

Mid Sussex District Plan Examination

Housing Matters: Hearing Sessions 12 and 13 January 2017

Notes

The following documents will form the main basis for discussion for these two days:

- *Updated Position on Full Objectively Assessed Need* (NLP / Developers' Forum)
- *Committed supply in the Affordable Housing Calculation* (corrected version) (NLP / Developers' Forum)
- *Affordable Housing Need Calculation* (two notes under one cover) (Neil Kerslake)
- *MSDC 4: Affordability, Calculating Affordable Housing Requirements and Unmet Needs* (Mid Sussex District Council)
- *MSDC 5: Sustainability Appraisal / SHLAA: Housing Provision Implications* (Mid Sussex District Council).
- *Note to the Mid Sussex District Plan Examination, January 2017* (Quod, on behalf of MMT)
- *ED8: Statement on OAN, Unmet Needs and Strategy* (NLP / Developers' Forum, 7 December 2016).

It may of course be necessary to make reference to previously submitted material as appropriate, but as far as possible we should avoid re-running previous discussions.

The intention is to complete, by the end of the hearing session on 12 January, our discussion on the objectively assessed need for housing, including affordable housing, and our discussion on unmet housing needs arising in Crawley and Brighton and Hove. The outcome of these discussions will not in itself be definitive of the housing requirement since environmental and infrastructure constraints will need to be considered.

The session on 13 January will deal with environmental and infrastructure constraints, by reference to the Council's newly submitted paper MSDC 5. To a degree, this will provide an opportunity to test the plan's position and explore the arguments of those who argue for both higher and lower housing requirements.

However, MSDC 5 falls back on the SHLAA which has already been criticised as rejecting sites that, subject to mitigation measures, are alleged to be developable. Therefore, whilst it is not my intention to examine omission sites for inclusion in the plan, it will probably be necessary to test the SHLAA analysis against a range of rejected sites to see whether the Council's approach to constraints stand up to closer practical scrutiny. This cannot be carried out by 13 January and I will be asking the parties to (a) agree a suitable list of sites for consideration and (b) consider appropriate hearing dates for this material to be considered (one or two days). The sites should not be limited by the 500 dwelling threshold.

Following this stage of the proceedings I will probably write to the Council with interim findings.

So far the hearings have dealt only with issues relating to the housing requirement and Policy DP5 of the submitted plan. I have come to the conclusion that, regardless of the outcome of any interim findings in respect of the housing requirement, it should still be possible to move on to hearing sessions into the remainder of the plan policies which, subject to appropriate notice, could take place towards the end of February.

Jonathan Bore
INSPECTOR

9 January 2017

AGENDA

Day 5: Thursday 12 January 2017

Topic 1: Market signals uplift

- The relevant area to be considered; are local / SHMA comparators sufficient having regard to the PPG advice?
- Comparative studies and benchmarking

Topic 2: Affordable housing

- What level of housing is required to meet affordable housing needs?
- Implications of raising the affordable housing percentage

Topic 3: Unmet needs in the local area

- Unmet needs working through the household projections?
- Crawley's unmet needs – compatibility (or otherwise) with Horsham's approach
- Brighton and Hove – need for a review mechanism?
- Other areas

Day 6: Friday 13 January 2017

Topic 4: Environmental and infrastructure constraints and an evaluation of MSDC 5

- The number of sites required to meet raised requirements (850, 900, 950, 1000 dpa)
- The number of such sites affecting protected landscapes, environmental designations and heritage assets
- The implications in respect of highways, transport and access
- The relationship to neighbourhood plans
- Whether there is evidence to demonstrate that 800dpa is excessive in environmental and infrastructure terms
- What further work would assist in testing the analysis that underlies this paper?