

Date: 13th December, 2013

INSPECTOR:
Laura Graham BSC MA MRTPI

PROGRAMME OFFICER:
Mrs Claire Jones-Hughes

This letter reflects my initial conclusions on the soundness issues I have identified at this stage in the examination process. I am writing to you now to enable you to consider the best way to address these issues. However, these comments are not intended to be comprehensive, and are made without prejudice to the content of my final report.

Housing

Objectively Assessed Need for Housing

The Framework requires local authorities to assess their full housing needs, including affordable housing. The Housing Duty to Cooperate Study for the Sussex Coast Housing Market Area, May 2013, identifies that an objective assessment of housing need would fall between 16,000 – 20,000 dwellings for the period to 2030. The study notes that the higher end of the range takes account of the shortfall of affordable housing in the City, and includes the provision of 210 dwellings per annum to contribute to reducing the affordable housing backlog.

At the hearings there was a reasonable degree of consensus that the range of 16,000 – 20,000 (as set out in Main Modification MM26) was an accurate reflection of the full, objectively assessed need for housing, although some participants argued that the need could be higher, having regard to the significant need for affordable housing.

Bearing in mind the Framework's requirements that local authorities should assess their **full** housing needs (my emphasis), including affordable housing, my view is that the Plan should indicate that the full objectively assessed need is the higher end of the range, i.e. 20,000 new dwellings.

Duty to cooperate.

I accept that the Council has sought to engage positively with neighbouring authorities in the region. My initial conclusion is that it has met the legal requirement under S.33A of the Act. Unfortunately, the cooperation with neighbouring Councils has not led to a positive outcome, in the sense that none has offered to assist Brighton and Hove by offering

to meet all or part of the objectively assessed needs that cannot be met in Brighton and Hove.

Housing supply.

The Plan proposes a target for the provision of new housing of 11,300. This represents only 56.5% of the full objectively assessed need. Even if the lower end of the range were to be used (which for the reasons given above, I do not accept is the correct approach), the target would meet only 70.6% of the need. These figures represent a significant shortfall and substantial weight must be given to the consequent failure to meet the social dimension of sustainable development.

I recognise that there are significant constraints to providing land for development, and that there are competing priorities for any land which may be available. However, given the significant shortfall in meeting housing needs, it is important that the Council rigorously assesses all opportunities to meet that need. It is my preliminary view that the following sources potentially offer an opportunity to increase the target for the provision of new housing.

Windfall sites.

The Council should investigate whether or not it would be appropriate to make an allowance for windfall sites, bearing in mind the requirements of paragraph 48 of the Framework.

Urban Fringe Sites.

These sites are not subject to nationally recognised designations, which would indicate that development may be restricted. Whilst it may be the Council's aspiration to designate some of these sites as Local Green Space, this is not being pursued through Part 1 of the Local Plan and I have doubts as to whether some of these areas would meet the requirements of paragraph 77 of the Framework. In my letter of 22 July 2013, I commented that the analysis of the urban fringe sites "identifies perceived constraints, but includes no analysis of whether such constraints could be satisfactorily overcome, and what the residual adverse impacts of developing some of the less constrained sites would be". The revised version of TP002a published in September 2013 includes additional commentary on constraints, but does not provide the further analysis that I referred to in my letter. Having now seen some of the sites and had the opportunity to examine more closely the underlying evidence on which this analysis is based, I am not persuaded that the protection from development implied by Policy SA4 is justified in relation to all urban fringe sites. In coming to this conclusion, I have taken account of paragraphs 73 and 74 of the Framework. However, your own analysis concludes that some of these sites do not make a significant contribution to the provision of useable open space, and have limited potential to do so in the future. No consideration appears to have been given to the possibility of allowing development on these sites, which would enable the provision of good quality public open space, as part of a package of

development. Similarly, no consideration appears to have been given to the extent to which other constraints, such as archaeological significance, should prevent development altogether, or whether adequate mitigation would be possible by, for example, careful consideration of design and layout and the imposition of conditions. The site at Toads Hole Valley, which is proposed for development, suffers from some of the same constraints that are said to affect other sites, including its proximity to the National Park. However, the more positive approach taken towards development on this site contrasts with the negative approach taken to other sites. The overall impression given is that the starting point for analysis of these sites has been the desire to resist development, which is at odds with the Framework's requirement that the plan should be positively prepared. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) makes general observations that the higher housing targets tested would result in significant losses of employment land and open space, but without a more detailed analysis of the sites concerned, I do not consider that great weight can be placed on the conclusions of the SA.

Main modifications MM21 and MM27 indicate that a review of the built up area boundary will be undertaken in Part 2 of the City Plan. However, Document TP/002a seems to pre-judge that exercise by concluding whether or not the sites have any development potential and if so, how many new dwellings may be provided. The expected yield of new dwellings from this analysis is about 100. In view of the significant shortfall in meeting objectively-assessed needs I consider the Council should undertake a more rigorous analysis of the urban fringe sites, along the lines I have already suggested, to determine whether there is greater potential for the delivery of new housing from this source.

Land currently in employment use.

I recognise that the Plan aims to make appropriate provision for land for employment uses to support the local economy. However, doubts have been raised about the ability of some sites to support the kind of employment and/or mixed-use development envisaged in policy CP3. Bearing in mind the shortfall in land to meet new housing needs, I consider the Council should rigorously reassess whether this policy should be modified to allow for the loss of employment land to housing, where an employment or mixed-use development is not viable. The requirement of the Policy that there should be no net loss in employment floor space may inhibit redevelopment for mixed uses, particularly on sites where viability is marginal.

Five-year land supply

I note that the Council achieved a good rate of housing delivery from the mid 1990s through to 2007. The lower rate of delivery in recent years is related to poor market conditions. In the circumstances, I consider there is not a record of persistent under delivery and therefore the appropriate buffer, in accordance with the Framework, is 5%. The most common method of calculating a five-year land supply is to use the annualised housing requirement derived from the overall target. I note the Council's

approach is to base its calculations on the housing trajectory, which has the effect of reducing the five-year land supply requirements in the early years of the Plan. The Framework is not prescriptive about the method that should be used to determine the five-year supply of land for housing. However, a method of calculation that suppresses housing land supply in the early years of the plan period does not, in my view, accord with the Framework's general intent to boost significantly the supply of new housing. Such an approach could be justified if essential infrastructure requirements are likely to constrain the delivery of new development, but I am not persuaded that the impact of the economic recession is a valid reason for taking this approach. Once you have addressed the issues relating to the overall target for new homes, you will need to demonstrate that a five year supply of housing land based on an annualised dwelling requirement plus 5% will be available at the time the Plan is adopted.

Overall conclusions on housing

The City Plan Part 1 falls well short of meeting the objectively assessed need for new housing, and although I note the Council's continuing commitment to engage with neighbouring authorities, there is no evidence before me to show that any of the unmet need will be met elsewhere. For the reasons given above I am not persuaded that the City Plan Part 1 meets the requirements of paragraph 14 of the Framework which requires local planning authorities to meet objectively assessed needs, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. I recognise the constraints faced by the Council but if I am to find the Plan sound, notwithstanding such a significant shortfall in the provision of new housing, I would need to be satisfied that the Council had left no stone unturned in seeking to meet as much of this need as possible. Furthermore, depending on the scale of unmet need it may be necessary to reduce the plan period in order that the City Plan can be found sound.

Brighton Marina

I have considered the representations made both orally and in writing regarding the Brighton Marina Act. However, it is not part of my examination to consider whether any planning permissions granted by the Council are lawful. There is no evidence before me that extant planning permissions are being challenged through the Courts, and I have seen nothing to persuade me that these permissions cannot be implemented. Bearing in mind the failure to meet objectively assessed housing needs, and the limited opportunities available to meet that need, it is important that the Marina makes as significant a contribution to the provision of new housing as is reasonably possible. At the hearings there was discussion about the criterion in Policy DA2, which requires development not to breach the cliff height, and there is evidence that this restriction threatens the viability of development at the Marina, and would reduce the amount of housing that could be provided. My attention was drawn to an appeal decision relating to a scheme, which would have breached the cliff height.

The appeal was dismissed because of the inadequacy of the accompanying legal agreement. However, neither the Inspector nor the Secretary of State concluded that the breach of the cliff height was a reason to refuse the scheme. Those conclusions were, of course, specific to that scheme and at the examination hearings the Council expressed the opinion that it was the particular qualities of that scheme that had led to those conclusions. Policy DA2 requires a high quality of building design and includes various safeguards for important environmental assets. There is a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Kemp Town Conservation Area. In all the circumstances I consider that the Policy should be modified to remove the cliff height restriction to enable a viable scheme to come forward, which can make a significant contribution to meeting housing needs.

Brighton Marina Shopping Centre.

The Council's own evidence does not support the designation of Brighton Marina as a District Centre. That aspect of Policy CP4 is not justified and the Policy should be modified accordingly. The Council's aspiration to improve the shopping centre is included in Policy DA2 and if this is successful, it may be appropriate to designate it as a District Centre when a review of the Plan is undertaken.

Viability

The Council's Combined Policy Viability Study, which was unfortunately finalised after the plan was submitted for examination, finds that the combined requirements of the Plan raise serious doubts about the viability of development across the Plan area. The Council seeks to rely on the flexibility clauses in the policies, which it says will enable development to go ahead. It is useful to build in such flexibility to allow for site specific issues to be taken into consideration, but this is not an acceptable substitute for ensuring that the plan facilitates development throughout the economic cycle, as required by the Framework (paragraph 174). I am therefore inviting you to draft modifications to the Plan to ensure that the requirements of the Framework are met in relation to this issue and in accordance with the evidence now available. In particular, you may wish to consider whether the requirements of Policy CP8 can be justified in this context, particularly bearing in mind forthcoming changes to the Building Regulations. Furthermore, the characteristics of the housing stock in Brighton are not dissimilar to those in many established urban areas and I am not convinced that this justifies a local requirement, which is more onerous than the national standards provided by the Building Regulations.

I look forward to receiving your response but it may be of assistance for you to know that I will be working on the Rother Local Plan Examination throughout January 2014.

Laura Graham

Inspector