

PENDLE CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION

Agenda - Session 6

15.00 Wednesday 15 April 2015

The Wilson Room, Nelson Town Hall

Matter - Housing Needs

The purpose of this session is to explore whether the Plan addresses the needs for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community.

The Plan has a target that 40% of housing will be affordable. However, because of viability issues, the Council's target ranges for the spatial areas of the Borough are well below 40%.

Policies within the Plan indicate the priority to be given to meeting different housing needs and the proportions of property types and sizes that should be sought.

Issues

1. Is the affordable housing target of 40% appropriate having regard to the evidence base of housing need?
2. Is the affordable housing target realistic and deliverable having regard to the doubts over the viability of the % of affordable housing provision that can be delivered and the area based affordable housing targets within Policy LIV4? If the 40% target is not realistic and deliverable (see CD/07/01) how should the Council's aspirations be expressed?
3. Are the sized threshold and area based affordable housing targets in Table LIV4a justified and deliverable, noting the revisions proposed to the table in the light of PPG advice?
Should affordable housing contributions be sought on a greater range of housing developments e.g. green field sites in the M65 corridor?
What is the derivation of the targets for the West Craven towns and Rural Pendle?
Should the requirement to demonstrate viability apply to those schemes that meet or exceed the targets set out in Table LIV4a?
Is it appropriate to revise targets based on the AMR, outside the development plan process?
4. How are different mechanisms expected to contribute to the target e.g. obligations on market housing sites, sites developed by social housing providers, exception sites, commuted sums, empty homes back into use, regeneration areas?
What contribution could be made by the Government's 'Starter Home Initiative'?
5. Is the requirement to retest viability if development does not start in 2 years within Policy LIV4 justified, having regard to the need to renew permissions

PENDLE CORE STRATEGY EXAMINATION

after 3 years?

6. Is the tenure split proposed by Policy LIV4 justified?
Should 'open market discounted housing' be considered as an option?

7. Is the guide to the property types and sizes within Tables LIV5a and LIV5b justified by the existing supply of small terraced houses, the requirement for lower density in some areas and the objective of higher value/aspirational housing?
Should the need for higher value housing be explicitly referred to in Policy LIV 5?

Main Evidence Base

CD/04/01 – SHMA

CD/04/02 – Pendle Housing Needs Study Update Report

CD/04/03 – SHLAA

CD/04/04 – Strategic Housing Land Site Allocation Report

CD/07/01 – Pendle Development Viability Study

C/004 – Council response to Inspector's Further Questions

C/006 – Council response to questions within Preliminary Schedule of Matters and Issues

Suggested Modifications

The Council suggests Modifications to Policy LIV4 and its justification to explain the differences between 'need' and what can realistically be delivered.

It is proposed to amend the site size threshold for affordable housing in Rural Pendle (Table LIV4a) to reflect the recent change to the Government's Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

Participants

PBC (*statement HS6/001*)

Andrew Bickerdike, Turley Associates (for Peel Investments (North) Ltd)
(*representation 868120*)

Michael Courcier, Barton Wilmore (for Junction Property Limited) (*statement HS6/002 and representation 818046*)

Matthew Good, HBF (*statement HS6/003 and representation 755915*)