



**DAVENTRY DISTRICT SETTLEMENTS AND COUNTRYSIDE
LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION**

**STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF:
L & Q Estates (Formerly Gallagher Estates)
Respondent Reference PS044**

**MATTER 3: Delivering the Housing Requirement over the Plan
period**

Pegasus Group
4 The Courtyard
Church Street
Lockington
Derbyshire
DE74 2SL

Telephone: (01509) 670806 Facsimile: (01509) 672247

PPG Ref: EMS.2785

Date: May 2019

COPYRIGHT

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of **Pegasus Group**

MATTER 3: Delivering the housing requirement over the plan period**Issue 1:**

Whether the approach towards the supply and delivery of housing land is justified, effective and consistent with national policy, so as to ensure the timely delivery of the JCS housing requirement for Daventry District.

Questions

1. *Is there a specific reason or justification why the housing trajectory in the Plan and the Housing Land Availability Report 2018 (HOU7) when setting out the completions and housing land supply position as at 1 April 2018, exclude the NRDA component listed in the JCS? Does the Plan intend to support the delivery of the housing requirement in the NRDA in Daventry as set out in the JCS?*
- 3.1 Appendix J to the Submission Draft Plan sets out the Housing Trajectory for the Plan period. This trajectory is also included in the Housing Background Paper (ref HOU1).
- 3.2 The trajectory is incomplete as it does not set out the position in relation to housing requirements for Daventry as set out in the JCS including that part of the NRDA falling within the district. The JCS is clear that Daventry District Council needs to plan for about 12,730 dwellings over the plan period to 2029.
- 3.3 Without a complete trajectory, it is it is not possible to assess how the plan meets the spatial principle set out at Policy SP1 to assist with the delivery of plan-led development to meet Northampton's needs where this cannot be accommodated in the NRDA.
2. *Is the housing trajectory in the Plan realistic? Does it demonstrate a supply of deliverable sites and developable sites that would meet the JCS housing requirement for Daventry District?*
3. *Is more recent monitoring information now available and does this alter the actual and forecast completion rate of dwellings against the expectations of the JCS?*
- 3.4 For the first part of the Plan period up to 2018, completions for the rural area totalled some 1,826 dwellings. This amounts to some 70% of

completions for the non-NRDA part of the district. From 2018 onwards, the contribution to housing completions from the rural area will reduce to 30% of overall provision. Development in the rural area has contributed to help meeting strategic housing requirements for the first part of the plan period. Suitable and sustainable sites have come forward in Primary and Secondary Service Centres and are an important part of housing delivery in the district.

- 3.5 The strategy of the plan means that this source of supply will be restricted in the latter part of the plan period, with development in the rural areas being limited to windfall sites from 2023.
- 3.6 The overprovision of some 1,559 dwellings identified in the Housing Trajectory relies on a significant step change in build rates on sites around Daventry Town. An additional urban extension is proposed at Daventry South West and this is expected to deliver 800 dwellings in the plan period. In relying on delivery from two strategic sites and restricting growth in the rural areas, the Council risks compromising the delivery of the strategic housing requirement if expected build rates are not achieved.
- 3.7 The Part 2 Plan takes no account of the requirement of the district to make provision for 5,750 homes in the NRDA and the extent to which there is likely to be a shortfall in provision over the plan period. The NRDA Background Paper (GEN03) suggests that there will be a significant shortfall against the JCS requirement. The Part 2 Plan must set out a strategy for the district to address this shortfall to ensure that it meets its full housing requirement as set out in the JCS. As currently framed the plan is unsound.
- 3.8 As part of a strategy to address shortfalls in provision in the NRDA, the Council should look to allocate additional housing in the more sustainable rural settlements well related to Northampton. Flore lies some 12km to the west of Northampton with the Stagecoach D1 service providing 27-minute journey time. The Council needs to amend the plan to address the full housing requirement for the district, and in dealing with likely shortfalls in the NRDA, should consider the opportunities for allocation in sustainable rural settlements well connected to Northampton, such as Flore.
- 3.9 The Council has published a Housing Land Availability Report, April 2019 (HOU10). This includes a five-year land supply assessment but does not

provide an updated housing trajectory for the plan period. If more up-to-date information is provided, we reserve the right to make further submissions on any new housing data as necessary.

4. *Is there a sufficient range and choice of sites allocated in the Plan in terms of location, type and size, to provide adequate flexibility to meet the JCS housing requirement for Daventry District? Would the housing allocations ensure that the Plan would be consistent with the Framework, in so far as it seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing?*

5. *Are the sites that are relied upon for the supply of housing in rural areas – deliverable and/or developable? What evidence is there to support this?*

3.10 As a result of the restrictive approach to further development in the rural areas, development in the rural areas would be restricted to windfall site releases for the last 6 years of the plan period. 82% of completions will be from sites at Daventry Town. The plan is over-reliant on delivery from a limited number of large sites in one location. This does not reflect the objective of the 2012 NPPF to boost significantly the supply of housing and does not provide a sufficient range and choice of sites to ensure the plan can flexibly respond to changing circumstances.

3.11 The approach of the plan is short-sighted in seeking to address under delivery from the strategic site allocation at Daventry North East by allocating a further large sustainable urban extension to the south west of Daventry. This approach will require annual completions at Daventry Town well in excess of build rates achieved in the past.

3.12 The plan should provide further flexibility through the allocation of additional sites in the more sustainable rural settlements such as Flore, which is also well placed to accommodate some of the unmet NRDA needs, or alternatively identify reserve site allocations that can be brought forward as required.

6. *Is the expected contribution from windfalls, as included in the housing trajectory for both Daventry Town and rural areas, realistic and justified by evidence?*

7. *Is it appropriate to apply a lapse rate of 20 dwellings per annum from 2018/19 onwards as set out in the housing trajectory for planning*

permissions or neighbourhood plan allocations in rural areas? Is such an approach justified by evidence?

8. *Are the neighbourhood plan allocations that are identified in the housing trajectory consistent with those within made neighbourhood Plans? If not, what certainty is there that any further allocations will be part of a made neighbourhood plan?*

3.13 The Housing Trajectory included at Appendix J of the Submission Plan includes an annual windfall of 17 dwellings a year for Daventry Town, and 86 dwellings a year for the rural areas, both from 2020- an annual total of 103 dwellings. The Housing Land Supply report 2019 (HOU10) provides evidence of previous windfall completions for Daventry Town and the Rural Areas for the last 10 years. This evidence shows an average annual windfall completion rate excluding garden land of 93 dwellings (18 dwellings a year for Daventry Town and 75 dwellings a year for the Rural Areas). This would suggest that the assumptions on windfall provision, particularly for the Rural Areas is overstated.

3.14 The tightly defined settlement limits for the rural settlements will mean that opportunities for further infill development are likely to be restricted.

3.15 In terms of a lapse rate, the approach is considered to be reasonable and is supported by evidence as set out in the Housing Land Availability Report, 2019.

3.16 It is understood that the trajectory for the Rural Areas only includes one Neighbourhood Plan allocation without permission at West Haddon. In terms of future Neighbourhood Plan allocations, there is no incentive for Neighbourhood Plans to make allocations when the Part 2 Local Plan Strategy is to make no further provision in the rural areas. It cannot therefore be assumed that additional housing will come forward through Neighbourhood Plans.

9. *What contingencies are in place should housing delivery fall below expectations with the housing site allocations in Daventry Town, the rural areas and/or the NRDA in Daventry District? Would it be necessary to consider other areas for development?*

3.17 There are no specific contingencies included in the plan to address potential shortfalls in delivery. Policies RA1-RA3 refer to 'exceptional

circumstances' where development outside settlement confines will be considered, including where housing supply is less than five years. The plan should take a more positive approach through the allocation of additional sites in the more sustainable rural settlements to both provide a wider range of development opportunities and greater flexibility. Alternatively, the plan should identify reserve sites that could come forward as and when required.

10. *Are the approaches to self-build and custom housebuilding in Policy HO5, rural workers dwellings in Policy HO6 and rural exception site selection in Policy HO7, justified, effective and consistent with national policy?*
 11. *Is Policy HO8 justified and consistent with national policy, with respect to the specific requirements relating to market housing, affordable housing, housing standards and specialist accommodation?*
 12. *Is there any evidence that any of the policy requirements on Policy HO8 would affect the viability or deliverability of housing sites? Is the policy sufficiently flexible? Would it allow for specific circumstances, including viability to be taken into account?*
- 3.18 Despite some changes to Policy HO8 in response to representations on the Submission Draft Plan, the Policy remains overly prescriptive in its approach to the provision of housing mix on sites. The policy remains unnecessarily inflexible in applying specific percentage requirements to be provided on every housing site for both market and affordable housing.
- 3.19 There will inevitably be site specific circumstances that would justify an alternative approach to mix. The mix should be expressed as an overall district-wide target to guide negotiations on specific sites. The policy should be amended to provide indicative percentage ranges to guide site negotiations.
13. *Are the recommendations of the viability assessment (GEN01) reflected in the plan?*
 14. *In overall terms, would the Plan realistically deliver the dwellings required over the plan period by the JCS?*
- 3.20 As outlined above, the plan is over-reliant on ambitious delivery rates from larger housing sites around Daventry Town. This does not provide for a range and choice of sites or the flexibility to deal with lower than expected

delivery rates. The plan should take a more flexible approach through the inclusion of additional allocations in the more sustainable rural settlements.

Issue 2:

Whether the proposed allocation of sites and site selection accords with the JCS and is consistent with national policy.

Questions

1. *Was the methodology used to assess and select the proposed site allocations appropriate? Were reasonable alternatives considered and tested?*
 2. *Are the reasons for selecting the preferred sites and rejecting alternative sites, clear and consistent? Is there a reason why sites where the SA identified significant negative effects such as Daventry South West (HO1) were selected, whereas others were not?*
 3. *Have any potential effects of the proposed site allocations on the predicted annual delivery rate of housing at the Daventry North East Sustainable Urban Extension (JCS allocation) and/or the NRDA's been adequately considered? What is the current situation with respect to those sites allocated in the JCS?*
- 3.21 In preparing the submission plan the Council ruled out the consideration of additional housing provision in the rural areas as a reasonable alternative on the basis that the spatial distribution was set in the JCS. Policy S6 of the JCS dealing with monitoring and review, allows for issues of delivery to be addressed through local plans. The Council should not have ruled out the consideration of additional provision in the rural areas as a reasonable alternative to address shortfalls in delivery at Daventry Town.
- 3.22 As a result of this decision, the Council limited itself to the identification of additional sites around Daventry Town and did not consider alternative distribution options as an approach to addressing shortfalls and providing for additional flexibility in housing provision.
- 3.23 Additional provision in the rural areas is a reasonable alternative that should have been properly considered. The overly restrictive approach to further development in the rural areas means that the plan has limited flexibility and does not allow for any further provision in the more

sustainable rural settlements in the remainder of the plan period to 2029. Rural settlements well related to Northampton are also well placed to help address shortfalls in provision in the NRDA part of Daventry District – an issue that must be addressed through the Part 2 Plan.