a focus on strongest sub-market of Beeston, consistent with evidence in the [ACS G L Hearn Report \(ACS Examination Library CD/KEY/02\)](#), consistent with built rate assumptions elsewhere in the HMA some of which are in weaker housing sub-markets and consistent with historic rates of delivery in Broxtowe.
- 4.2. There are agreed generic assumptions with the development industry to inform the SHLAA ([HO/02](#)) this is reviewed annually. In addition, dialogue with the promoters of sites to be allocated in this Part 2 Local Plan regarding start times; build rates, number of developers on a single site have been on-going and has informed the trajectory (for the larger sites these are detailed further in the Statements of Common Ground).

5. The Trajectory illustrates a shortfall of delivery in the early stages of the Plan period but a much higher annual delivery towards the latter stages. Is there a need for a flexible approach to maximise delivery in the early years of the Plan? Is a delivery of over 1000 dwellings per year in 2020/21 – 2023/24 realistic and achievable bearing in mind past delivery rates and the local housing market?

- 5.1. The staggered trajectory reflects the fact that many of the large housing allocations are currently located within the Green Belt and therefore they cannot come forward in advance of the Part 2 Local Plan going through its due process. The Council has taken a realistic approach to when the sites are likely to be developed given the time period associated with the Local Plan process and the time needed to gain detailed consent.
- 5.2. The Council considers that there is limited intervention that can be taken to boost delivery in the early years of the Plan i.e. prior to 2020. The Council has worked pro-actively to bring development forward on urban sites (see [Site Selection document \(CD/26\)](#) and SHLAA ([HO/02](#)) including working closely with landowners and developers, being a pilot authority in the Brownfield Register, taking a pragmatic approach to negotiating reduced S106 requirements, encouraging local communities to prepare Neighbourhood Plans to shape the growth in their areas and it is considered that the land supply constraints (i.e. the Green Belt) preventing development from happening now. It is therefore not appropriate to release further sites in the Green Belt as it is not considered that this will resolve the issue. It is considered that the most appropriate way to boost the supply is to have an adopted Part 2 Local Plan.

- 5.3. The Council recognises that the delivery of over 1000 homes a year is ambitious but this ambition is fully compliant with the ACS and government policy in planning positively for growth. In line with the evidence ([ACS G L Hearn Report \(ACS Examination Library CD/KEY/02\)](#)) Broxtowe has already seen a year on year increase in housing delivery as the economy improves. It is expected that housing delivery will accelerate further once the allocations are made in line with this Part 2 Local Plan. It is also considered inappropriate to artificially restrict the ability for development to come forward. There are no further steps the Council can take to accelerate delivery over the next two years.

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?

- 6.1. Yes, the Part 2 Local Plan has built-in flexibility to allow for some slippage in delivery (in excess of 1000 homes) which amounts to 18% uplift in the minimum required supply of the ACS.
- 6.2. Given that the Council is already making best use of its ability to bring forward development on Previously Developed sites in the urban area the only further mechanism available is additional Green Belt release (see response to question 5 above). There is already significant overprovision of housing in this Part 2 Local Plan and there is a timetable for an ACS review across the Greater Nottingham Housing Market Area with this to be adopted in December 2021 ([Local Development Scheme CD/24](#)). This is the appropriate and timely forum to address any necessary additional contingencies beyond those set out by the overprovision in this Part 2 Local Plan.

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?

- 7.1. With the allocations in this Part 2 Local Plan the Council has a 5.2 year Land Supply (see SHLAA ([HO/02](#))). The Council has used a robust methodology for calculating the 5 year land supply. Delivery assumptions in the SHLAA are cautious and are on the basis of detailed dialogue with the development industry, take full account of the shortfall in the 5 year supply (Sedgefield approach), takes account of historic lapse rates and includes only a limited windfall allowance (see response to question 9).
- 7.2. The Council does not consider that the buffer should be applied to the shortfall for the following reasons: The Council is planning for in excess of the objectively assessed need over the Plan period. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that the Council should include a buffer (of either 5% or 20%) and that this should be “moved forward from later in the plan period”. The Council considers that the shortfall is from earlier in the Plan period and that there is no requirement to add a buffer on to the shortfall. As detailed in the response to question 5 if further allocations area required this would require further Green Belt release given that the Council is making best

use of Previously Developed sites and it is not considered that exceptional circumstances exist to justify additional Green Belt release.

8. How have site densities been determined? Are they reasonably accurate?

- 8.1. Yes, in most cases the number of dwellings expected to be delivered on a site is the result of numerous discussions with developers (detailed in the [Consultation Statement \(CD/20\)](#) and Statements of Common Ground), historic precedent, a default assumption of 30 dwellings per hectare and site specific considerations such as Town Centre location and / or adjacent to a transport hub (leading to higher density assumptions e.g. Beeston and Toton allocations). It is expected that these densities are accurate.

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 (ie. the first 2 years) of the supply calculation?

- 9.1. Windfall, as set out in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) ([HO/02](#)), consists of dwellings on small sites of less than 10 dwellings that were not garden land.
- 9.2. The windfall allowance has been applied consistently at Broxtowe for several years and was accepted by the Appeal Inspector in relation to Hempshill Hall ([BBC/07](#)).
- 9.3. The windfall allowance is considered to be conservative as the Council restricts the size of the site that is included in the evidence base. As shown on page 19 of the SHLAA the number of additional annual windfall sites (not included in the previous year’s SHLAA) that are considered suitable for development averages 271 dwellings a year.
- 9.4. The Council notes that source of windfall has changed in the revised NPPF (2018) with the removal of the phrase “and should not include residential gardens”. Table 2 shows the comparison between including residential garden land in the windfall figures (in line with the 2018 NPPF).

Table 2: Comparison between historic windfalls on small sites as calculated in line with the 2012 NPPF compared to those calculated in line with the 2018

Year	2012 NPPF	2018 NPPF
	Number of windfalls delivered on small sites (less than 10) not including residential gardens	Number of windfalls delivered on small sites
2011-12	23	37
2012-13	23	23
2013 -14	37	92
2014-15	57	63
2015-16	55	68
2016-17	37	143

2017-18	47	99
Average	279 (average 40 dwellings a year)	525 (average of 75 dwellings a year)

9.5. Therefore the current approach to windfalls is modest and may well be substantially increased in line with the 2018 NPPF.

10. Based on the available evidence is the lapse rate appropriate?

10.1. Yes, as set out in the SHLAA [\(HO/02\)](#) the Council has based its lapse rate on historic evidence.

10.2. The lapse rate is calculated as an average of the annual percentage of dwellings that lapse in comparison to those that are granted permission. The lapse rate is then applied to all sites in the 5 year supply that have not been implemented.

Broxtowe Borough Council
Neighbourhoods and Prosperity
Council Offices, Foster Avenue,
Beeston, Nottingham, NG9 1AB
Tel: 0115 917 7777
www.broxtowe.gov.uk

