

The notes of this meeting are intended as a general account of the meeting and are not a verbatim record

**Hyndburn Borough Council Core Strategy and Accrington AAP Examination**

**Examination Hearings**

**Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2011**  
**Afternoon Session**

<b>Attendees</b>		
Stephen J Pratt	Planning Inspectorate	SJP
Michael Walker	Programme Officer	MW
Steve Watson	Note taker	
<b>Hyndburn Council Team</b>		
Simon Prideaux	Head of Planning and Transportation	SP
Joanne Macholc	Principal Planning Officer	JM
Farooq Rafiq	Assistant Planning Officer	FR
Fiona Goodfellow	Housing Strategy and Policy Manager	FG
Cllr Bernard Dawson	Chair of Planning	BD
<b>Other Participants</b>		
David Proctor	(Blackburn With Darwen Council)	DP
Robert Fletcher	Ian Baseley Associates representing H Grimshaw	RF

SJP	Asked participants to summarise and conclude Affordable Housing threshold comments.
DP	Made 4 Points. 1 A threshold would harm BwD's housing market, and would create a non-level playing field with Blackburn. 2. AVHA used a sample of sites and could not cover all eventualities in terms of range of sites. 3. Never achieve target of 20% (or 38 dwellings) if you only seek on sites over 15 dwellings. 4. Accepts current economic difficulties but does not accept that difference in viability between small and large sites  Application of a threshold is an inappropriate response as evidence of viability.
SP	Government is seeking to ensure no unreasonable requirements on developers. Council chosen to apply national minimum threshold and threshold of 1 is not viable or applicable. Will not cause any harm to Blackburn with Darwen..
SJP	Summarised and will consider if should be a change.

SJP	Asked RF to summarise position re: viability report requirements.
RF	Supportive text at para 4.37 already onerous task to undertake viability assessment and to ask developer to fund the Council's review of that assessment is onerous due to cost. Developer already demonstrating if cost is viable.
SJP	Developer expected to pay cost of independent assessment by council.
SP	Council has reflected and is prepared to remove 3 <sup>rd</sup> sentence from para 4.37 Government reviewing approach to planning fees and could be captured as part of that process.
SJP	Homework task.
RF	Further concern regarding the 2 year period for review of S106, not consistent with period for planning permission (3 years).
SP	RF agrees with rationale but not the time period. Time period for outline consent being 3 years dovetail with planning consent. Concluded would be happy to modify to 3 years. Review would be done in line with planning consent.
SJP	PPS3 requires Local Authorities to identify certain things with regards to consider in affordable housing. Where would further details on Affordable Housing be provided?
SP	Be in Development Management DPD otherwise SPD (affordable housing)
SJP	Size and type of affordable housing will be in Development Management DPD and Affordable Housing SPD.  Range of circumstances when affordable housing will be provided has been done.  Developer contributions, P4.35 of Core Strategy. Is need for affordable housing evidenced.
DP	Gross need in Hyndburn of 665 net per year, down to 156 per year if private rented sector taken into account. CS only seeks 20% or 38 a year. Not able to provide the no of units needed.
SP	Need to revisit the SHMA. Wouldn't be viable to provide even when economy functioning normally.
JM	SHMA recommends as a realistic figure for affordable housing would be 20% of overall housing provision (see para 6.44 of SHMA)
SJP	Affordable housing not affordable without grant funding.

	<p>In Council how will sufficient affordable housing be delivered? What are current and future prospects of grants funding?</p>
FG	<p>HCA still has an affordable housing programme but much reduced.</p>
SJP	<p>Have RSLs been turned down for grant</p>
FG	<p>Had grant for Project Phoenix, Within Grove. RSLs put bids in for affordable housing. Likelihood of grant is less than before.</p>
SP	<p>RSLs reviewing concerns over ability to re-invest and availability of financing.</p>
SJR	<p>Plan has target of 38 a year does this include provision of RSLs or just on market housing sites of 15 of more dwellings.</p>
SP	<p>Will include on site provision and will include provision by RSLs. The total can come from S106 or market development and RSLs.</p>
SJP	<p>How may affordable houses have been provided in previous years</p>
FR	<p>Annual Monitoring Reports indicator H5 – 2009-2010 indicates 12 social rented home are provided and included RSL.</p>
FG	<p>Figure for 2010-11 was nearer 30</p>
SJP	<p>Turn to Gypsy and Travellers. H3 Policy and statement explain it. Sub 1.2 Policy 29 – saved Policy from Lancashire Structure Plan</p>
FR	<p>Reference Post 2.29 for JLSP policy 29 Gypsy and Traveller accommodation assessment CS_Supp1.5.</p>
SP	<p>Page v in preface of unpublished Panel report – covers the weight to be given to technical evidence. Hyndburn has a large Gypsy and Traveller community in it and concerns over distribution of sites. Previous policies reinforced patterns of distribution. Hyndburn reacted positively to change mechanisms for better distributions. Felt proposed distribution to 2016 represented a step change in way distribution would be managed. Sought to ensure Core Strategy fitted with RSS and drafted policies that would provide 10 permanent and 5 transient pitches identified in RSS. Planning applications submitted for 15 pitches at Sanky House Farm and would be basis of Councils provision to 2016 when will reassess needs. Gives chance to see what comes out of National Level. Concerns that approach going back to authorities setting own targets. Provision in Hyndburn for Travellers and Showpeople accommodation which meets the needs for whole of Pennine Lancashire. Lots of existing sites in urban area and at Whinney Hill. Existing 104 pitches over 14 sites received planning permission and future need provided at Sanky House Farm. Land at Sanky House Farm in site</p>

	<p>allocation DPD although has planning permission. Members concerned about pressure on Hyndburn from Policy point of view and wished to see a more even distribution across the North West. No reason why other authorities shouldn't share distribution. Gypsy and Traveller allocations were not deemed fair. Submitted Draft Review (CS_Supp1.2) Page 5 footnote 4 - Gypsy and Traveller need is on a need to where it arises basis. Gypsy and Traveller allocations interpreted very rigorously as if no provision no need arises.</p>
SJP	Table 7.2 of Submitted Draft shows Hyndburn has 104 pitches in 2007. Now 110 plus additional 15 by 2016.
FG	Should have read 86 not 104. But the 10 and 5 are correct.
SJP	Table 7.3 of Submitted Draft shows Hyndburn minimum additional Traveller and Show plots required equates to 0. Endorsed by Panel as 18 already provided and that would continue.
SP	Provided an interim policy but says same thing and overtaken by Core Strategy.
SJP	Interim Policy adopted May 2010 should be included as a document and spells out background and sets out policy similar to Core Strategy. Proposed Sanky House Farm plot next to existing site.
SP	Not cancelled, still adopted policy. Reflects Core Strategy which has not been adopted yet.
SJP	Policy is effectively the same as Policy H3 but identifies need beyond 2016 and has criteria to assess Planning applications.
SP	Criteria for considering Planning Applications for G & T after 2016 would be considered by the Development Management DPD.
SJP	Government Circulars say should set out criteria which should be in Core Strategy but can be diverted to Development Management DPD.
SP	Before 2016 will have to undertake another review of need under policies in existence at that time.
SJP	You've made representations on recent Government consultation on concerns that allocations of provision will revert to local authorities. No further preclusion for additional provision now.
SP	If application in area considered suitable would be considered on its merit. If proposal unacceptable sufficient provision at Sanky House Farm. No Policy but sufficient guidance.
RF	Similar representations that GTAA is used for allocations are being made by

	the Gypsy and Traveller representatives.
SP	No further information other than HAA and criteria level and not being worked on at local level other than covered by Pennine Lancashire and Partial Review. P7 of Pennine Lancashire Housing Strategy original one much stronger than the refreshed version.  P 48.9 Policy Aim 11. Pennine Lancashire Housing Strategy
SJP	Interim policy should be included as a background document. Partial review talked about a 3% compound increase, if adopted will result in an additional 40 – 50 pitches. Approach after 2016 considered in a future review Government intends to revoke circulars 01/2006 and 04/2007 along with guidance. Don't know outcome of consultation.
SP	Will give it little weight
SJP	Concludes and summarised issues on topic Hyndburn on Gypsy and Travellers.  Brings to a close today's proceedings