Basingstoke & Deane Local Plan Examination

Inspector's Supplementary Questions to the Council

(V1 29 September 2015)

These questions to the Council are based on the statements received in response to the Inspector's Key Issues & Discussion Note (PS/01/13a&b).

Issue/Matter	Supplei	mentary Questions
Issue 1:		
Legal		
Requirements		
& DTC		
1. Legal		
Requirements		
2. DTC	2.1	What are the 'minor' issues which have not yet been agreed by stakeholders, and do any of them affect the soundness of the LP? Does DTC for Basingstoke & Deane extend as far
		as London, given the economic and social links between the two areas and the housing difficulties in the capital?
Issue 2: SA and HRA		
3.1-3.3 SA/HRA	3.1	What is the reasoning for the reduction from 4 to 3 options in para 5.31 of the SA document PS/02/16?
	3.2	Several alternatives have been put forward in representations, such developing on land to the south of Junction 6 on the M3, and a new settlement at Micheldever. Is the Council satisfied that the SA has covered all the reasonable alternatives for development in B&D?
Issue3: Spatial Strategy &		
Housing Need		
4.Spatial Strategy and		
Housing Need		
4.1 Spatial	4.1.1	What is the Council's response to concerns that
Strategy		the spatial strategy is too 'Basingstoke town
J ,		centric' with a disproportionately low proportion allocated at the other settlements.
	4.1.2	Are the restrictions on development in the countryside too inflexible, especially on the fringes of some of the smaller settlements and villages?
	4.1.3	What is the Council's response to concerns that the housing allocations in and around the town of Basingstoke have an undue emphasis on the west

	ı	
		and south-west of the town and would be unsustainable in view of their 'disconnect' from major employment centres in the Borough and distance from town centre facilities?
4.2 OAHN	4.2.1	What is the Council's response to the view widely held by housing developers and consultants, that the Council's own consultants, Edge Analytics, in their latest report [Appendix A to PS/02/17], point to a housing need of 936 dpa? Also, should the LP include an uplift to reflect the worsening AH situation? In the light of recent international migration, should the OAHN be adjusted to reflect this factor?
4.3 2012 hh projections	3.3.1	Several representations point to the fact that the 2012-based DCLG headship rates are based on the recession and are therefore suppressed and as a consequence are not appropriate for planning for new housing in an era where the economy is expected to improve? What is the Council's response in view of the need to meet the full OAHN?
4.4 Housing delivery buffer	4.4.1	What is the Council's response to the representations which argue that the housing buffer figure should be 20% and be factored in using the Sedgefield method, as advised by the PPG?
4.5 Job growth figures	4.5.1	Several concerns were raised by representors, including: (i) the Cambridge Econometrics forecast, only one year after the Experian forecast, is significantly lower (700 jpa cf 1,377 jpa) and also downplays growth in the transport and distribution sector; (ii) that the arguments advanced by the Council to link 850 dpa to 700 jpa rely on substantial falls in commuting and rises in economic activity rates, which are considered to be unrealistic; and (iii) there is a danger of economic underperformance unless the housing requirement is increased; the Regeneris Report suggests a figure of 1,040 dpa as appropriate. What is the Council's response to these points?
4.6 Other factors	4.6.1	In view of the fact that the affordability ratio (housing prices to earnings ratio for the lowest quartile) has increased from 4.4 in 1997 to 7.7 in 2014, should there be an uplift to the OAHN to account for this, and if so, what should it be?
4.7 HMA	4.7.1	Several representors consider that none of the three main criteria – house prices, migration patterns, and those living and working in the Borough – make a strong case for Basingstoke to be treated as a separate HMA. What is the Council's response to these arguments?

4.8 Affordable housing (AH)	4.8.1	In view of the fact that the 40% AH policy in the existing LP has not delivered (e.g. 15% in 2013/14), how will the emerging LP tackle the challenges of implementation?
4.9 Specialist housing		
4.10 Regeneration	4.10.1	Several representors consider that the regeneration targets are unrealistic and only aspirational. What is the Council's response?
4.11 Review		
4.12 5 year housing land supply	4.12.1	There is considerable doubt expressed by several representors that Basingstoke and Deane has a 5 year housing land supply. In particular, the following points are made: (i) there has been persistent under-delivery, so a buffer of 20% should be factored in, to be brought on-stream in the first 5 years; (ii) there is an over-reliance on large sites, which recent research shows conclusively are slow to deliver for several reasons, including major infrastructure requirements; (iii) disagreements over the implementation rates for sites with different planning status and for specific sites. In view of the importance of the first 5 years to the soundness of the LP, it would be helpful if a statement of common ground (SCG) could be prepared between the Council and key participants from the house building industry. Those participants interested in contributing should contact the Programme Officer as soon as possible and by no later than 5 Oct 2015.
		The SCG should set out to agree the following:1. The annual housing requirement (based on 850 dpa and/or a range).2. The 5 year requirement.
		 The start date for assessing the 5 year supply. The housing targets for previous years, say over the last 10 years. A completions rate, according to planning
		 status). Whether a 5% or 20% buffer should be applied. Whether the buffer should be applied to any previous under-delivery. What were the past completions? What are the current commitments? According to plaining state, according to plaining state, acco
4.13 Reliance on sources of development land		

Issue 4: Other	To follow
Housing	10 TOHOW
Matters	
5. Distribution of	
housing	
development	
6. Deliverability	
of housing	
7. Landscape	
and other	
constraints	
8. Gypsy &	
Traveller	
Accommodation	
9. Housing in	
the countryside	
10. Neighbour-	
hood Plans	
Issue 5:	
Greenfield Site	
Allocs	
11. G/F site	
allocs-general	
11.1	
11.2	
11.3	
11.4	
11.5	
11.6	
11.7	
11.8	
11.9	
11.10	
11.11	
11.12	
Issue 6 :	
Omission Sites	
Issue 7:	
Employment,	
Town Centre,	
Retail, Rural	
Economy	
13. Employment	
14. Town Centre	
Issue 8:	
Infrastructure	
15. Waste Mgt	
16. Flood Risk	
17. Infras	
delivery	
18. Nuclear	
201 11401041	

installations	
Issue 9:	
Transport	
Issue 10:	
Environment	
Issue 11:	
Development	
Management.	

Inspector Mike Fox

V1 29 Sept 2015