# Submission on behalf of SevenHomes Matter 7 Housing Provision

1. The purpose of this Paper is to set out SevenHomes's position in respect of Matter 7

#### **Question 3**

- 2. SevenHomes's position is that the lack of a housing trajectory regarding the delivery of the strategic sites in the Plan is unhelpful and contrary to the guidance in the NPPF.
- 3. The starting point for housing policy in the NPPF is paragraph 60, which sets out the Government's overall approach to housing. This is focused on significantly boosting the supply of housing and ensuring that a sufficient amount and variety of housing sites come forward.
- 4. In Stroud's case, it has selected a development strategy which seeks to deliver the bulk of its housing requirement via eight strategic level allocations across the District. SevenHomes has reservations about the heavy reliance the Plan places on these 8 strategic sites to deliver in a timely manner to meet the requirements of paragraph 60. It thinks that a more dispersed strategy should be adopted and the lack of a housing trajectory for strategic housing sites in the Plan underlines its point.
- 5. In deciding to adopt a strategy which places the majority of its housing requirement in a very limited number of sites, the Plan will have had to meet the tests in paragraph 68 of the NPPF, which requires inter alia a clear understanding of land availability in the area and the deliverability of sites within years one to five of the plan period as well as specific sites for years six to ten. The output of this paragraph is that it requires the Plan to have a detailed understanding of the allocations which it is making and how they are going to be delivered.
- 6. Moving onto paragraph 74, this represents the culmination of the guidance in paragraph 60 and 68 in particular. The Council has to provide as a minimum, a detailed picture of its five-year housing land supply. It follows that the decisions it made to allocate specific sites in response to paragraph 68 should now manifest themselves into the housing land supply trajectory.
- 7. Other representations made to this EIP have highlighted SevenHomes's concerns about two of the strategic allocations in the Plan, not for the reason that SevenHomes is promoting an alternative, but rather highlighting the point that the Plan will develop



# Submission on behalf of SevenHomes Matter 7 Housing Provision

serious housing land supply problems if these sites fail to deliver as anticipated. In addition, other submissions have raised serious concerns about the ability of these strategic sites to deliver in the timeframes set out in Table 6 of the Plan, further undermining the robustness of the Council's housing land supply position.

- 8. Therefore, either the Council is able to demonstrate a robust trajectory or not and that there is no justification for not providing a trajectory in the Plan.
- 9. If the imposition of a trajectory highlights a supply issue, then this can be addressed by increasing the number of units to be delivered from current allocations.

#### **Question 4**

- 10. SevenHomes's position is that there is not the flexibility in the limited information in the housing trajectory to ensure that the housing land supply will be maintained.
- 11. The first problem is that the Council has not published a detailed trajectory in the Plan for the proposed allocations as required by paragraph 74 of the Framework. That, combined with other submissions about the vagaries of delivering strategic sites means that there could be real and serious problems with housing land supply.
- 12. The second problem is that the Plan is highly restrictive, looking to limit development to allocated sites and sites within settlement boundaries. Given that the settlement boundaries are drafted broadly commensurate with the urban areas of settlements, it means that the options for bringing other sites forward without conflicting with the Local Plan are seriously compromised.
- 13. The third problem is simply one of quantum of development. Taking Table 3 of the Plan, the problem is obvious:
  - Out of a total allocation of 9065 dwellings.
  - 8080 dwellings are accounted for in 8 strategic allocations (89%).
  - 985 dwellings are accounted for in local allocations/smaller sites (11%).



# Submission on behalf of SevenHomes Matter 7 Housing Provision

- 14. Based on an annual housing requirement of 630 dpa, the smaller, more rapidly deliverable allocations represent only 1.5 years of housing land supply should there be any failure in the timely delivery of the strategic sites. Looking at the trajectory on page 302, the Plan anticipates the small sites coming forward broadly uniformly across the plan period, further limiting their potential to 'shore up' housing land supply across the Plan period. This leaves the Plan in the unenviable position of either phasing the delivery of small sites to prevent 'burn through' of smaller easily deliverable allocations or facing 'burn through' on the smaller allocations in the early years of the Plan. In either case, this could lead to housing land supply problems This problem could be further exacerbated on the failure to deliver smaller scale allocations (for example PS01 and PS02 which SevenHomes has raised concerns about and equate to 190 dwellings).
- 15. It is SevenHomes position that the Council will face housing land supply problems in the next 5 years and part of its promotion of land at Frampton on Severn is to demonstrate how a larger allocation can come forward to support the Council in maintaining its housing land supply. A decision on this needs to be made now because as proposed, the Plan's requirement from smaller allocations such as PS44, could lead to forms of development which cannot be expanded further, and opportunities missed to boost housing supply.

#### **Question 5**

- 16. Whilst SevenHomes supports the Plan's housing target, both in terms of the overall target and the annual housing requirement, it is of the view that there is not the credible evidence to support the expected delivery rates set out in the housing trajectory, because of the lack of evidence on the delivery of strategic housing sites. This means that the Plan is failing to meet the requirements of the NPPF.
- 17. In terms of what evidence is available, past annual build rate data can be extrapolated from EiP Document EB12. Page 15 of the document shows that between April 2006 and March 2021 (15 years) 7091 dwellings were completed, equating to 472 dpa, a shortfall of 158 dwellings. This is a simplistic assessment of historic build rates and greater clarity could be achieved if the Council provided the data in an appropriate format. A good example of this would be the Table provided in Annex 1 of EiP Document EB15, showing the historic annual completion rates across the period 2006 to 2021. Aside from presenting a better understanding of the annual completion rate year on year, the data would also demonstrate the completion rates from Strategic Sites allocated in earlier Local Plans



# Submission on behalf of SevenHomes Matter 7 Housing Provision

(e.g., Hunts Grove or West of Stonehouse) so that a more detailed conclusion can be drawn about delivery rates from strategic sites allocated in the plan.

#### **Question 6**

- 18. In respect of the windfall allowance, SevenHomes is concerned that there is not the evidence in the Plan to support the allowance proposed.
- 19. The first issue is the quantum of development. Currently, the Plan anticipates a windfall delivery of 1275 dwellings across the Plan period, equating to circa 63 dwellings per annum. Currently, the windfall assumptions made in the Plan equates to 129% of the small sites' allocation figure.
- 20. The second issue is how the windfall figure is calculated with reference to the requirements of Paragraph 71 of the NPPF. SevenHomes does not dispute the need for a windfall allowance in the Plan, but the NPPF requires that the allowance has to be "realistic" and have regard to the SHLAA, historic rates and future trends. It is noted that Document EB14 provides windfall data in Appendix 8 of the document, but this does not list the types of sites which are classifying as windfall.
- 21. Turning to the matter of the SHLAA, there is a considerable evidence base of sites in the Plan which can come forward and in conjunction with other representations by SevenHomes, it is felt that opportunities have been missed to maximise the development potential of sties in the SHLAA (e.g., FRA004). There is nothing in the NPPF preventing the Plan from allocating additional sites to further reduce its reliance on windfall housing sites.
- 22. The third issue relates to the lack of data available from the Council. As with the response to Question 5, the data is available to the Council for it to present and it is an opportunity missed. Again, referring to Document EB15, it should be possible for the Council to provide such data, based on previous monitoring results.

#### **Question 7**

23. Currently, SevenHomes remain unconvinced about the 5-year housing land supply calculation moving forward from the proposed adoption date of the Local Plan. Assuming a Plan adoption in 2024, we do not have a detailed estimate of completion data from the



# Submission on behalf of SevenHomes Matter 7 Housing Provision

allocations in the emerging Plan. In conjunction with other submissions, the problems associated with strategic site delivery are made clear. According to the analysis on Page 302 of the Plan, the following supply picture is presented:

- 626 from strategic sites for years 2020 to 2025.
- 3077 from strategic sites for years 2025 to 2030.
- 24. This places a total of 3,703 dwellings to be provided at some point prior to 2030, some 6 years after the anticipated adoption date of the plan (2024). This equates to 617 per year over an eight-year period. It is not clear how this supply is assumed to be delivered through the plan period to 2030. Other EiP documents provide a picture of how the current Local Plan allocations are to be delivered, but there is not that integration of new sites into the process.
- 25. The significance of this risk can be demonstrated with EiP Document EB14. Appendix 9 of this document shows that from monitoring year 2025/26 completions will drop from
  - 25/26 654 dwellings.
  - 26/27 506 dwellings.
  - 27/28 259 dwellings.
  - 28/29 255 dwellings.
  - 29/30 227 dwellings.
- 26. Over these five years, the housing total is 1,901, compared to a requirement of 3,150 over the same period, a shortfall of 1,249.
- 27. From a housing land supply standpoint, it is simply essential that the strategic sites deliver at the identified rates in the table on page 302 of the Plan. As has been demonstrated in our submissions, there is a considerable risk of this not being achieved. The alternative sources of supply, being local-level allocations, which should be able to be delivered easily within a 5-year timeframe do not address this shortfall.

