



South East Lincolnshire
Joint Strategic Planning Committee

SOUTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

**Tuesday 10 October 2017
Day 1**

A G E N D A

Afternoon Hearing Session

- 1. Matter 1 – Housing Requirements (continued from Morning Session)**
- 2. Matter 2 - Affordable Housing and Housing Mix**
- 3. Any Other Business**

Participants:

South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee

Roland Bolton, DLP Planning Ltd representing Mr R Hardy and Richard Hardy and Larkfleet Homes

Alister Hume, Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd representing Broadgate Homes and Broadgate Builders (Spalding) UK

David Hodgetts, Indigo Planning representing Diana Properties Ltd

Tim Waller, Waller Planning representing Ashley King Developments

Mrs J Woods

Neil Kempster, Chestnut Homes

Sue Green, House Builders Federation Ltd

Michael Braithwaite, Robert Doughty Consultancy representing Various Clients

Matter 1: Overall Housing Need (Policy 10)

Issue: Whether the Plan's housing requirements are justified and based on a sound assessment of need

Housing Market Areas

27. In preparing the Plan, how have the Councils satisfied NPPF paragraph 159, first bullet point, which says that local planning authorities should prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries?
28. Given that Boston Borough and East Lindsey District were previously within the same Housing Market Area (HMA), is the identification of Boston Borough alone as a self-contained HMA based on robust evidence? How has the Boston HMA been determined?
29. Is the inclusion of South Holland in the Peterborough HMA (encompassing Peterborough City Council, South Kesteven District, Rutland County and South Holland District) based on robust evidence? How has the Peterborough HMA been determined?

Objectively Assessed Housing Need OAHN

30. Is there a robust statistical and methodological basis for the OAHN figures of 7,550 dwellings (Boston) and 11,125 dwellings (South Holland) totalling 18,675 dwellings that underpin the Plan?
31. Have similar methodologies been used in the SMAs for the two HMAs of Boston and Peterborough?
32. How have any differences been reconciled?
33. What assumptions have been used and are they reasonable? (provide a brief answer outlining how ONS population projections/mid-year estimates, migration, Unattributable Population Change, CLG Household projections, Household Representative Rates, vacant/second homes allowances, economic factors & market signals have been dealt with so as to reach the OAHN figures in the Plan).
34. Has an uplift been made for concealed households?
35. How does the updated SMA assessment of economic factors compare to the *Employment Premises & Land Review* assessment of job growth and that in the *Employment Land Technical Paper Update*?
36. What figures/evidence have been used to reach the job growth scenario of 17,600 new jobs overall in the Plan period?
37. What risk is there of job growth overall exceeding the resident labour supply over the Plan Period?

38. Given the substantial need for affordable housing in the SELLP area, should there be an uplift to the OAHN to boost the supply of affordable housing? If not, please explain why.

Matter 2: Affordable Housing and Housing Mix (Policies 14, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 20)

Issue: Whether the identified affordable housing need is soundly based and reasonably provided for, and whether the needs of particular groups have been adequately assessed and provided for

Affordable Housing (Policy 15: Affordable Housing & Policy 16: Rural Exception Sites)

39. Overall, what is the estimated updated full affordable housing need (net) in 1) Boston Borough and 2) South Holland District for the Plan period between 2011 and 2036?

40. Are the assumptions used in assessing the need for affordable housing reasonable?

41. Is the threshold of 30% of gross income spent on housing reasonable for determining households in need of affordable housing?

42. The *Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update* of March 2017 estimates the average affordable housing need to be 282 units in South Holland and 263 units in Boston. How does this translate in Policy 15 of the Plan into an annual need of 280 units in South Holland (about 2/3 of overall housing need) and 100 units in Boston (about 1/3 of overall housing need)?

43. What influence has the availability of Private Rented Sector (PRS) accommodation had on the Policy response to providing affordable housing?

44. Is it reasonable to count PRS properties paid for by housing benefit (Local Housing Allowance) as supply for those in need of affordable housing, thereby reducing the net need?

45. Has PRS supply paid for by housing benefit influenced the decision not to uplift the housing requirement to provide additional affordable housing?

46. How does this compare with the High Court judgement in *Oadby and Wigston BC V Secretary of State for CLG and Bloor Homes Ltd. HC 3 July 2015 CO/139/2015 paras 34(ii) and 50*?

47. Should the Plan indicate what the estimated full affordable need is without any reduction for PRS supply?

48. If the Councils are unable to provide sufficient affordable housing to meet the full affordable housing need, and intend to rely upon state-subsidised PRS accommodation to contribute residential units, should this be made clear in the Plan as a policy decision?

49. What other sources of affordable housing, if any, are expected to come forward in the Plan period and in what timescale?
50. Whilst it may not be practical to meet the full affordable housing need in the Plan period, given the high level of affordable housing need, does the Plan make reasonable provision for affordable housing?
51. The Housing and Planning Act 2016 imposes a general duty to promote the supply of Starter Homes, albeit this is not yet in force. Nonetheless, as it is likely to be brought into force during the Plan period, should provision be made for the potential to include Starter Homes in the affordable housing mix? Whilst Starter Homes are referred to in the text of Policy 15, should they be included in the Policy itself?
52. Should there be more flexibility in the mix of affordable rented to intermediate housing?
53. Are the proposed developer contributions in Policy 15 supported by robust viability evidence?

Housing Mix- Policy 14: Providing a Mix of housing

54. Does the Plan adequately address the needs for all types of housing (excluding affordable housing which is considered under questions 39-53) and the needs of different groups in the community in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 50 and 159?
55. Has the Plan specifically addressed the needs of older persons? Has adequate assessment been made of the needs for specific types of older person accommodation such as sheltered, enhanced sheltered, extra care, registered care?
56. Has the Plan specifically addressed the requirements of those with physical disabilities/learning difficulties?
57. Are the provisions of the Public Sector Equality Duty, set out in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, satisfied with respect to persons with a physical or mental impairment? What approach have the Councils taken to discharge the duty with respect to this group? If any adverse impacts have been identified on this group has potential mitigation been considered?
58. Does the Plan make sufficient provision for inclusive design and accessible environments in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 57, 58, 61 and 69?
59. Has the Plan specifically addressed the needs for temporary accommodation for example migrant workers and others?
60. Does the Plan make sufficient provision for accommodation for gypsies and travellers who have ceased to travel?

61. Have the needs for privately rented accommodation been adequately addressed in the Plan?
62. Have the demands for self-build plots been addressed in the Plan?
63. Is there any need for student accommodation or accommodation for service families?
64. The Peterborough SHMA indicates that there is a housing stock mismatch with stock mix not meeting needs as well as it could. How does the Plan seek to address this?

Policy 18 – Houses in Multiple Occupation and the Sub-Division of Dwellings

65. What is meant by “high density residential areas” in paragraph 1 of the policy? Does this give sufficient guidance on what might be acceptable?
66. What is meant by “an adequate standard of residential accommodation/amenity” in paragraph 7 of the policy? Is there a potential for conflict with the Written Ministerial Statement of March 2015 and the Government policy of streamlining housing standards?
67. How do DASH space standards fit with the Nationally Described Space Standards?

Policy 19 – Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside; Policy 20 – The Reuse of Buildings in the Countryside for Residential Use

68. Should paragraph 5 of Policy 19 be more flexible to include, for example, other beneficial impacts such as flood betterment?