

Basingstoke & Deane Local Plan Examination

Inspector's Supplementary Questions to the Council

(V2 22 October 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	Supplementary 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? 2.2 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 Strategy	4.1.1 What is the Council's response to concerns that the spatial strategy is too 'Basingstoke town 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

		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 Sedgfield 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	<p>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.</p> <p>The SCG should set out to agree the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The annual housing requirement (based on 850 dpa and/or a range). 2. The 5 year requirement. 3. The start date for assessing the 5 year supply. 4. The housing targets for previous years, say over the last 10 years. 5. A completions rate, according to planning status). 6. Whether a 5% or 20% buffer should be applied. 7. Whether the buffer should be applied to any previous under-delivery. 8. What were the past completions? 9. What are the current commitments? 10. Assumptions over LP allocations and windfalls.
4.13 Reliance on sources of development land	

Issue 4: Other Housing Matters	No further questions
Issue 5: Greenfield Site Allocs	No further questions
Issue 6 : Omission Sites	No further questions
Issue 7:	Employment, Town Centre, Retail, Rural Economy No further questions
Issue 8: Infrastructure	
18. Nuclear installations	<i>During the morning session on 13 October 'Other Housing Matters', the Inspector asked the Council to produce a note on the current position with the Office for Nuclear Regulation and West Berkshire Council regarding future development at Tadley. This is expected to be published as document MF9 on 30 October 2015</i>
Issue 9: Transport	
19.1	Transport Infrastructure
19.1.1	Is the Plan's provision for highways infrastructure to serve the strategic greenfield development allocations at Manydown, Basingstoke Golf Course and Hounsome Fields justified and implementable? <i>Links with MF25 work requested by Inspector at Manydown session on 20 October</i>
19.1.2	What is the intended role of the proposed Link Road at Manydown? <i>Links with MF19 work requested by by Inspector at Manydown session on 20 October</i>
19.1.3	Is the proposed improvement of the Fiveways junction at Kempshott justified; will the increased capacity cater for likely traffic flows up to 2029; and how user-friendly will it be for both pedestrians and cyclists? <i>Links with MF23 work requested by Inspector at Manydown session on 20 October</i>
19.5	Modal Shift
19.5.1	Does the Plan provide sufficient strategic direction to increase the potential for safe and convenient cycling within the Borough and is this realistic in terms of the likely costs for the provision of improved routes and facilities? <i>Links with MF22 work requested by Inspector at Manydown session on 20 October</i>
Issue 10 : Environment	No further questions
Issue 11: Development Management.	No further questions

Inspector Mike Fox
V2 22 Oct 2015