

Matter 3. Do the policies of the plan identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites for the plan period? Response to further evidence submitted by BANES

This LPPU seeks to increase the provision of housing accommodation over the Plan period from 13000 to over 14000 for reasons given in fresh evidence, which the CPRE maintains are unjustified. While CPRE recognizes the housing shortage and the need for new building (in the right places), as the Countryside charity, it does not support the unwarranted incursion of housing developments into Green Belt and other rural areas. CPRE maintains that over-provision of housing in areas like BANES, restricted as it is by valued and protected landscapes, is something that the Local Plan should seek to prevent. It also maintains that, if Planning Policy and Guidance were properly understood and applied, required levels of housing provision under this LPPU could be moderated.

A primary reason why the BANES proposal is incorrect is that targeted housing provision should have been reevaluated using the standard methodology and this would reduce the annual requirement from 722 to 676, thereby mitigating problems of complying with the 5 year land supply condition and the Housing Delivery Test.

BANES (in BANES Council para 14.1) contends that though the standard method should be used where policies are over 5 years old, this is negated by footnote 39 'where policies have been reviewed and found not to require updating'. The following quote from the guidance shows that BANES' conclusion is incorrect:

***“What housing requirement figure should authorities use when calculating their 5 year housing land supply?”***

*Housing requirement figures identified in adopted strategic housing policies should be used for calculating the 5 year housing land supply figure where:*

- *the plan was adopted in the last 5 years, or*
- *the strategic housing policies have been reviewed **within the last 5 years** and found not to need updating.*

*In other circumstances the 5 year housing land supply will be measured against the area's local housing need calculated using the standard method.”*

Again, see the following quote from the Housing Delivery Test 2021 measurement technical note (which presumably adopts the same criteria as the 5 year land supply test) as it relates to the definition of 'review' as referred to in footnote 39 of the NPPF:

- *Plan Reviews – In order to determine whether a plan review<sup>[footnote 6\]](#), that concludes that policies do not require updating, has been satisfied for the purposes of Housing Delivery Test, the authority must have<sup>[footnote 7\]](#)</sup></sup>*
- *Published an assessment of the strategic housing requirement policy (or policies) within 5 years of adoption of such policies; and*
- *As part of the review concluded that such policies do not require updating.*

Footnote 7 referred to above removes any possible doubt that the standard method is the one that should have been used:

- *An ‘up to date plan’ for the purposes of the Housing Delivery Test is a plan with an adopted housing requirement which is less than 5 years old or is older than 5 years old and has been reviewed and found not to require updating. ‘Out of date’ for the purpose of the Housing Delivery Test, is a plan with an adopted housing requirement which is 5 years old or older and: has not been reviewed **or a review has been carried out after the 5-year deadline** or a plan review has found that the strategic housing policies require updating.↵*

BANES have provided other justifications for why the standard method should not be used. For example, the Housing Topic Paper para 2.4 misinterprets NPPG para 062 as meaning that a policy should only be reviewed if the local plan produces a housing provision significantly below that using the standard method. The actual purpose of this paragraph is to explain the circumstances in which a Plan may have to be reviewed earlier than 5 years, not whether it has to be reviewed at all.

The Opinion Research Services report concludes that, though the standard method should be employed, the difference it makes is very small (6%) and not worth it. However, despite the frequent assertions by BANES that the Core Strategy targets hold, the targets emerging from this exercise are not the 13000 Core Strategy figures but well over 14000.

A major reason for this is that BANES claim that there will be difficulties in passing Housing Delivery tests in the latter part of the Plan period so that numbers must be increased to remedy this. But this is a matter of simple arithmetic, because a large part of the total provision has been delivered in the

first part of the Plan period, so a decline in building in the latter part is inevitable to avoid targets being exceeded.

The Core Strategy did not specify a trajectory for housing delivery as is now required by para 74 of the NPPF, so this outcome cannot be seen as a failure, indeed existing deliveries plus sites expected to deliver indicate that the Core Strategy objectives will be comfortably achieved. To justify additional housing provision merely to satisfy an inappropriate Housing Delivery Test seems contradictory and is surely an area where Planning discretion might be exercised.

BANES suggest that further need to bolster up the housing provision is that there is a shortfall of sites due to sites falling by the wayside or not coming up to expectations. There seems to be confusion here because if new sites are required for this purpose, they do not add to the housing to be provided for, but merely enable that existing provision to be fulfilled.