

Matter 5: Housing

Issue 5a: Housing Provision and Distribution

- Q1. Is the overall level of housing provision and its distribution in the Plan consistent with the ACS? [Policy LPD 63]
- Q2. Although the distribution of housing differs in the Plan to that set out in the ACS, would it accord with the Spatial Strategy of the ACS?
- Q3. The figures in Policy LPD 63 include dwellings which have already been built since 2011, sites with extant planning permission and sites below the threshold for allocation. Does the Plan adequately demonstrate where these sites are and how many dwellings are included? Are all those that have not already been built expected to be constructed in the Plan period?
- Q4. Although a planning application for the Gedling Colliery/Chase Farm site (H9) has been submitted and granted, subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement, would it still be necessary to plan for the total of 7,550 homes set out in the ACS (Policy 2) rather than the housing target of 7,250?
- Q5. Would this provide sufficient flexibility if problems were to arise with sites coming forward, particularly given that 7,250 homes is a minimum requirement?
- Q6. Is the distribution of homes between the Key Settlements appropriate? How has this distribution evolved? Is it clear how and why the housing requirement has been reduced in the Key Settlements? [Policy LPD 63]
- Q7. If the provision of up to 260 homes in Other Villages referred to in the ACS (Policy 2) is solely to meet local needs, what evidence of local needs is there to support a requirement for 140 dwellings in the Other Villages? [Policy LPD 63]

Issue 5b: Housing Supply in the Plan period

- Q8. Have sufficient sites been allocated in the Plan to meet the target of 7,250 homes set out in the ACS? [Policies LPD 63 – LPD 68 and Policy LPD 70]
- Q9. How has the actual number of dwellings allocated been arrived at? [LPD 64 – LPD 70]
- Q10. Should a buffer be included? If so, what level should it be? Specifically, have sufficient sites been allocated to meet the housing target and should more housing be allocated?
- Q11. Are there any important development/changes since the submission of the Plan, for instance in terms of planning permissions/completions? Is the SHLAA and SHMA up to date and robust?
- Q12. What evidence is there of the percentage of previous planning permissions being constructed? For instance, how many

sites/dwellings with the benefit of planning permission have not been developed as a percentage of the total?

- Q13. On what basis are individual sites with planning permission excluded/ included within the supply calculations?
- Q14. What evidence is there to support build out rates for each site, in particular larger sites?
- Q15. Should a lapse rate be included in the calculations?
- Q16. Are all of the housing sites allocated in Policies LPD 64 to LPD 70 justified and deliverable in terms of national policy and guidance and as indicated in the Housing Trajectory? [Appendix A]
- Q17. Should the housing sites allocated in Policies LPD 64, LPD 65, LPD 66, LPD 67, LPD 68 and LPD 70 which benefit from planning permission or a resolution to grant planning permission, or are under construction, be formally allocated in the Plan? Have these sites been assessed using the same site selection process? Have any been found to be unacceptable and allocated only because they benefit from planning permission? [H6, H9, H11, H13, H14, H19, H20 and H23]
- Q18. Is a windfall allowance of 230 homes in the last 5 years of the Plan period appropriate?
- Q19. Where are the existing housing commitments? What form do they take – large or small? Is their distribution in accordance with the ACS?
- Q20. Does the housing trajectory demonstrate realistically that the housing development, for which the Plan provides, will come forward within the Plan period? [Appendix A]
- Q21. What are the main findings of the Local Plan Viability Assessment? Has this work indicated that any sites are likely to be unviable? What are the implications? Is more work necessary? [LPD/HOU/08]
- Q22. How have site densities been determined? How rigid are these figures? [Policy LPD 33]
- Q23. What is the threshold for the inclusion of sites and why?
- Q24. Is the type and size of housing provided/planned meeting/likely to meet the needs of the area?
- Q25. Are the allocations based on a robust assessment of infrastructure requirements and their deliverability, including expected sources of funding?
- Q26. In assessing the speed at which development will come forward on certain sites, has full regard been had to the proposed Gedling Access Road?
- Q27. Does the development of the Strategic Site at Top Wighay Farm for 845 dwellings, rather than 1,000 homes accord with the ACS? Would this scale of development be viable on this site?
- Q28. Overall, does the Plan deal adequately with uncertainty? Is sufficient consideration given to monitoring and triggers for review?

- Q29. Should the development of brownfield sites be undertaken prior to the use of greenfield sites? If so, how would this be achieved and what would be the implications for housing supply and deliverability?

Issue 5c: 5 Year Housing Land Supply

- Q30. Is it robustly demonstrated that the Plan can deliver a 5 year housing land supply throughout the Plan period, calculated in accordance with national policy and guidance, taking account of past delivery performance and applying the appropriate 5% or 20% buffer?
- Q31. What is the current position with regard to housing supply? Is there a 5 year supply? How has this been calculated?
- Q32. Is the use of a 5% buffer appropriate when calculating the Council's 5 year supply of deliverable housing? Is there any justification for a 20% buffer?
- Q33. What evidence is there to support the projected completions on the sites expected to deliver homes within the 5 year period 2016 – 2021, in particular on allocated sites which do not currently have planning permission?
- Q34. What evidence is there to support build out rates for each site, in particular larger sites?

Issue 5d: Range of different types of homes

- Q35. Does the Plan make appropriate provisions for a range of different types of homes in accordance with national policy (Policies LPD 36 – LPD 42)?

Issue 5e: Gypsy and Traveller Sites

- Q36. Does the Plan make appropriate provision for Gypsy and Traveller Sites, having regard to evidence of need?
- Q37. Does the Council's approach in relation to traveller sites generally conform with the expectations of the ACS and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (August 2015)? If not, why not?
- Q38. The South Nottinghamshire Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (January 2016) identifies a baseline need for a total of 3 additional pitches in Gedling Borough between 2014 and 2029. The Plan does not seek to provide any pitches within the Borough. How does the Council intend to ensure that the 3 additional pitches required within the Borough will be provided?
- Q39. Is the Council's approach to future provision, set out in an additional paragraph suggested in proposed MM37 appropriate?

Issue 5f: Affordable Housing

- Q40. Does the Plan make appropriate provision for affordable housing? [Policy LPD 36]
- Q41. What are the targets for the provision of affordable housing? [Policy LPD 36]
- Q42. Why are these targets dependent on location?

- Q43. What is the justification for this?
- Q44. Should the targets and the locations to which they apply be set out in an appendix to the Plan, as suggested in the Council's proposed MM64, without reference to the Affordable Housing SPD in Policy LPD 36 as suggested in proposed MM63? Are they clearly defined?
- Q45. As it is intended that they apply to allocated and unallocated sites, should this be set out in the supporting text to the Policy as suggested in the Council's proposed MM63 and MM64?
- Q46. What has been achieved in recent years?
- Q47. Should the Plan make provision for Starter Homes?

Issue 5g: Self Build/Custom Build Homes

- Q48. Does the Plan make appropriate provision for the development of Self Build/Custom Build homes in a range of locations and on a variety of sites? [Policy LPD 41]
- Q49. How would the appropriate percentage of the dwellings to be provided for Self Build/Custom Build homes be defined?
- Q50. What is the demand/need for Self Build/Custom Build homes in the Borough?

Issue 5h: Specialist Accommodation

- Q51. Does the Plan make appropriate provision for the development of C2 accommodation? [Policy LPD 38]

Issue 5i: Residential Design

- Q52. Do Policies LPD 32 – LPD35 incorporate appropriate measures to ensure good design in new developments?
- Q53. Should the Plan include a policy on space standards?

Issue 5j: Residential Densities

- Q54. Are the residential densities included in Policy LPD 33 appropriate and achievable?
- Q55. What evidence is there to support lower densities of 20dph in Burton Joyce, Lambley, Ravenshead and Woodborough and 25dph in Bestwood Village, Calverton and Newstead? [Policy LPD 33]