

Hyndburn Borough Council Core Strategy and Accrington AAP Examination

Examination Hearings

Thursday 22 September 2011

Morning Session

Attendees		
Stephen J Pratt	Planning Inspectorate	SJP
Michael Walker	Programme Officer	MW
Ursula Reilly	Note taker	
Hyndburn Council Team		
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
Other Participants		
Robert Fletcher	Ian Baseley Associates representing H Grimshaw	RF
David Proctor	Blackburn with Darwen Council	DP

5	Housing Policy H1-H3 & A1, GH1 & R1
5.1	<p>SJP introduced topic.</p> <p>Robert Fletcher representing Mr Grimshaw, clarified which site had interest in. HBC confirmed site 126 in SHLAA – long term site. RF had concerns over the scoring in SHLAA.</p> <p>DP and RF both content with overall provision. RF wants clarification on types of sites that would contribute to meeting housing provision figure. .</p> <p>SJP We have Council's Statement (Post_2.19E) and Post_2.19E _1 which includes corrections. Also have DP and RF statements.</p> <p>HBC outlined changes to Housing policies of the plan as per Schedule (September 2011 version 1):.</p> <p>FPC7 page 4-5 adds new text to H1.</p> <p>FPC8 new supporting text to H1..</p> <p>FPC 9 replacement text to housing in gardens/curtilages</p> <p>FPC10 affordability issues sets a target.</p> <p>FPC 12 change to Policy A1 housing in Accrington to update figure</p>

FPC 23 Similar to above for Great Harwood
FPC 24 Similar to above for Rishton
FPC 33 change to appendix 4 new text and revised housing trajectory
FPC 37, 41, 42 changes to appendix 9 to update overall housing figure

JM went through the statement and answered questions –
Overall provision of housing 3175 new houses for 15 year period in
Submission version
Amended – new figure 3200 net of demolition 2011 – 26 based on more up to
date monitoring
189 dwellings year 2003 – 21 (RSS period)
Roll forward short period after (2021-26)
Demise of RSS
2835 need to provide plus shortfall of 362 =
overall provision 3200 – net of demolition for period (2011 – 2026)
Made up of completions, sites with planning permission, strategic sites in
Core Strategy. No allowance for windfall sites – rate 1516 completions from
1996-2009, annual average of 117 dwellings.

Distribution – Accrington and townships 75% provision = 2400
Great Harwood 15% = 480
Rishton 10% = 320

Sufficient potential housing land

SJP Any challenges to overall housing provision amount?

- No

Several LA's reassessing housing provision under PPS3. LA's can reassess
figures.

JM Hyndburn content to use RSS figures. PPS3 Para 33 requires
consideration of most up to date population/household forecasts.

New household projections have been produced since RSS which used 2003
projections. If use latest 2008 figures, in knowledge that are crude estimates,
going to be 33,000 in 2008. End of planning period 36,000 over 18 yrs. $3000 \div$
 $18 = 167$

Latest figures would equate to 189 houses per year. SHMAA – joint with
Blackburn identifies 200 per year (which is rounded up). See SHMA page 171
Para 6.68

Projections are trend based – no policy interventions or development
constraints.

Satisfied that housing figure is supported by evidence base . Got SHLAA.

Satisfied that latest projections taken account of and satisfied PPS3 Para 33
requirements.

Latest figures in housing statement will supersede topic paper.

Confirmed statement requires no changes.

Scope in supply side to make up provision due to demolitions – yes

SJP - Policy H1 should include above amendments

JM – Yes, proposed changes put forward (FPC7 and FPC8), also needs
Policy A1, GH1 and R1 amended from 3175 to 3200. Only 25 extra houses
Insert reference to maintaining 5 yr supply into Policy H1– homework
Sustainability appraisal already undertaken.

	<p>How much, where, when, how? All responded to adequately.</p>
SP	<p>Housing renewal – years grace with additional funding provided 2011 – 12. Pennine Lancs Pathfinder got funding, some will come to Hyndburn. Concentrate on Blackburn Road. Timing may be different. Were looking at extending into East Accrington from West Accrington (this would be more renewal and selected clearance) Currently assessing its position in view of financial constraints. New Homes Bonus. Hyndburn got £70k. Any restriction on hsg development outside HMR areas? – No.</p>
b.	<p>SJP SHLAA – would we see a broad mix of sites both on PDLand on greenfield sites? JM– Yes</p> <p>FR Annual monitoring Report – appendix 3 says HBC got 1179 dwellings to meet the 5 yr supply requirement. Been updated twice. Figure now up to date. Statement – pg 6. current commitments are 429 dwellings Went through figures – satisfactory Majority within urban area Greenbelt and flood risk excluded from SHLAA No allowance for windfalls acknowledged FPC 8 Para 2 last sentence Housing trajectory – ok, explained SP Pg 6 statement para 3 from the bottom – explained what further work had been undertaken since the SHLAA</p>
5.1	<p>SJP – are SHLAA/SHMA soundly based, accurate, up to date, etc</p> <p>JM Yes, both docs have been produced in line with CLG Guidance – no challenges.</p> <p>RF confirmed not contacted HBC re SHLAA questions re availability. HBC confirmed could take concerns into consideration – would need formal request from Grimshaw, Para 4.26 – RF – raised concerns, unclear what “identified areas “ are? Is it urban areas or urban areas plus former ASR’s. Required clarification, consulted RF’s statement – page 2 para 4.26 HBC felt it was clear but would review the wording of Para 4.26 (Homework)</p> <p>SJP Queried status of ASR policy not clear? SP responded, policy not been saved. Policy framework re Areas of Special Restraint no longer exists.</p>
SJP	<p>Homework for Para 4.26 - review wording re areas of special restraint. Re RF clarification – HBC not happy? Too specific. Debate ensued. Agreed needs clarification.</p>
5.2	<p>Housing mix SJP – Is sufficient justification and evidence to support housing mix in H1?</p>

Over supply of terrace housing needs to be addressed. Provide a more balanced choice of housing. Supported by SHMA and PLHS.

SJP referred to RF's Statement pg 3 – no challenge to the housing mix

SJP not to prescriptive, sufficient flexibility?

No, a guide to be achieved over the plan period and not on a site by site basis.

SJP – Is the balance between Greenfield/Brownfield appropriate and soundly based?

FR Yes, past housing development in excess 90% on brownfield. RSS has target of 65%. SHLAA does categorise sites as Greenfield/Brownfield but not summarised into % split.

c. Responses accepted

d. SJ P Status of Interim Policy on houses in gardens

SP Policy has been subject to consultation and adopted by resolution of the Council .

SJP raised concerns – blanket presumption against any development of residential gardens – too black and white. RF agreed.

SP Principle of resistance important, may be appropriate to include word 'normally' or a 'strong presumption against'. To look at text. Plus update footnote 47 to reflect revised PPS3. DM DPD to elaborate.

SJP spoke to RF re his concerns, may not need now to attend again next week. Able to deal with his issues today.

RF Supports intention to focus development in Accrington & townships. Grimshaw Statement 3.7b – will former ASR be considered as part of rural areas policy or Accrington and Townships policy. Sites on fringe outside existing urban area should form part of area of search for site allocation. SP Yes – refer to SHLAA para 4.26 to be reviewed by next Tuesday.

5.3 Affordable Housing

SJP Any proposed change to text?

JM FPC10 introduces a target of 38 affordable dwellings per year

SJP Summarised the Councils position.

SP Yes, added that PPS3 states that national indicative minimum is 15 dwellings

Costs associated with viability assessment and puts additional burden on small developers.

Complex from a Development Management DPD perspective to negotiate and agree a S106 for a single dwelling

CIL only allows for 5 obligations to be pooled

SP Council aware that PPS3 sets the minimum threshold at 15 dwellings and

can apply lower threshold if justified. Core Strategy consistent with policy.
Viability – illogical in context of bleak picture to impose further burden.
Practicable – complex
Follow national indicative minimum threshold – should apply in Hyndburn.
Don't need to be identical with Blackburn with Darwen

DP Threshold: BwD CS seeks affordable hsg on every site (one or more dwellings)

SJP How would HBC policy harm BwD CS?

DP Need to provide a level playing field, concerned about impact on delivery on small sites – would not need to provide affordable housing in Hyndburn but would in Blackburn. Any development in BwD triggers requirement for affordable housing.

SP Both authorities used same consultants – but came to different conclusions.

SJP Hyndburn state BwD housing market area is bigger and more viable?

DP Accepts viability is more difficult in Hyndburn but no justification for a threshold of 15 whether one unit or 300.

SJP therefore Hyndburn cannot justify any threshold so have chosen national indicative minimum.

SJP Would no threshold be onerous on small developers?

DP BwD have “light touch” on sites 1-15 dwellings. Explained less info required, not necessarily from Chartered Surveyor.

SJP is the situation as bleak in BwD?

DP Blackburn has some sites that could be delivered without grant. Accepts that prospects are slightly better in BwD but does not accept there is a difference in viability between small and large sites in either.

RF Can't squeeze development industry to the pip. Current financial climate – agree with HBC view – less onerous. Example of Debyshire Dales authority with 1 dwelling threshold. Have struggled to deliver.

SJP summarised BwD position, no difference in viability between 1 and 15 dwelling threshold,

SP at Pennine level recognised we have housing market failure. Without market housing cannot rebalance market. Re viability AVHA are different
BwD study 3.2.1: 16 out of 18 schemes viable without affordable housing.
Hyndburn 4 out of 14 viable without affordable housing. Therefore not logical to ask for affordable housing studies when not viable.

RF summarised issue regarding need to pay for Council's costs to assess affordable housing studies (4.37 of CS submission document)

SP have reflected on this and propose change to remove sentence. Can be covered by proposed changes to planning fees.

RF concerned about 2 year review – should be 3 years to tie in with planning permission.

SP Notes agreement with principle but not time period. Will propose change

to 3 rather than 2 in line with period of planning permission.

SP No saved local plan policy re affordable hsg but introducing in line with Core Strategy – if not able to provide, developers will be required to provide justification.

Absolutely no inclination to change current policy as used to encourage development in current financial climate. Could be a fundamental change to plan. Don't want to place extra burden on developers.

SJP approach to off site contributions

SP will include in subsequent DPDs and SPD

SJP prospects for getting affordable housing grant?

FG HCA still alive but grant much reduced

SJP Past completions?

FR No affordable housing provided through developers. RSL been providing. Envisage 38 per year though need is 3 times that. SHMA suggests 20% should be affordable which equates to 38 per year.

Homework

delete third sentence of Para 4.37

change review period to 3 years in same Para.