

Mansfield Local Plan Examination

Inspector - Mrs S Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

Programme Officer – Ian Kemp

idkemp@icloud.com

07723 009166

HEARING SESSION AGENDA

22 May 2019 9.30am & 2pm

Note – the additional points in bold have been identified for further discussion at the hearing sessions in addition to the MIQs

1. Inspector’s introduction
 2. Participant introductions
 3. Any follow up matters from Week 1
 4. **Main Matter 6 – Whether or not the proposed housing allocations are soundly based and deliverable, whether other housing policies are soundly based and whether a 5 year supply of land can be provided on adoption and throughout the plan period**
 - 1 Is the site selection process for the housing allocations soundly based, including sustainability appraisal and the testing of reasonable alternatives? Is the site selection methodology based on an appropriate set of criteria?
 - 2 Are the reasons for selecting allocated sites and rejecting other clearly set out and justified?
 - 3 Are the following assumptions for residential development set out in the Housing Land Availability Assessment and Policy Assessment (HE1) appropriate and based on robust evidence:
 - Gross to net developable areas for residential development (Table 5.5)
 - Density of 35 dwellings per net developable hectare.
- Does the evidence relating to the density of development on greenfield/brownfield sites in Table E1 of document HE1 have any implications for the assumptions made in estimating the capacity of the allocated sites?**
- 4 What approach has been taken to site capacity where specific site constraints or developer intentions are known?

Having regard to the hearing statements, discussion at the hearing sessions will focus on the following sites in relation to the questions below - H1a, H1b, H1c, H1d, H1e, H1f, H1g, H1l, H1m, H1o, H1q

- a. Is the amount of development proposed for each site justified having regard to any constraints and the provision of necessary infrastructure?
- b. Are any further safeguards or mitigation measures necessary to achieve an acceptable form of development including in relation to:
 - ecology, biodiversity, green infrastructure and agricultural land;
 - landscape quality and character;
 - heritage assets;
 - strategic and local infrastructure including transport;
 - air and water quality, noise pollution, land stability and flood risk.
- c. Overall, would the site allocation be soundly based and are any main modifications necessary for soundness?

(Note – timescale for delivery in the trajectory covered in question 12)

- 6 Have Policies H3 and H6 been positively prepared to meet the housing needs of different groups having regard to the findings of the SHMA (H4) and Housing Needs of Particular Groups (H3), including the need for accessible and adaptable homes? What are the implications for overall plan viability?

Provision of bungalows within the housing mix and any impact on viability

Whether or not the evidence, including on viability justifies a proportion of dwellings being constructed to M4(2) standards (accessible and adaptable homes)

- 7 Are the thresholds and targets for affordable housing in Policy H4 justified and based on a robust assessment of economic viability? Are the different percentages for greenfield and brownfield land justified by the viability assessment?

Effect of viability testing including affordable housing as defined in the 2019 National Planning Policy Framework and any implications for the delivery of Policy H4

Whether the threshold of 11 or more dwellings in Policy H4 2(a) is still appropriate having regard to the definition of

major development in the 2019 NPPF

- 8 Is the provision in Policy H5 for at least 5% of the dwelling plots on sites of more than 100 dwellings to be provided for self build or custom build homes appropriate and what evidence justifies the threshold of 100 dwellings? What evidence is available to demonstrate the level of interest in these types of dwellings?

The number of people on the register and any planning applications made

How unsold plots would be dealt with and the marketing period

Any impact on SUE1 and SUE2 in relation to viability

- 9 Is Policy H7 clear and justified and will it provide sufficient guidance for plan users?

Should the policy include reference to the amenities of the occupiers of the proposed dwellings?

- 10 Does Policy H8 set out appropriate and clear criteria for the assessment of planning applications for gypsy, traveller and travelling showpeople's sites that may come forward during the plan period? Are any main modifications necessary for soundness?
- 11 Taking into account completions since 2013, what is the residual amount of housing that needs to be delivered to meet the housing requirement of 6500 dwellings over the plan period?

Update on completions 1.4.13 -31.3.19

- 12 Is the development proposed on the sites listed in Policy H1 deliverable in the timescales envisaged in the updated housing trajectory in document H2? Are the assumptions for start dates and rates of delivery on each site appropriate and justified?

Updated list in Council's MM6 hearing statement (p63)

- 13 Does the updated trajectory in the Housing Technical Paper Addendum (H2) provide an accurate indication of housing supply in the plan period from:
- Completions 2013 – 2019 (as at 31.3.18);
 - Sites with planning permission for 10 or more dwellings

- (large sites);
Sites with planning permission for 9 or less dwellings
(small sites)

Updated trajectory in Council's MM6 hearing statement (Annex C)

- 14 Are the assumptions for the 'non delivery' of sites set out in section 3 of document H6 justified and based on robust evidence?
- 15 Are the assumptions about the rate of windfall development (380 dwellings from 2023 – 2033) justified and are there any policy changes which could change the rate of delivery in the future compared with historical rates?
- 16 Does the proposed supply of 8597 dwellings set out in Table 5.1 of the plan against a requirement of 6500 dwellings incorporate a sufficient 'buffer' to allow for non-delivery as well as providing choice and flexibility in the supply of housing land?

Updated supply figure in Council's MM6 hearing statement (p69)

The approach to SUE1 and SUE2 as components of the supply

- 17 Does past delivery and/or the recent Housing Delivery Test results have any implications for the appropriate buffer to be added to the five year housing land supply?
- 18 What is the 5 year requirement for the relevant period on adoption of the plan?

What requirement figure should housing delivery since the start of the plan period be assessed against?

- 19 Is the approach to calculating the 5 year requirement set out in document H2 appropriate and consistent with national policy, in particular the deduction of 'oversupply' from the subsequent 5 year period?
- 20 Based on a requirement of 325 dwellings per year, would the plan help to ensure a 5 year supply of deliverable sites on adoption and over the plan period? Is there clear evidence to support the delivery of sites in the relevant 5 year period?

Will sites meet the definition of 'deliverable' in the 2019 Framework?

5. Follow up items and close of hearing session