

Chichester Local Plan Review 2035
Preferred Approach
Gladman Representations



February 2019

CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	2
1 Introduction.....	3
1.1 Context.....	3
1.2 Plan Making.....	3
2 National Planning Policy and Guidance.....	4
2.1 NPPF (2018).....	4
3 Planning Practice Guidance.....	6
3.1 Overview.....	6
4 Legal Compliance.....	8
4.1 Duty to Cooperate.....	8
4.2 Sustainability Appraisal.....	9
5 Evidence Base.....	10
5.1 Duty to Cooperate.....	10
5.2 Housing Need and the Standard Methodology.....	10
6 Local Plan Review Policies.....	12
6.1 Spatial Planning Vision and Local Plan Strategic Objectives.....	12
6.2 Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.....	12
6.3 Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy.....	12
6.4 Policy S3: Development Strategy.....	13
6.5 Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs.....	13
6.6 Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035.....	15
6.7 Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs.....	16
6.8 Policy S24: Countryside & DM22: Development in the Countryside.....	16
6.9 Policy DM2: Housing Mix.....	16
6.10 Policy DM27: Historic Environment.....	17
6.11 Policy DM28: Natural Environment.....	17
7 Conclusion.....	18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- i. This submission provides Gladman Developments' written representations to the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 preferred approach.
- ii. Gladman specialise in the promotion of strategic land for residential development with associated community infrastructure and the promotion and construction of employment land.
- iii. Gladman welcome the opportunity to comment on the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035, and support the Council in seeking to take positive decisions to meet its development needs despite the constraints faced by the District. This representation contains comments designed to help the Council achieve a sound plan to guide the delivery of its housing and economic needs as well as associated infrastructure improvements and community facilities.
- iv. This representation makes comments on the following matters:
 - a. Duty to Cooperate
 - b. Housing Requirement
 - c. Evidence Base
 - d. Plan Flexibility
 - e. Distribution of Growth
 - f. Development Management Policies

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context

1.1.1 Gladman Developments Limited (Gladman) specialise in the promotion of strategic land for residential development with associated community infrastructure. This submission provides Gladman's representations to the Chichester Local Plan Review 2035 preferred approach.

1.1.2 The Chichester Local Plan Review is being prepared in a time of transition between the NPPF (2012) and the NPPF (2018). As the Local Plan will be submitted for examination after the 24th January 2019 the examination of the Chichester Local Plan Review will be undertaken in accordance with the policies set out in the NPPF (2018). There are important changes within that document which will need to factor into the assessment of the plans soundness.

1.2 Plan Making

1.2.1 For the avoidance of doubt, Paragraph 35 of NPPF (2018) sets out the four tests that must be met for Local Plans to be concluded as sound:

- Positively Prepared – Providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area's objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;
- Effective – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and
- Consistent with National Policy – the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

1.2.2 Gladman also notes the significant emphasis directed within NPPF (2018) to securing the sustainable and full delivery of housing requirements. Amongst other new policy requirements the NPPF (2018) introduces a new housing delivery test to monitor and measure housing delivery over the plan period, with specific measures outlined for those authorities unable to demonstrate sufficient levels of delivery. The NPPF also redefines what is considered deliverable in five-year supply terms, and the level of evidence required to demonstrate this.

2 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

2.1 NPPF (2018)

2.1.1 On 24th July 2018, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) published the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2018). This publication forms the first revision of the Framework since 2012 and implements changes that have been informed through the Housing White Paper, The Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places consultation and the draft NPPF (2018) consultation.

2.1.2 The revised Framework introduces a number of major changes to national policy. The changes reaffirm the Government's commitment to ensuring up-to-date plans are in place which provide a positive vision for the areas they cover. These should outline the housing, economic, social and environmental priorities to help shape future local communities. In particular, paragraph 16 of the NPPF (2018) states that Plans should:

“Be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development;

Be prepared positively, in a way that is aspirational but deliverable;

Be shaped early, proportionate and effective engagement between plan-makers and communities, local organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers and operators and statutory consultees;

Contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evidence how a decision maker should react to development proposals;

Be accessible through the use of digital tools to assist public involvement and policy presentation; and

Serve a clear purpose, avoiding unnecessary duplication of policies that apply to a particular area (including policies in this Framework, where relevant).”

2.1.3 To support the Government's continued objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that the Local Plan provides a sufficient amount of variety of land that can come forward where it is needed and that the needs of groups with specific housing requirements are addressed and land with permission is developed without unnecessary delay.

2.1.4 In determining the minimum number of homes needed, strategic plans should be based upon a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method as set out in the PPG unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach. It is imperative that the emerging Local Plan is formulated on the basis of meeting this requirement as a minimum.

2.1.5 Once the minimum number of homes that is required is identified the strategic planning authority should have a clear understanding of the land available in their area through the preparation of a

strategic housing land availability assessment (SHLAA). In this regard, paragraph 68 sets out specific guidance that local planning authorities should take into account when identifying and meeting their housing need. It states:

“Strategic planning authorities should have a clear understanding of the land available in their areas through the reparation of a strategic housing land availability assessment. From this planning policies should identify a sufficient supply and mix of sites, taking into account their availability, suitability and likely economic viability. Strategic plans should identify a supply of:

a) specific, deliverable sites for years one to five of the plan , and

b) specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15 of the plan.”

2.1.6 Once a local planning authority has identified its housing needs, these needs should be met in full, unless any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of doing so. This includes in paragraph 11 (b) i. considering the application of policies such as those relating to Green Belt and AONB and giving consideration as to whether or not these provide a strong reason for restricting the overall scale, type or distribution of development. Local planning authorities should seek to achieve each of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development, resulting in net gains across all three. Adverse impacts on any of these dimensions should be avoided, where significant adverse impacts are unavoidable, suitable mitigation measures should be proposed or, where this is not possible, compensatory measures should be considered.

2.1.7 To be considered sound at Examination the emerging Local Plan will need to meet all four of the soundness tests set out in paragraph 35 of the Revised Framework. Paragraph 35 states:

“Positively Prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;

Justified – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;

Effective – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and

Consistent with National Policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework.”

3 PLANNING PRACTICE GUIDANCE

3.1 Overview

- 3.1.1 The Government published updates to its Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on 13th September 2018. The updated PPG provides further clarity on how specific elements of the NPPF (2018) should be interpreted when preparing local plans. In particular, the updated Housing Needs Assessment chapter confirms that the NPPF (2018) expects local planning authorities to follow the Standard Methodology for assessing local housing needs, and that the Standard Methodology identifies the minimum housing need figure and not a final housing requirement.
- 3.1.2 The calculation of objectively assessed needs (OAN) for housing has been a subject of much debate as part of Local Plan examinations and s.78 appeals since its initial introduction through the NPPF in 2012, with interested parties grappling with the issue of OAN with varying outcomes depending on local circumstances. To simplify the assessment the Government through the Revised Framework has introduced the standardised method which should be undertaken through the 3-stage process outlined in the PPG¹.
- 3.1.3 Notwithstanding the above, it is important to note that whilst the Standard Methodology to assess housing needs has been introduced, it is likely that this will be subject to further change. In this regard, it is currently anticipated that the Standard Methodology will be adjusted to ensure that the starting point in the plan-making process is consistent with the Government's proposals in Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places consultation, to ensure that 300,000 homes are built per annum by the mid-2020s. This follows the release of the 2016 based household projections in September 2018, which forecast a lower level of household growth than previously envisaged.
- 3.1.4 Whilst the PPG advises that the Standard Methodology is not mandatory, there is an expectation that other methods can only be used in exceptional circumstances. Indeed, the PPG is clear that the standard method only identifies the minimum number of housing required to meet population needs and does not take into account the variety of factors which may influence the housing required in local areas such as changing economic circumstances or other factors which may change demographic behaviour. Where additional growth above historic trends are likely to occur then local planning authorities should include an appropriate uplift to the housing numbers to meet the need in full. It is important that this uplift is undertaken prior to and separate from the consideration of the demographic baseline assessment of need and how much of this need can be accommodated in a housing requirement figure. Circumstances where the need to apply an uplift may be appropriate include, but are not limited to:

“Where growth strategies are in place, particularly where those growth strategies identify that additional housing above historic trends is needed to

¹ Paragraph PPG – 004 Reference ID: 2a-004-20180913

support growth or funding is in place to promote and facilitate growth (e.g. housing deals);

Where strategic infrastructure improvements are planned that would support new homes;

Where an authority has agreed to take on unmet need, calculated using the standard method from neighbouring authorities, as set out in a statement of common ground;

Historic delivery levels where previous delivery has exceeded the minimum need identified it should be considered whether the level of delivery is indicative of greater housing need; and

Where recent assessments such as Strategic Housing Market Assessments suggest higher levels of need than those proposed by a strategic policy making authority, an assessment of lower need should be justified. “

- 3.1.5 In addition, it is also important for local planning authorities to consider the implications the Standard Methodology will have on delivering affordable housing need in full. The PPG is clear that the total affordable housing need should be considered in the context of its likely delivery as a proportion of mixed market and affordable housing developments, taking into account the probable percentage of affordable housing to be delivered by market housing led development. If it becomes clear that affordable housing need will not be delivered in full then an increase to the total housing figures included in the plan should be considered where it could help to deliver the required number of the affordable homes.
- 3.1.6 In the event that an alternative approach is used it should only be considered sound if it exceeds the minimum starting point. The PPG is clear that any alternative approach with results in lower housing need figure than the Standard Methodology should be considered unsound as it does not meet the minimum housing need required.

4 LEGAL COMPLIANCE

4.1 Duty to Cooperate

- 4.1.1 The Duty to Cooperate (DtC) is a legal requirement established through section 33(A) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, as amended by Section 110 of the Localism Act. The DtC requires local planning authorities to engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with neighbouring authorities on cross-boundary strategic issues through the process ongoing engagement and collaboration.
- 4.1.2 The NPPF (2018) has introduced a number of significant changes on how local planning authorities are expected to cooperate, including the preparation of Statement(s) of Common Ground (SOCG) which are required to demonstrate that a plan is based on effective cooperation and has been based on agreements made by neighbouring authorities where cross boundary strategic issues are likely to exist. The NPPF (2018) sets out that local planning authorities should produce, maintain, and update one or more SOCG, throughout the plan making process. The SOCG should provide a written record of the progress made by the strategic planning authorities during the process of planning for strategic cross-boundary matters and will need to demonstrate the lengths local authorities have taken to ensure cross boundary matters have been considered and what actions are required to ensure issues are proactively dealt with i.e. unmet housing needs.
- 4.1.3 As demonstrated through the outcome of the St. Albans Local Plan examination, if a Council fails to satisfactorily discharge its DtC a Planning Inspector must recommend non-adoption of the Plan. This legal test cannot be rectified through modifications.
- 4.1.4 Gladman recognise that the DtC is a process of ongoing engagement and collaboration, as set out in the PPG it is clear that the Duty is intended to produce effective policies on cross boundary strategic matters. In this regard, the Council must be able to demonstrate that it has engaged and worked with its neighbouring authorities, alongside their existing joint working arrangements, to satisfactorily address cross boundary strategic issues, and consider the requirement to meet any unmet housing needs. This is not simply an issue of consultation but a question of effective cooperation to ensure that the Housing Market Area's (HMAs) housing needs are met in full.
- 4.1.5 The Council's ability to fulfil the DtC is fundamentally vital to securing legal compliance and the soundness of the plan. In order to meet the DtC, the Council should effectively engage with neighbouring authorities to meet any unmet housing needs in the HMA and vice versa. The Council should ensure that it is able to demonstrate through its SOCG what steps have been taken at each stage of plan preparation to ensure that the plan has been subject to ongoing and effective cooperation with any interested parties to which a strategic cross boundary issue, such as unmet housing needs, may affect. This will require extensive and ongoing meaningful cooperation by both officers and members to ensure the Duty is met in full.
- 4.1.6 Any issues of unmet housing need arising from relevant neighbouring local authorities must be fully considered through the preparation of the Local Plan, working under the auspices of the DtC

and agreements and evidenced through SOCG. To achieve this, it is vital that this matter is carefully explored through joint working with all other local planning authorities within the HMA, together with any other relevant local authorities that the HMA has a clear functional relationship with. Where necessary, a strong policy mechanism will be required within the Local Plan to demonstrate that unmet housing needs arising from relevant neighbouring authorities and those with a clear functional relationship will be met during the plan period.

- 4.1.7 The position in Chichester with regard to the DtC remains unclear, whilst the plan at paragraphs 1.25 and 4.23 makes referenced to the DtC it does so in the context that further work is required at a strategic level in order to assess a range of issues, including unmet housing need. Gladman do not consider this is sufficient to meet the requirements of the PPG which expects Statements of Common Ground to be formulated and published with each stage of plan development. These issues are considered in further detail in response to policy S4.

4.2 Sustainability Appraisal

- 4.2.1 In accordance with Section 19 of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, policies that are set out in local plans must be the subject of a Sustainability Appraisal (SA). Incorporating the requirements of the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, SA is a systematic process that should be undertaken at each stage of the Plan's preparation, assessing the effects of the Local Plan's proposals on sustainable development when judged against all reasonable alternatives.
- 4.2.2 The Council should ensure that the results of the SA process conducted through the Review clearly justify any policy choices that are ultimately made, including the proposed site allocations (or any decision not to allocate sites) when considered against 'all reasonable alternatives'. In meeting the development needs of the area, it should be clear from the results of the assessment why some policy options have been progressed and others have been rejected. Undertaking a comparative and equal assessment of each reasonable alternative, the Council's decision making, and scoring should be robust, justified and transparent.
- 4.2.3 The SA must demonstrate that a comprehensive testing of options has been undertaken and that it provides evidence and reasoning as to why any reasonable alternatives identified, have not been chosen for allocation. A failure to adequately give reasons in the SA will lead to inevitable challenge of the Council's position through the examination process. The SA should inform plan making and whilst exercising planning judgement on the results of the SA in the Local Plan is to be expected the SA should still clearly assess any reasonable alternatives and clearly articulate the results of any such assessment.

5 EVIDENCE BASE

5.1 Duty to Cooperate

- 5.1.1 Gladman have outlined in Section 4 the importance of the DtC in terms of the legal compliance of the plan, however it is important to note that DtC can also be an issue of soundness when assessing the plan. At present no supporting evidence, demonstrating cooperation, is presented by the Council. The draft plan makes passing reference to the DtC in a number of places and indicates that SOCG have/will be prepared. In our view there are a range of strategic cross boundary issues which will need to be adequately addressed through the DtC with neighbouring authorities, principally any unmet housing and economic needs which are present.
- 5.1.2 Gladman note that both the NPPF² and the PPG³ require Local Authorities to publish Statements of Common Ground when they publish their plans. These Statements should be the subject of preparation and discussion from the formative stages of plan making. Gladman would urge the Council to publish these statements at the earliest possible opportunity.
- 5.1.3 The PPG⁴ also gives guidance as to what the SOCG ought to cover. This includes providing an assessment of the capacity of the district to meet its needs, a quantified level of the unmet need which will arise and consideration of how unmet need should be addressed. Crucially these statements need to be prepared by all of the constituent parties in the housing market area (HMA). In the case of Chichester the 2018 SHMA, clearly articulates that there are relationships with neighbouring authorities including Guildford, Horsham, Portsmouth, Havant, Waverley, South Downs National Park and Arun⁵. In addition Chichester will need, through the emerging Local Strategic Statement 3 to give consideration to the unmet needs of other areas of coastal Sussex, including Adur, Worthing and Brighton. There is an expectation that these issues will have been considered at the HMA level (and wider), not just the district or borough level, in order for a plan to be sound. Chichester and its partners must ensure that they are aware of their housing needs in full and that a SoCG is prepared identifying these needs and any unmet needs and showing where they will be distributed amongst the participating local authority areas.

5.2 Housing Need and the Standard Methodology

- 5.2.1 Gladman support the Council in assessing its housing need using the Standard Methodology. We do however believe that to ensure the approach is found sound the submission version of the Local Plan should be accompanied by supporting evidence which assesses whether the Standard Methodology figure should be revised to allow for economic growth, unmet need etc. It may be that the uplift derived through the Standard Methodology allows for economic growth, to the levels

² Paragraph 27 NPPF (2018)

³ Paragraph PPG 012 Reference ID:61-012-20180913

⁴ Paragraph PPG 004 Reference ID: 61-004-20180913

⁵ Paragraph 129-132 – Chichester Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment – GL Hearn – January 2018

- planned for by the Council, but consideration and evidence to this effect should still be prepared to ensure soundness.
- 5.2.2 Notionally the Council have prepared a Housing Topic Paper which considers these issues⁶. However, this simply repeats the guidance in the NPPF, no consideration is given to what has been considered with regard to economic growth and the text states that an allowance for unmet need from the South Downs National Park is made but not for any other area. Gladman consider that further consideration of both economic factors and unmet needs is required to justify the potential calculation of housing needs used within the plan.
- 5.2.3 Such an approach would be in line with the NPPF⁷ which requires the local housing need figure of the Standard Methodology to be uplifted for unmet needs from neighbouring areas. The PPG also contains guidance in this area, including confirmation that the Standard Methodology figure is a minimum⁸, this is expanded on further in the PPG⁹ discussing reasons by which the Standard Methodology figure might be increased – including for economic growth.
- 5.2.4 It will also be important for the Council to remember that the housing need figure which comes from the Standard Methodology is the minimum that it should be seeking to meet. As well as reflecting the issues considered above with regard the housing requirement the Council will also need to ensure that the plan is sufficiently flexible (In terms of housing numbers) to respond to rapid change¹⁰, this may relate to a problem with the approved strategy in terms of housing. The Council must be sure its assessment of housing needs is robust in these regards, by providing an evidence base document to accompany the submission of the Local Plan.

⁶ Paragraphs 3.9 – 3.20 – Chichester District Council Local Plan Review – Background Paper Housing – January 2019

⁷ Paragraph 61 NPPF (2018)

⁸ Paragraph PPG 004 Reference ID: 2A-004-20180913

⁹ Paragraph PPG 010 Reference ID: 2A-010-20180913

¹⁰ Paragraph 11 a) NPPF (2018)

6 LOCAL PLAN REVIEW POLICIES

6.1 Spatial Planning Vision and Local Plan Strategic Objectives

- 6.1.1 Gladman are supportive of the Spatial Vision identified by the Council. The vision recognises the importance of Chichester meetings its housing and employment needs and the importance of people being able to afford good quality dwellings. The vision also recognises the need to provide a range of employment opportunities in order to meet the economic aspirations of residents.
- 6.1.2 The importance of providing new housing choice is also reflected in cross boundary Strategic Objective 2, which seeks to meet strategic housing needs.
- 6.1.3 Gladman are also supportive of all of the Local Plan Strategic Objectives listed on pages 27 and 28 of the Local Plan, particularly those related to the economy and housing. Given what cross boundary Strategic Objective 2 states however we believe that the Local Plan Strategic Objectives should make reference to meeting, or attempting to meet, the unmet housing needs of the sub-region.
- 6.1.4 The Council will need to ensure that the Spatial Vision and the Local Plan Strategic Objectives are at the fore front of their mind when considering the implementation of the policies within the Local Plan in the context of decision taking. The vision and objectives should not be forgotten if the Local Plan is to achieve what it is currently planning to deliver.

6.2 Policy S1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

- 6.2.1 Gladman support the inclusion of Policy S1. S1 sets out the Local Planning Authority's commitment to making local planning decisions based on a presumption in favour of sustainable development. It provides assurance of a local approach to planning that is proactively seeking to improve the social, environmental and economic well-being of the area, confirming that the process of 'weighing up' the relevant factors in decision making will aim to strike an appropriate 'planning balance' across the three pillars of sustainability.

6.3 Policy S2: Settlement Hierarchy

- 6.3.1 Gladman broadly support the hierarchy identified in policy S2, it is clear that Chichester as the main settlement ought to be taking the majority of growth allocated though the Local Plan. Having reviewed the Council evidence¹¹ for the policy however we would question whether or not sufficient consideration has been given to the sustainability and range of services that are provided in adjacent settlements and particularly adjacent settlements which sit outside of Chichester District. The NPPF¹² recognises that, particularly in rural areas, services in villages may be shared between villages and supported by more than one settlement.

¹¹ Chichester District Council Local Plan Review – Background Paper – Settlement Hierarchy

¹² Paragraph 78 – NPPF (2018)

6.3.2 By way of example Westbourne and Hermitage are currently considered to be service villages, but will inevitably also draw upon services in both New Brighton and Emsworth (within Havent Borough). Emsworth has a wide range of services including a main line rail station serving London, Brighton, Portsmouth, Southampton and Littlehampton (as well as local stations) and is within a 20 minute walk of the centre of Westbourne.

6.3.3 Gladman consider that to ensure the settlement hierarchy is robust that consideration ought to be given to this issue and a reassessment undertaken to consider whether some of the service villages should play a larger role in meeting housing needs.

6.4 Policy S3: Development Strategy

6.4.1 For clarity Gladman would recommend that policy S3 is amended to ensure that it is clear what quantum of development is being allocated at each tier and what percentage of the overall total is being planned for at each tier.

6.4.2 As we discussed above we consider that the scoring for sustainability of many of the service villages may have been underplayed, likewise we consider that the level of development attributed to services villages through policy S3 is again below what would be a reasonable and sustainable level. In response to policy S4 below we consider that in order for the plan to eventually be found sound further housing capacity will need to be found, it is possible that some of this additional requirement could be aimed at the service village tier.

6.5 Policy S4: Meeting Housing Needs

6.5.1 Gladman note that the Council has used the capped figure from the Standard Methodology of 609 dwellings per annum, plus the unmet need from the South Downs National Park to arrive at the proposed housing requirement of 650 dwellings per annum. As we have discussed in sections 4 and 5 of this representation Gladman consider that the Council needs to give further consideration to both unmet needs and economic needs in arriving at its proposed housing requirement.

Unmet Need

6.5.2 As Gladman have expressed the Standard Methodology figure should be seen as the minimum figure to plan for, and a SoCG is required to identify what the housing needs are of all parties in the housing market are, identify how these needs are to be met and what is to be done to accommodate any unmet housing needs. These SoCG should be published alongside plans when they are the subject of consultation, they should not just be presented at the examination stage. The Council must give series consideration to these issues in ensuring that it is planning appropriately for unmet housing needs.

6.5.3 It is known that there are unmet housing needs in Brighton, Adur and Worthing and the Standard Methodology puts significant additional pressure for housing delivery on Crawley, Mid Sussex and Horsham. The requirements of authorities in Hampshire will also need to be considered.

Economic Needs

6.5.4 The PPG also urges local planning authorities to ensure that their housing and economic needs are aligned. Whilst the HEDNA does contain an assessment of employment land requirements it does not at any point seem to undertake an assessment of how the employment needs and housing needs interrelate. The Council will need to prepare a background paper for the next round of plan making considering if the level of housing and level of employment growth are balanced. For example would the proposed new employment requirements mean a requirement for more homes?

Overall Plan Supply

6.5.5 On the basis of the Council's position (challenged above) the requirement for the Local Plan Review is stated as being 12,350 homes. Against this SP4 confirms a supply position of just 12,478 homes, or a circa 1% buffer for flexibility. This approach puts the Local Plan at serious risk of failing to meet its identified housing needs, and this figure includes a number of parish housing requirements to be potentially delivered through Neighbourhood Plans as well as a significant amount from windfall development.

6.5.6 It is not realistic to expect that all sites allocated for development, or all sources of planned supply, will come forward exactly as envisaged now. Any change in circumstance for just one of the sites could render the plan incapable of fully meeting its needs, it is therefore vital that additional allocations are made to ensure that the plan can deliver its requirements. Gladman consider that in order to ensure delivery plans should seek to allocate 20% additional capacity above their housing requirement.

6.5.7 In addition the Council may wish to think about including a policy which sets a criteria based approach to development on the edge of settlement boundaries. Such an approach has the advantage of giving a clear steer to development even in the case where the plan cannot demonstrate a 5 year land supply. It allows the plan to respond to rapid change as required by the NPPF, as well as ensuring the plan led system can maintain control in approving development needed to make up for any shortfall accrued in the 5 year land supply or overall plan period, without the need for a lengthy and time consuming plan review.

6.5.8 In this regard policy HOU5 of the emerging Ashford Local Plan is suggested by Gladman as being an appropriate mechanism, it has recently been found sound at examination¹³ and states:

“Policy HOU5 - Residential windfall development in the countryside

Proposals for residential development adjoining or close to the existing built up confines of the following settlements will be acceptable:

Ashford, Aldington, Appledore, Bethersden, Biddenden, Brabourne Lees/Smeeth, Challock, Charing, Chilham, Egerton, Great Chart, Hamstreet, High

¹³ <https://www.ashford.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/local-plan-to-2030/local-plan-2030-examination/> (retrieved 07/02/19)

Halden, Hothfield, Kingsnorth*, Mersham, Pluckley, Rolvenden, Shadoxhurst, Smarden, Tenterden (including St Michaels), Wittersham, Woodchurch and Wye.

*** Existing Kingsnorth village**

Providing that each of the following criteria is met:

a) the scale of development proposed is proportionate to the size of the settlement and the level, type and quality of day to day service provision currently available, and commensurate with the ability of those services to absorb the level of development in combination with any planned allocations in this Local Plan and committed development, in liaison with service providers;

b) the site is within easy walking distance of basic day to day services in the nearest settlement, and/or has access to sustainable methods of transport to access a range of services;

c) the development is able to be safely accessed from the local road network and the traffic generated can be accommodated on the local and wider road network without adversely affecting the character of the surrounding area;

d) the development is located where it is possible to maximise the use of public transport, cycling and walking to access services;

e) conserve and enhance the natural environment and preserve or enhance any heritage assets in the locality;

f) the development (and any associated infrastructure) is of a high quality design and meets the following requirements:-

vi) It would conserve biodiversity interests on the site and /or adjoining area and not adversely affect the integrity of international and national protected sites in line with Policy ENV1.

Isolated Residential development elsewhere in the countryside will only be permitted if the proposal is for at least one of the following:-

Policy HOU10 will also be applied to relevant garden land applications."

6.5.9 Gladman believe that policy S4 should therefore consider the allocation of additional land to provide flexibility and a new policy should be introduced along the lines of the one quoted above from the Ashford Local Plan. The new policy could involve elements of policies S24 and DM22.

6.6 Policy S5: Parish Housing Requirements 2016-2035

6.6.1 Gladman believe that policy S5 is unsound as written. No evidence is presented as to why certain parishes, including settlements such as Westbourne, at the service village tier are not the subject of

allocations. The NPPF¹⁴ states that planning policies should be responsive and reflect local needs. No assessment, other than that done in the Settlement Hierarchy paper appears to have been undertaken to evidence why certain settlements are given growth and others not. Whilst Gladman understand that there will be some areas to where, for sound planning reasons, more growth ought to be allocated, it cannot be in the long term interest of the health and the sustainability of the settlement/parish, or in accordance with the NPPF for such a large number of settlements/parishes to be allocated zero growth for a near 20 year period.

- 6.6.2 Further evidence and consideration needs to be given as to what the actual housing needs of the parishes are, it cannot be sound for so many parishes to be allocated zero growth.

6.7 Policy S8: Meeting Employment Land Needs

- 6.7.1 As considered previously the Council will need to consider the interrelationship of housing and economic needs and whether the planned for employment land provision requires an upward adjustment of the housing requirement.

6.8 Policy S24: Countryside & DM22: Development in the Countryside

- 6.8.1 Gladman believe that in order to ensure plan flexibility and to meet unexpected needs policy S24 and DM22 should be revised or amalgamated into a similar policy to that referenced in response to policy S4 and taken from the Ashford Local Plan. The new policy could involve elements of policies

6.9 Policy DM2: Housing Mix

- 6.9.1 Gladman note the policy requirement of DM2, we have concerns about prescriptive mix policies which do not take account of local circumstances and are therefore pleased that the Council recognises there can be factors which might mean a need to depart from the table in DM2. There are a range of circumstances which may influence the mix of dwellings on a site, these include site size, local housing market and viability.
- 6.9.2 The policy should also consider that whilst a higher proportion of lower bedroom properties may seem attractive due to the results of the SHMA in terms of housing need, these are often not reflected when it comes to housing demand. A range of factors can differentiate the two, for example many people see home ownership (in particular) as an investment and may strive to purchase a larger home, others may wish to buy a bigger home to future proof themselves for changing circumstances (for example starting a family). A change in working patterns with an ever increasing number of people working from home may also create a desire for an additional bedroom to be used as an office.

¹⁴ Paragraph 77 – NPPF (2018)

6.10 Policy DM27: Historic Environment

6.10.1 Gladman consider that policy DM27 is currently more onerous than the tests on heritage set in Chapter 16 of the NPPF. We particularly note the requirement for all proposals to conserve and enhance set out in criteria (1) of the policy. We would suggest that 'and' after conserves should be replaced with 'or'. Whilst it may be desirable for all development to enhance heritage assets it may not always be possible for this to be achieved, but it may be necessary for development to conserve the existing heritage asset.

6.11 Policy DM28: Natural Environment

6.11.1 The requirements of DM28 are noted, Gladman consider that the policy ought to reference the potential for mitigation measures brought about through development and how they may be able to address any potentially negative impacts on views, landscape character etc.

6.11.2 Gladman also question the use of the word 'perceived' in criteria (5) of the policy. Whilst we understand the importance of the identify of a settlement considering the 'perceived' rather than actual distinctiveness of a settlement will likely be challenging for any decision maker using the policy in the future.

7 CONCLUSION

- 7.1.1 This representation has been prepared by Gladman Developments Ltd in response to the consultation on the Chichester Local Plan Review. Gladman consider that whilst the plan is positive in many ways there are a number of potential issues which are in need of redress in order to ensure that the finalised plan can be soundly prepared.
- 7.1.2 The Council needs to publish a report detailing the discussions and agreements which have taken place with the appropriate authorities on a range of strategic matters, most notably any unmet housing needs which may exist. Such issues raise potential cause for concern not only on matters of sounds but also potentially on the legal compliance of the Local Plan.
- 7.1.3 Allied with the above the Council needs to reconsider its housing requirement, whilst the use of the Standard Methodology is supported further work is needed to clarify the position with regard to whether there is a need to increase the figure to support economic growth. Similarly following on from the DtC there will be a further need to consider the accommodation of unmet housing needs.
- 7.1.4 Gladman also believe that he Council must look again at the flexibility of the plan and whether the plan will actually be able to meet its housing needs over the plan period, given that the planned supply and housing requirement do not allow for the failure of a single site. Additional allocations and a flexible approach to settlement boundaries will be required if the plan is to be sound.
- 7.1.5 Some of this additional required capacity can come from considering further allocations at the service village level and through the wide number of parishes to which the plan allocates zero growth over a 20 year period. Again this will need to be reconsidered if the plan is to be found sound.
- 7.1.6 Gladman would request to be kept inform of the next round of plan making, and would be happy to discuss the contents of this representation further with the Council if desired.