

## **Hartlepool Local Plan**

### **Examination Hearings**

#### **Matter 7: Housing Land Supply**

**Wednesday 4 October 2017 – 2pm**

#### **Participants:**

Hartlepool Borough Council

Home Builders Federation

Cecil M Yuill Ltd

Mr Tones

Persimmon Homes (Teesside)

Taylor Wimpey

Park Residents Association

#### **Key documents/references:**

HLP06/4 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

EX/HBC/57 & EX/HBC/71 – Five Year Housing Land Supply

Planning Practice Guidance – Section 3 'Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment'. Last Updated March 2014

#### **Agenda**

##### ***1. Completions to date.***

##### ***2. Meeting the housing requirement – components of Policy HSG1***

###### ***(a) Extant residential permissions***

- Capacity of sites with full permission
- Are there sites with permission replacing existing stock under the 50% on site windfall replacement assumption? Are there any issues of supply from permissions being gross or net regarding replacement sites?
- Capacity of sites where there is a resolution to grant planning permission subject to a S106)
- Profile of delivery of extant permissions in the trajectory – including those sites expected to contribute within five year period; what are the key sites that are going to make significant contribution to early uplift in delivery?
- Testing of assumptions on delivery timeframes – dialogue with developers, trigger points for infrastructure, planning obligations & discharge of conditions etc.

**(b) Local Plan allocations**

- Scoping of sites
- Transparent screening out of sites due to strategic constraints
- Detailed assessment of candidate sites – assumptions on delivery, net capacity (densities) and trigger points
- Trajectory of when allocations will deliver
- Trajectories for High Tunstall and Wynyard – are they realistic in terms of lead-in times, infrastructure dependencies

**(c) Windfall allowance / Allowance for specific sites (179 units)**

- Is the 65dpa “windfall” allowance for replacement stock in the housing requirement “windfall” for the purposes of supply?

**(d) Evidence/allowance for non-implementation**

- 10% on sites of 4 dwellings or less.
- Larger sites subject to delivery assessment

**(e) Any additional buffer for flexibility?**

- Is there supply capacity for a buffer?
- Would a buffer ensure conformity with the housing delivery test in the Housing White Paper? Would this be justified?
- Would a buffer duplicate the 20% buffer proposed in the housing requirement (separate from any +% for past performance)?
- Ability to deliver an additional buffer – past delivery is a useful context but is there tangible evidence the market has been constrained from delivering in Hartlepool since 2012 (NPPF)?

**3. Presenting a five year deliverable supply**

- (a) The five year requirement – see EX/HBC/71 for Council’s latest position as of 1 April 2017
- (b) Past performance - 5% or 20% buffer; and is the % applied to the requirement and the backlog?
- (c) Sedgefield (first five years) or Liverpool (plan period) for dealing with backlog. Would a Sedgefield approach be deliverable?
- (d) Annualized or stepped/staggered trajectory – reflective of supply sources (large strategic sites) and realistic rates of delivery

#### ***4. Monitoring a five year deliverable supply***

- (a) Clarity of the Plan on how the five year supply is calculated for decision makers – Table 7, p81 of the Plan
- (b) Should the Plan contain appropriate policy mechanisms that would trigger measures were a five year supply not attainable

Session ends.