

Agenda

1. 10.00am Welcome and Introductions
2. Factual updates and housekeeping matters (as necessary)
3. Focus for Discussion: Housing

**Matter 7: Is the Core Strategy's approach to housing provision sufficiently justified and consistent with national planning policy—such as found—within Planning Policy Statement-3: Housing (PPS-3)? With particular regard to deliverability and the Duty to Cooperate, will the Core Strategy be effective in meeting the varied housing needs of the Borough over the plan period?**

i.	<i>(Note, items i-iv to be taken together.)</i> Is the evidence base in support of the housing policies robust and credible? How does this relate to the <i>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)</i> and associated guidance? To what extent is the content of the <i>NPPF</i> particularly satisfied by the Core Strategy? How has the CS been informed by, and is consistent with, the Council's Housing Strategy?
ii.	Is the latest SHLAA <sup>1</sup> robust? <i>(to include: what extent was a joint SHLAA with neighbouring authorities considered? Why was the site size threshold set at 6 units? Should the net increase in housing from sub-divisions be considered in the overall housing supply figures? Why are net housing increases from small sites only included in the overall housing supply figures for the last 5 years of the plan period? Were assumptions made as regards the potential impact of CIL?)</i>
iii.	To what extent, and in what ways, was the chosen spatial distribution of housing considered against alternatives? Is the spatial distribution of intended housing over the plan period clear?
iv.	Does the Council have a demonstrable housing land supply consistent with the <i>NPPF (with particular regard to Section 6)</i> ? Is the intended release of Green Belt deliverable? What reliance is made upon windfalls?
v.	How will matters relating to housing design be addressed to meet the aims of PPS3-et-af?
<b>CS10 Housing</b>	
vi.	Is the number of new homes consistently stated in CS? Are the house prices up to date in Para 2.14? Should current ONS stats be used?
vii.	What is the primary evidence to support the housing distribution identified in CS10? Is the evidence base robust? (to include 2007 Fordham's Research Paper) Can the required housing trajectory be delivered? Is the proposed approach to housing supply adequate and reasonable when considered against the evidence of need?
viii.	Is the policy sufficiently flexible to enable different density and housing mixes?
ix.	Is the policy on Green Belt (GB) release robust and effective?
x.	Are the indicative density ranges deliverable when considered against the required housing mix of the Borough?
xi.	Where is the evidence that the town centre can support 200dph to meet the target of 2300 dwellings? Will this be the required type of housing?
xii.	Is there sufficient flexibility within Policy CS10? Particularly in relation to potential non-implementation? Should a non-implementation figure of 10% be applied?
xiii.	Is the annual housing figure an indicative minimum target? Is the figure too low? To what extent have alternatives been considered?
xiv.	Is housing at Moorlane and Brookwood Farm justified by the evidence base? Is it deliverable?

<sup>1</sup> Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment

<sup>2</sup> Community Infrastructure Levy

	<b>CS 11 Housing Mix</b>
xv.	Is the policy sufficiently flexible to cater appropriately for specialist housing schemes such as care homes?
xvi.	Does the CS plan adequately and upon a robust evidence base for the projected increased proportion of elderly within the population?
xvii.	How will the aims of para 5.72 be realised? Is this supported by evidence? Consistent with CS 13?
xviii.	How will the delivery of necessary family housing be secured and managed?
	<b>CS12 Affordable Housing</b>
xix.	To what extent is the CS approach to the total provision of affordable housing justified by the evidence base? How much affordable housing (and of what size/tenure mix) is required and how will it be delivered? Are the thresholds justified? Should the affordable housing target be greater than 35%? <i>Issues to be covered include: Are housing waiting lists increasing or decreasing? Does the policy address social deprivation adequately? Does the policy reflect the Council's Housing and Community Strategies?</i>
xx.	Are issues of development viability recognised adequately? Are the assumptions of the Viability Assessment unrealistic (market conditions; CSH level 4 not 5)? Will development be deliverable?
xxi.	Is the proposed change to para 5.83 clear?
xxii.	Is 'affordable' adequately defined and consistent with <i>the NPPF</i> ? Are the tenure splits justified by the evidence base? Is there adequate detail with regard to the need and intended supply of dwelling house sizes – is this consistent with the evidence base?
xxiii.	How will the off-site provision of affordable housing be managed? Is the intended approach justified?
xxiv.	What is the evidence base in support of enabling the payment of commuted sums for alternative provision elsewhere? Will the potential for off site affordable housing provision lead to an unbalanced proportion of affordable housing on the alternative site? Is this element of policy warranted by the evidence base?
xxv.	Is the 50% requirement for affordable housing on greenfield sites warranted by the evidence base? Why should land in public ownership be treated differently? Is this justified and effective? Will 50% target for affordable housing on greenfield be ineffective in terms of stymied delivery?
xxvi.	Is para 5.89 inflexible?
xxvii.	Is the policy clear with regard to affordable housing and non residential development schemes? Is this approach supported by robust evidence?
xxviii.	Should the issue of RSL <sup>3</sup> rents be addressed within the CS?
	<b>CS Policy CS13</b>
xxix.	What is the need for accommodation to serve older people and vulnerable groups? What is the evidence to justify 3 <sup>rd</sup> para of CS13?
xxx.	Does CS13 cater adequately for the leisure and service needs of an ageing population?
	<b>CS14 Gypsy and Travellers</b>
xxxi.	Is the evidence for gypsy/traveller pitches robust? Is the 'pitch' requirement justified?
xxxii.	Is the Council's approach consistent with the SEP and <i>the government's 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' (March 2012)</i> ?

4. Other Matters

5. Close

---

<sup>3</sup> Registered Social Landlords