



Position  
Statement

3 Brindleyplace  
Birmingham  
B1 2JB

T: +44 (0)8449 02 03 04  
F: +44 (0)121 609 8314

# North West Leicestershire Local Plan Examination

Position Statement on behalf of  
Jelson Limited

Matter 5 – Housing Land Supply

December 2016



## Matter 5 – Housing Land Supply

Are the housing sites with planning permission nominated in Policy H1 deliverable in terms of national policy and guidance and as indicated in the housing trajectory?

We comment below on those sites nominated within Policy H1 in respect of which we have concerns. All other sites nominated in Policy H1 are considered to be deliverable.

Site	Comments
Holywell Spring Farm	Development deliverable but likely to proceed at a slower pace than trajectory indicates. Possible viability issues and River Mease 'Second Window' is currently a limiting factor.
South of Park Lane, Castle Donington	Development not currently viable. Development requires public sector funding support. Unclear how / when this will be resolved.
Standard Hill / West of Highfield Street	Viability concerns although no obvious barriers to development. Assuming development remains viable, it will be deliverable but will contribute housing at a slower rate than the trajectory indicates.
Land North of Grange Road	Development not currently viable. Developer seeking further relaxation in respect of affordable housing and infrastructure obligations, together with modified planning conditions. Unclear how / when this will be resolved. South East Coalville also faces utilities challenges that will take time to quantify and resolve. Cost associated with this not yet known (see IDP).
Acresford Road, Donnithorpe	Council has approved a relaxation of the affordable housing requirement to address viability issues but site not yet with a developer and so not demonstrably available or achievable.
Ashby Road, Kegworth	Affected by HS2. Not deliverable.

**Are the housing sites with resolutions to approve nominated in Policy H2 deliverable in terms of national policy and guidance and as indicated in the housing trajectory?**

As above, we comment in the table below on those sites in respect of which we have concerns.

Site	Comments
Jackson Street, Coalville	Development unviable and so not demonstrably achievable.
North and South of Grange Road, Hugglescote	Developer faces significant challenges in respect of infrastructure (highways and utilities in particular). Unclear at present what highway improvements will be required and when, and whether any of these will necessitate the acquisition of third party land (concerns have emerged in this respect at the Hugglescote Crossroads). Utilities issues not yet quantified or costed. Ecological surveys need to be refreshed (badgers, bats and reptiles believed to be on site). Ground investigations and fluvial modelling to be carried out. Even if available and acvhievable, site most unlikely to deliver as soon as Council / developer predict or at the rate predicted. 130dpa is wholly unrealistic in the Coalville market. Even a modest adjustment down to 90dpa would have a significant impact on the trajectory. Failure to deliver policy compliant levels of affordable housing will have significant adverse effect on affordable housing delivery generally.
West of High Street, Measham	Site not available. Development not viable. Development not deliverable.
Blackfordby Lane, Moira	Site not available, not with developer and not demonstrably achievable.

**Should the housing sites with resolutions to approve nominated in Policy H2 be formally allocated in the Plan?**

No. The Plan may take account of developments committed by planning permissions and resolutions but these sites should not be allocated for development. The Plan should focus on allocating sites that have not been the subject of applications for planning permission; in other words making provision for development beyond existing commitments, providing choice and flexibility and dealing with needs beyond 520dpa that the Council is presently ignoring.

**Are the housing sites allocated at H3a-c justified and deliverable in terms of national policy and guidance and as indicated in the housing trajectory?**

Site H3a appears to be deliverable but is likely to have a slower start than the trajectory indicates and we would question whether it will deliver 130dpa from 2025 onwards as the Council suggests.

Site 3b is not justified or deliverable. It is land locked and cannot be developed without third party land being acquired.

Site H3c is affected by HS2 and is not deliverable.

**Does the trajectory demonstrate realistically that the housing development for which the Plan provides will come forward within the Plan period?**

No. There are numerous sites in respect of which there is uncertainty in respect of delivery and this is not adequately reflected in the trajectory.

**Is it robustly demonstrated that the Plan can deliver a Five 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 five or twenty per cent buffer?**

No. For the purposes of our Client's appeal in respect of Land off Hall Lane (APP/G2435/W/16/3150237 - being heard at Inquiry commencing on 17 January 2017) we have examined the Council's December 2016 data on delivery and land supply and have concluded that:

- a) the Council has satisfied its housing requirement (either Structure Plan, RSS or its proposed 520dpa) in only 5 of the last 15 years and 2 of the last 6 years;
- b) applying the Council's proposed requirement of 520dpa (which we consider to be flawed), it has amassed a shortfall of 170 dwellings in the last 5.5 years;
- c) in the same period it has delivered only 527 affordable dwellings – half of what it needs to deliver;
- d) the Council is one that should be applying a 20% buffer and seeking to make up the shortfall as soon as possible (in the first 5 year period);
- e) looking forward, the Council is only likely to deliver 2,477 dwellings in the first 5 year period compared with a requirement (on its own numbers but with a 20% buffer) of 3324; and

f) beyond the first five year period, the trajectory becomes more and more reliant on a small number of large sites which are unlikely to deliver at the rates specified. Moreover, any kind of failure in respect of any of those sites will have a significant adverse effect on supply.

Moreover, if our submissions on Matter 3 are accepted, the trajectory is woefully short of where it will need to be, both in the first 5 year period and all subsequent 5 year periods.

**GVA**