Matter 4: Housing Land Supply

Session 5 - 09.30 Thursday 23 May 2019

This matter considers how the housing requirement will be met; whether those means of meeting the requirement have been justified and will be effective; and whether the LP will be able to maintain a five-year housing land supply (HLS).

In response to preliminary questions the Council has indicated that:

- The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) figure of 13,233 homes referred to in para 4.22 does not include the Housing Growth Areas (HGA's) identified in this Plan but does include sites likely to be allocated in the Allocations and Designations Plan (A & D Plan);
- A table showing the components of housing land supply, similar to Table 22 of the Compliance Statement, will be included in the Plan;
- The Plan includes a flexibility factor of 8.5% within the projected supply, taking into account SHLAA sites and the Strategic Sites and HGAs allocated in this Plan;
- The evidence supports a small-sites allowance of 50 dpa but does not support a windfall allowance for larger sites as they are caught by the SHLAA threshold;
- An updated HLS position (31 March 2019) will be provided to inform discussion at the hearings;
- Additional text will be inserted into Section 6 of the Plan to summarise the five-year HLS position and the assumptions behind it; and,
- The Council propose to produce a Housing Implementation Strategy (HIS) later in 2019.
- Delivery from individual sites will be considered during Week 2 of the hearings.

<u>Issues</u>

1. Components of Housing Supply

1.1 Will the up to date housing supply position be clearly shown in the Plan (base date of 31 March 2019)?

The HBF would expect the up to date supply position to be clearly shown within the Plan, along with information on how it will be monitored to ensure homes can be delivered.

1.2 Will the components of the housing supply that will meet the housing requirement be clearly shown in the Plan (Table 22 of the Compliance Statement refers)?

The HBF would expect the components of the housing supply that will meet the housing requirement to be set out within the Plan in a similar fashion to that set out within Table 22 of the Compliance Statement.

1.3 Is the small sites allowance of 50 dpa justified by compelling evidence?

The HBF consider that the small site allowance is only appropriate where it can be evidenced that these small sites will continue to come forward and that there will remain a deliverable supply of the plan period.

1.4 Is the flexibility factor of 8.5% sufficient to ensure that the housing requirement will be met over the Plan period?

The HBF strongly recommends that the plan allocates more sites than required to meet the housing requirement; as a buffer or flexibility factor. This buffer should be sufficient to deal with any under-delivery which is likely to occur from some sites. Such an approach would be

consistent with the NPPF requirements for the plan to be positively prepared and flexible. The HBF recommends an appropriate contingency (circa at least 20%) to the overall housing land supply to provide sufficient flexibility for unforeseen circumstances and in acknowledgement that the housing requirement is a minimum not a maximum figure.

1.5 Is the allowance for demolitions of 20 units per year justified?

The HBF is supportive of the recognition by the Council that demolitions will continue to occur within the area and that an appropriate allowance is included. It is noted that demolitions have historically been higher than the allowance proposed, and whilst it is noted that this has been due to stock clearance, there may be scope for a more significant allowance.

2. The Housing Trajectory and HIS

2.1 Is the data that supports the Housing Trajectory (Figure 34) based on realistic assumptions?

The HBF would expect the Council base their Housing Trajectory on realistic assumptions. The HBF would expect to see more evidence from the Council on their engagement with site owners and developers to support the sites and the trajectory provided.

2.2 Will the HIS (when available) demonstrate that a five-year supply can be maintained through the plan period?

The HBF would expect the Council to be able to demonstrate that a five year housing land supply can be maintained, this could be within the Housing Implementation Strategy (HIS).

3. Five Year Housing Land Supply

3.1 Is the use of a 5% buffer to calculate the housing land supply position appropriate?

As the Sunderland Core Strategy and Development Plan was submitted before 24 January 2019 it is to be examined under the policies of the 2012 NPPF. Paragraph 47 of this NPPF provides details of when a 5% or 20% buffer should be used. It states that where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, the Council should increase the buffer to 20%, it does not define persistent under delivery.

Year	Completions ¹	Housing Requirement	Difference
2009/10	380	700 ²	-320
2010/11	690	700	-10
2011/12	430	940 ³	-510
2012/13	330	940	-610
2013/14	510	940	-430
2014/15	910	940	-30
2015/16	700	745	-45
2016/17	590	745	-155

¹ Taken from CLG Live Housing Table 253: Permanent Dwellings started and completed by tenure and district (https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/live-tables-on-house-building)

² Housing Requirement from the NE RSS 2004-11 – 700dpa

³ Housing Requirement from the NE RSS 2011-16 – 940dpa (NE RSS revoked April 2013)

2017/18	690	745	-55
2018/19		745	

Based on completions identified by MHCLG and the housing requirement proposed in the Sunderland Core Strategy and Development Plan and the NE RSS, there has been a record of persistent under delivery in Sunderland. This would suggest that a 20% buffer would be appropriate.

It is however, recognised that in reality once adopted that Plan will be used alongside the 2019 NPPF which states that the 20% buffer should be applied where there has been significant under delivery of housing over the previous three years, footnote 39 then states that from November 2018 this will be measured against the Housing Delivery Test, where this indicates that delivery was below 85% of the housing requirement. Based on the 2019 NPPF and the results of the 2018 Housing Delivery Test the 5% buffer is considered appropriate to calculate the housing land supply position.

3.2 Is the inclusion of 250 units from small sites justified taking into account the need to avoid double counting?

The Council will make an allowance for 50 residential dwellings each year on small sites (4 homes or less). The HBF consider that this is only appropriate where it can be evidenced that these small sites will continue to come forward and that there will remain a deliverable supply of the plan period. The HBF would expect the Council to ensure that this allowance would avoid double counting of any sites that have already been included e.g. because they have permission.

3.3 Generally, are the assumptions about the delivery from commitments and allocations realistic taking into account past completions?

The HBF does not wish to comment upon the acceptability or otherwise of individual sites. It is, however, important that all the sites contained within the plan are deliverable over the plan period and planned to an appropriate strategy. The Council's assumptions on sites in relation to delivery and capacity should be realistic based on evidence supported by the parties responsible for housing delivery and sense checked by the Council based on local knowledge and historical empirical data.

3.4 Are lead in times and build out rates realistic?

Appendix J of the SHLAA 2018 appears to show average build rates over then period 2009/10 to 2017/18, for different sizes of site. The build out rates vary from 32.87 dpa for sites of more than 150 dwellings to 3dpa for sites of less than 10 dwellings⁴. It is not entirely clear how this information has been utilised in determining the build out rates for sites. It also not clear how the lead in times have been determined.

Table 5 in the SHLAA sets out the assumptions used in the SHLAA in relation to the build out rates and lead in times. It is not evident whether this has then been agreed with the land owner and developer of each of the sites, or what other engagement may have occurred.

⁴ Over 150 = 32.87, 101 to 150 = 31.31, 51 to 100 = 18.27, 11 to 50 = 8.14, up to 10 = 3.11.

3.5 Will there be a five year supply of deliverable housing sites on adoption of the LP?

The HBF does not wish to comment upon the acceptability or otherwise of individual sites. However, there is little evidence provided to support the deliverability of the sites included within the 5-year supply. The HBF would therefore encourage the Council to ensure that a 5year supply can be provided.

4. The wording of the Policy SP8

4.1 Will Policy SP8 as worded be effective in ensuring the delivery of at least 745 dpa? The HBF support the Council in working with partners and landowners to seek to exceed the minimum target of 745 additional dwellings per year. Although it could benefit from the addition of 'net' additional dwellings each year, as it has already been indicated that the Council consider that demolitions and loss of dwellings will continue to occur.

4.2 Should the policy refer to measures that would be implemented in the event of under-delivery against the minimum target or does the Housing Delivery Test contained within the 2019 Framework provide sufficient safeguards in this respect?

Whilst the Housing Delivery Test (HDT) will help to ensure that the standard methodology OAN is met, it will not ensure that the housing requirement as set out in the Core Strategy and Development Plan is met. It will be for the Council to monitor this delivery of the Plan including the housing requirement. If the housing requirement is not being delivered it may be beneficial for the Council to include within the Local Plan what actions they will take to ensure that the housing requirement is met in future. This could include measures highlighted within SP8.