

Examination of the New Castle Point Local Plan

Inspector: Philip Lewis BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

Programme Officer: Andrea Copsey

Examination Office, PO Box 12607, Clacton-on-Sea, CO15 9GN

copseyandrea@gmail.com 07842 643988

Agenda

Hearing Day 2. Wednesday 12 May 2021 Session to commence no earlier than 1400

Hearing Day 3. Thursday 13 May 2021 Session to commence at 0930

(Matter 4 E: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople will take place on Hearing Day 3, Thursday 13 May)

Matter 4: Delivering a sufficient supply of homes

Issue: Is the overall strategy and provision for housing development effective and justified?

A: Calculating the housing need

- Q.47 What is the level of local housing need for Castle Point derived from the standard method using the most recent median workplace-based affordability ratios to apply an affordability adjustment, and capping as per the Planning Practice Guidance?
- Q.48 Are there circumstances to justify a higher housing need figure than the standard method indicates?

B: The Supply of Housing

- Q.49 What is the up to date level of housing supply proposed to be provided by the plan?
- Q.50 Which sites make up the extant permissions included with the housing trajectory and what is the evidence that they are either deliverable or developable as per the Framework definitions?

- Q.51 What is the compelling evidence for the supply of housing from windfall sites through the plan period?
- Q.52 What are the specific sites included in the housing land supply from the Brownfield Register and Policy Compliant SHLAA sites and what is the evidence that they are either deliverable or developable as per the Framework definitions?
- Q.53 Whilst the proposed housing allocations will be considered separately, are the broad assumptions made as to site capacity and when houses would be delivered realistic and justified? Is it effective and justified to express site capacity for a number of sites as being up to a certain number of homes?
- Q.54 Will there be a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites on adoption of the Plan?
- Q.55 Given historic levels of housing completions in the Plan area, are the numbers of units envisaged to be built per annum in the plan area as set out in the trajectory realistic and achievable?

C: Housing needs and Strategic Policy HO3 Housing Mix

- Q.56 Does the Plan adequately address the needs of different groups in the community as set out in paragraph 61 of the Framework?
- Q.57 Is Strategic Policy HO3 justified and would it be effective in meeting the housing needs of different groups in the community?
- Q.58 The Framework in paragraph 61 states that the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community should be assessed and be reflected in planning policies. Has the size, type and tenure of properties needed for the Plan Area been adequately assessed and would the Policy be effective in meeting needs?
- Q.59 In particular and with regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty, does the Plan identify the housing requirements of older and disabled people, does it set clear policies to address these particular needs and has the viability implications of meeting the housing needs of these groups been taken into account?
- Q.60 Would the Plan be effective in meeting the housing needs of people wishing to commission or build their own homes?

Q.61 Are the proposed modifications necessary for soundness?

D: The Housing Requirement

Q.62 The submitted Plan sets a housing requirement based upon the local housing need figure of 342 homes per annum. The Framework in paragraph 11 sets out that plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

- a) Does the plan positively seek opportunities to meet the housing needs of the area and is it sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change?
- b) The plan is seeking to meet the minimum local housing need for the plan period 2018 – 2033. Should the plan provide for some 'headroom' in terms of housing supply over the minimum local housing need figure and if so, would this be justified?
- c) In the context of paragraph 11 b) of the Framework, are there reasons which indicate that strategic policies should not provide for the minimum objectively assessed needs for housing? If so, how should any unmet need be addressed?

Q.63 The level of housing development proposed represents a significant increase from that achieved per annum in recent years. Is there evidence to justify a stepped housing requirement so as to transition between the supply of housing arising from current policies and achieved to date in the plan period, to that proposed in the Plan?

E: Provision for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

Issue: Is the Plan positively prepared and would it be effective in addressing the likely accommodation needs of Gypsies, Travellers and travelling showpeople?

Q.64 Has the identified need for additional pitches for Gypsies and Travellers been robustly calculated and up to date, and is the approach taken in the Plan to meeting identified need justified and consistent with the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS)?

- Q.65 How would the needs of the wider community who reside in caravans including people who are no longer classified as gypsies, travellers or travelling showpeople be identified and addressed by the Plan?
- Q.66 Is part 1a) of Policy HO7 sufficiently clear so that it is evident as to how a decision maker should react to a development proposal? Is the requirement that a site has good access to healthcare, schools and other community facilities consistent with national policy as expressed in the PPTS?
- Q.67 Would the Policy be effective in providing for the provision of new Gypsy and Traveller accommodation whilst safeguarding the living conditions of the occupants of nearby property?
- Q.68 Given Strategic Policy GB2 New Development in the Green Belt, is part 2 of Strategic Policy HO7 necessary?
- Q.69 Are the proposed modifications necessary for soundness?

F Housing Policies

Strategic Policy HO1 Housing Strategy

- Q.70 A number of criteria set out in parts 2, 3 and 4 of Strategic Policy HO1 appear to duplicate other policies of the plan. Do the criteria serve a clear purpose and is it evident as to how a decision maker should react to development proposals? Would the criteria be better expressed in a separate strategic policy to address the strategic priorities of the area?

Strategic Policy HO2 Master Planning

- Q.71 Is Policy HO2 consistent with paragraphs 39 – 46 of the Framework in expecting master plans and/or planning or development briefs for all major housing development proposals and entering into voluntary planning performance agreements with promoters?
- Q.72 Are the proposed modifications necessary for soundness?

Strategic Policy HO4 Securing More Affordable Housing

- Q.73 Is the evidence for the requirement for affordable housing need justified by robust and up to date evidence?
- Q.74 Are the thresholds for seeking affordable housing justified, effective in terms of viability considerations and consistent with national policy?
- Q.75 Why are some thresholds expressed as absolutes whilst other are expressed as 'up to'?
- Q.76 Is the Policy clear as to the circumstances where viability should be assessed in decision making?
- Q.77 Are the proposed modifications necessary for soundness?

Strategic Policy HO6 Caravan and Park Homes

- Q.78 Is Strategic Policy HO6 consistent with the findings of the HRA?

Local Policy HO8 Residential Annexes

- Q.79 What is the justification for the provisions relating to ownership in criterion 1 a. given that the sale of such property would not be an act of development?
- Q.80 Is part 2 of the Policy consistent with national policy for Green Belts as set out in paragraphs 143 to 145 of the Framework? Why would a detached annex proposed in the Green Belt be treated as a new dwelling, when a detached annex outside of the Green Belt would not be?

Participants

Canvey Green Belt Campaign, Mr G Bracci & Mr S Sawkins

HO20 – Mr J Driscoll

Home Builders Federation, Mr M Behrendt

Rainier Developments Ltd, Strutt & Parker, Mr S Hollingworth

Vistry Group, Boyer Planning, Ms L Hindle

McLaren, Icen, Mr J Bompas

Gladman, Mr P Bamford

Redrow & Persimmon, Pegasus, Mrs N Parsons

JD Armitage & CALA Homes, JB Planning, Mr P Cronk