

Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036 Examination

MATTER 6: Housing Land Supply (LP2, LP3, LP4, LP49, LP50, LP51, LP52, LP53 and LP54)

Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee
Hearing Statement

October 2016



MATTER 6: Housing Land Supply (LP2, LP3, LP4, LP49, LP50, LP51, LP52, LP53 and LP54)

Issue 6a – The Five Year Housing Land Requirement

Q1. Taking into account the reliance upon SUEs, is a flat trajectory realistic and appropriate? If not, what should it be? Should it be re-profiled so that the annual targets are lower earlier on in the plan period and higher later on?

As is demonstrated in the trajectory on page 110 of the Local Plan (which will be updated to take account of revised delivery information underpinning the five year land supply report), as allocations obtain permission in the early years of the plan there will be a slight lag with delivery reaching peak supply. SUEs will also take some time to start to deliver, but many will start delivering within the five year period.

The flat trajectory is considered to be realistic and can be delivered as a whole across the plan period. Furthermore, the Committee would not wish to see a delay to any delivery to the allocations of the plan. The acknowledged benefit, however, of a reduced trajectory for the first five years of the plan would allow for full account to be taken of the economic downturn and the lack of remaining allocations from previous Local Plans. It would also better reflect the anticipated delivery timeline for development allocated in the Local Plan.

If the Inspectors saw fit to re-profile the trajectory, the Committee would suggest the following:

- 2012/13-2016/17 (5 years prior to adoption) – reduced to 1,000 dwellings per annum. This is 540 dwellings short of the current flat trajectory, and covers the period when the present adopted Local Plans were arguably not ‘up to date’ in terms of allocations, and reflects actual delivery on the ground.
- 2017/18-2019/2020 (3 years post-adoption) – 1,540 dwellings per annum.
- 2020/21-2024/25 (5 years at anticipated peak of delivery) – 2,080 dwellings per annum. This would take the 540 dwellings per annum from the first 5 years of the plan period and deliver them in accordance with broadly the anticipated peak of delivery from SUEs and other sites. This allows adequate time for permissions and reserved matters to be dealt with on most sites and SUEs.
- 2025/26-2035/36 – 1,540 dwellings per annum.

This revised trajectory, if applied, would take account of the real, post downturn housing market, but would also start delivering a higher growth level during the five year period, meaning that there is still a positive outlook for the delivery of housing in the short term.

Q2. Taking into account the number of allocations in the Local Plan, and the strategic nature of the SUEs and their anticipated commencement, is this method the most appropriate? Alternatively, should the undersupply be spread over a longer period of time? (i.e. the ‘Liverpool’ approach)

In accordance with the requirements of the PPG, and in an effort to take a cautious approach, the Committee has used the ‘Sedgefield’ method of calculating the five year land supply as this methodology is generally supported at examination and in appeals. The Committee is also keen to promote growth in the short term and as such, the positive front-loading of housing is generally

supported. Using the ‘Sedgefield’ methodology, the Five Year Land Supply Report – September 2016 (**E007D**) demonstrates that Central Lincolnshire has a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. However, given that nearly 40% of the overall housing target across the plan period is made up of SUEs (14,700 of 36,960 dwellings), and as detailed in section 5 of the Five Year Land Supply Report – September 2016, the Liverpool method could apply in the case of Central Lincolnshire (and this would result in 6.4 years of supply). The Committee would welcome this approach being endorsed by the Local Plan Inspectors as appropriate for the Central Lincolnshire case, but if the Inspector does so, the Committee would expect the Inspector to include a modification in the Local Plan which made it clear that for the foreseeable future (eg at least 5 years) the Liverpool method would be applied for future five year land supply calculations. This will avoid the risk of inconsistent application of methods to calculate the supply by subsequent decision makers.

As such, the Committee make the following suggested modification (modification Main/SC/38) in Policy LP3:

New paragraph at the end of policy LP3:

“For the purpose of identifying and updating annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against the Local Plan’s housing requirements, the ‘Liverpool method’ of spreading the backlog across the remainder of the plan period applies to Central Lincolnshire for all reports published up to 31 December 2021”.

Irrespective of above, the Central Lincolnshire Districts are committed to seek to deliver housing in the short term and would continue to work with owners and developers of SUEs to promote their early delivery where possible.

Q3. Taking into account a longer-term view how have the three authorities performed against their annual housing requirements, both individually and cumulatively? Could this data be provided by the Committee? Does this represent the ‘persistent undersupply’ defined by the Framework? In this context, should the buffer be 5% or 20%?

Figure 5.10 of the SHMA (**E003**) details the historic delivery of housing for each of the Central Lincolnshire Districts. The Committee’s response to initial question 10 (**ED004**) provides background to this question in relation to targets and delivery over the longer term. The detailed breakdown of the targets versus delivery are provided below.

Year	Source of target	City of Lincoln			North Kesteven			West Lindsey			Central Lincolnshire		
		Target	Delivery	+/-	Target	Delivery	+/-	Target	Delivery	+/-	Target	Delivery	+/-
2001/2	Lincs Structure Plan (Sep 2006)	405	159	-246	400	1,001	+601	350	387	+37	1,155	1,547	+392
2002/3		405	329	-76	400	768	+368	350	341	-9	1,155	1,438	+283
2003/4		405	278	-127	400	499	+99	350	878	+528	1,155	1,655	+500
2004/5		405	332	-73	400	453	+53	350	809	+459	1,155	1,594	+439
2005/6		405	379	-26	400	538	+138	350	897	+547	1,155	1,814	+659
2006/7	East Midlands	n/a	532	n/a	n/a	584	n/a	n/a	873	n/a	2,030	1,989	-41
2007/8		n/a	414	n/a	n/a	605	n/a	n/a	668	n/a	2,030	1,687	-343

2008/9		n/a	297	n/a	n/a	432	n/a	n/a	506	n/a	2,030	1,235	-795
2009/10		n/a	367	n/a	n/a	508	n/a	n/a	383	n/a	2,030	1,258	-772
2010/11		n/a	400	n/a	n/a	494	n/a	n/a	347	n/a	2,030	1,241	-789
2011/12		n/a	501	n/a	n/a	329	n/a	n/a	233	n/a	2,030	1,063	-967
2012/13	Central Lincs Local Plan	n/a	233	n/a	n/a	348	n/a	n/a	256	n/a	1,540	837	-703
2013/14		n/a	236	n/a	n/a	379	n/a	n/a	289	n/a	1,540	904	-636
2014/15		n/a	166	n/a	n/a	458	n/a	n/a	378	n/a	1,540	1,002	-538
2015/16		n/a	235	n/a	n/a	473	n/a	n/a	284	n/a	1,540	992	-548
Total					-548			+1,259			+1,562		

As neither the East Midlands Regional Plan nor the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan set targets for each authority area it is not possible to compare the delivery rates against district targets.

Clearly in the years leading up to the economic downturn, Central Lincolnshire performed very well against the Structure Plan target (including in the years following the adoption of the East Midlands Regional Plan). It is only the external factors of unrealistic targets in the Regional Plan and the effects of the economic downturn on the house building industry in Lincolnshire that have resulted in under-delivery. However, it is difficult to argue that there has not been a persistent under-delivery of housing, if a strict comparison of adopted targets and actual delivery is made. As such, the Committee's view is that a 20% buffer ought to apply.

Q4. Is this approach justified and is it the most appropriate methodology to adopt in this scenario? Shouldn't the buffer be applied to the annual requirement after undersupply since the start of the Plan period has been added?

The buffer should exclude any backlog, unless the Liverpool Method is used, as is highlighted in section 5 of the Five Year Land Supply Report – September 2016 (**E0007D**).

Q5. What would the five-year housing land requirement be, for both the 'Sedgefield' and 'Liverpool' methodologies, if the 20% buffer was applied to the average annual requirement and accounted for any undersupply? What would be the five year supply if a 5% buffer was applied?

Using the 'Sedgefield' methodology, if the 20% is applied to both the requirement and the undersupply since 2012/13, the requirement would be 12,662 dwellings. The supply in the Five Year Land Supply Report – September 2016 (**E0007D**) is 12,712 dwellings which results in there being 5.02 years of supply.

Using the 'Liverpool' methodology, if the 20% is applied to both the requirement and the undersupply since 2012/13, the requirement would be 10,141 dwellings, which would represent 6.3 years of supply.

Using the methodology of the Five Year Land Supply Report – September 2016, the five year requirement would be 10,937 dwellings if a 5% buffer was applied instead of a 20% buffer. This would equate to 5.81 years of supply.

If the 5% buffer were applied, using the 'Sedgefield' methodology, and applying this to the basic requirement and undersupply since 2012/2013, the requirement would be 11,080 dwellings, which equates to 5.74 years of supply.

Issue 6b – Housing Land Supply – General Questions

Q6. For development management purposes will the five-year housing land supply position be based on a Central Lincolnshire figure, or per local authority area? To be effective does this need to be clearly set out in the Local Plan, along with direction on what should happen if one particular area has an undersupply, but others do not?

No, this is not necessary.

The Committee is a Local Planning Authority and the Local Plan covers its area. The Local Plan target covers the whole area, and is not broken down per district.

There will be only one five year land supply report published for the area at any one time.

It is not necessary for the Local Plan to explain all this.

Q7. Are the totals for completed sites and sites under construction correct and up-to-date? Does this include sites which have been granted planning permission which are now proposed as allocations in the Local Plan (as per MM/SC/6 and MM/SC/7)?

Yes. The information in Appendix 1 of the Five Year Land Supply Report – September 2016 (**E007D**), is correct from monitoring as of 1 April 2016. In an effort to present the latest information, sites proposed through MM/SC6 and MM/SC/7 are included, even where these have obtained permission since 1 April 2016. These are presented in the yellow section of the Appendix 1 data at the bottom of the table.

Small sites without permission at 1 April 2016, but that have since obtained permission are not included. These will be included in next year's update of the report.

Q8. What lead-in times and delivery rates have been used to underpin the assumptions regarding the deliverability of sites? What is this based on? Where is it set-out?

The consideration of lead-in times and delivery rates was undertaken in a bespoke manner with District officers, looking at each site based on its merits and latest site delivery knowledge.

For smaller sites, a realistic assumption for delivery was made based on whether any reserved matters needed approval or if any potentially tricky conditions required discharging. Timings of these have varied on a case by case basis, based on the situation on the site, the location, and also the type of applicant (i.e. whether it is a landowner or a developer).

For larger sites, including allocations not at planning application stage, many developers were contacted to provide an indication of anticipated delivery on the site. Where sites are not in the planning application process (or at pre-application stage) and promoters were not contacted, a conservative estimate was used with sites not included in the five year period.

As such, no specific methodology for this is set out as officers at the district have undertaken a detailed (and therefore more robust) review of each site.

Q9. Have the same delivery rates and lead-in times been used on a consistent basis across Central Lincolnshire, or does the location of a development mean that a varied approach should be used?

No, the nature and location of a site, including which district it is in, means a varied approach is more appropriate. This is because timings for deciding on a planning application of a certain size, or the discharge of conditions will vary in each District. Each site will also have different constraints or obstacles to overcome in its development. Furthermore, as in many cases developers were contacted or case officers have provided input given their detailed knowledge of a site, the approach used in Central Lincolnshire will be more accurate than just applying a standard assumption.

Q10. Do the delivery rates and lead-in times take account of the size of sites and the possibility that there will be more than one developer on larger sites / SUEs?

Yes.

Q11. Does the list of sites 'with planning permission' make any allowance for sites with outline planning permission where subsequent reserved matters submissions will be necessary before works start on site?

Yes, the status of permissions have been taken into account in considering the timing of delivery of each site.

Q12. Some of the sites identified in Appendix 1 to the updated Five Year Housing Land Supply Report are listed as not currently having planning permission but where units are expected in Years 2016/17 and 2017/18 – is this realistic and justified? If so, where is this set out?

Appendix 1 of the Five Year Land Supply September 2016 clarifies that there are only 25 dwellings coming forward in 2017/18 from one site and no dwellings coming forward in 2016/17 from sites that do not benefit from planning permission. The single site included with dwellings in these two years is currently the subject of a live application and officers at the District consider, with knowledge of the situation surrounding that site and the application, that the delivery of dwellings in 2017/18 is realistic and justified.

Issue 6c – Housing Land Supply – Site Specific Questions

Sustainable Urban Extensions

Q13. Lincoln Western Growth Corridor – 275 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years. The August 2016 Topic Paper states that detailed viability assessments are ongoing, that a planning application is not expected until ‘summer 2017’ and that the infrastructure required to unlock the site is estimated to cost £17.5m. Is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

Yes. The delivery trajectory is based on a combination of the progress made to date in bringing the site forward for development and the delivery and implementation programme which identifies key milestones such as estimated date for submission of a planning application which is expected summer 2017 and start on site date of Spring 2018 which is considered deliverable and realistic under Phase 1 of the scheme.

Q14. Lincoln North East Quadrant – 250 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years with the first houses delivered in 2017/18. The August 2016 Topic Paper confirms that conditions need to be discharged, the site marketed, a developer secured and reserved matters submissions made and approved. Is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

Yes. As outlined in the updated NEQ Topic Paper (**E014A2**) para. 3.2, the Outline Planning Application (ref.132932) was approved by West Lindsey’s Planning Committee on 16th December 2015 for Phase 1 of the development, subject to agreement of suitable sums for infrastructure and affordable housing and the signing of the s106. Following the signing of the S.106 agreements in summer 2016 the site is currently being marketed and a reserved matters submission is expected in early 2017. On this basis the estimated delivery is considered realistic, reasonable and justified.

Q15. Lincoln South East Quadrant – 420 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years with 60 houses in year 3, 160 in year 4 and 200 in year 5. The August 2016 Topic Paper indicates that there will be 4/5 developers on site each delivering around 40 dpa. What is this based on? How many developers have been secured so far? Is the delivery of up to 200 houses a year justified?

Delivery of up to 200 dwellings per annum is justified. The 420 units estimated to come forward over the next 5 years relates to the Linden scheme for 120 homes and 300 from Barratts and David Wilson Homes for the 1st phase of 450 units. Therefore 3 outlets in the initial years of the development will comfortably deliver the housing in line with the trajectory. 4/5 developers delivering 40 pa is also realistic. There are already 4 housebuilding brands with legal interests in the site (Linden, William Davis, Barratt and David Wilson) and the Jesus College land is controlled under a Promotion Agreement whereby parcels of land will be sold on the open market to other developers. Additionally, part of the site is owned by Church Commissioners who will be seeking developer parcels to build out their land interests.

Q16. The Topic Paper also confirms that no planning permission is in place. Is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified considering the time required to secure planning permission, sign Section 106 agreements, discharge conditions and get developers involved and building?

A resolution to grant is already in place for the Linden scheme so therefore an early start on site is likely. Additionally, Barratt/David Wilson Homes is in the process of submitting the 1st phase application for circa 450 units which will be followed by a site-wide application following the conformation of the allocation once the Plan is adopted. Barratt/David Wilson Homes will require a continuous presence on site throughout the life of the project to benefit from the economies of scale.

Q17. Lincoln South West Quadrant – what is the reason for not including any dwellings within the first five years? Do the same reasons apply to other SUEs?

SWQ was identified as a SUE opportunity during the evolution of the Local Plan and as a consequence it is not as well progressed as the other SUEs. Nevertheless, NKDC are currently working positively with principle land owner and other partners to develop the concept and understand the opportunities, constraints and issues. As part of this approach, an outstanding planning application within the SWQ area is being revised to reflect the emerging concept plan, in particular the internal distributor road identified as being desirable to deal with local traffic issues within and around the SUE. This scheme is being promoted by a local housebuilder and a revised submission of this application is due in mid-October. Therefore, it is possible that housing could be delivered within the next five years. However, given the nature of the application and progress of the SUE proposal, a cautious approach has been used with no supply coming forward in the five year period.

Q18. Gainsborough Northern Neighbourhood – 150 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years with the first houses delivered in 2018/19. The August 2016 Topic Paper suggests that an outline planning application is ‘expected late summer 2016’. Taking into account that this would need to be considered, approved, a Section 106 agreed, conditions discharged, the site marketed, a developer secured and reserved matters submitted and approved, is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

The outline planning application for 750 units on the Northern Neighbourhood will be submitted in late 2016 / early 2017. Whilst the timescales for delivery of the units are ambitious, it is expected there will be an outline planning permission in 2017. In parallel with the planning process the Committee understand that house builder interest will soon be sought by the landowners with a view to have selected a partner by the time outline planning permission is granted. This will allow for a prompt submission of reserved matters and the discharge of planning conditions by the end of 2017. A start can then be made on site.

Q19. Gainsborough Southern Neighbourhood – 200 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years with the first houses delivered in 2017/18. The August 2016 Topic Paper confirms that conditions are yet to be discharged and that the site needs marketing, a developer securing and reserved matters submitted and approved. Is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

The position on the Southern Neighbourhood remains the same as in the latest version of the Topic Paper. However, there are constant ongoing discussions regarding development industry interest and it is possible that a further oral update can be provided in the next few weeks as part of the hearing sessions.

Q20. Sleaford South Quadrant – 230 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years with the first houses delivered in 2018/19. Is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

The delivery trajectory is based on discussions with and agreed upon by the SUE promoters. It is a cautious trajectory assuming 1-2 developers delivering 50 homes per annum before delivery accelerates to 80pa in the fifth year. The Reserved Matters Application is expected in 2017 and pre-application discussions for 32 dwellings including the northern access are currently taking place. Development proposed in the current pre-application discussion will unlock the site through the delivery of infrastructure. This will assist in the market attractiveness of the site for developers such that it is realistic to anticipate two developers on site towards the end of five year period, each building 40 per annum.

Q21. Sleaford West Quadrant - 340 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years with the first houses delivered in 2018/19. The August 2016 Topic Paper confirms that the outline planning application is still under consideration. Is this still the same? Bearing in mind that conditions would need to be discharged, a Section 106 agreed, the site marketed, a developer secured and reserved matters approved, is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

An outline planning application on this site is outstanding with tentative committee date towards the end of 2016. Up to 200 dwellings can be served from existing infrastructure and can come forward as Phase 1 of the development of the SUE before the new A15 roundabout is constructed. It is reasonable to anticipate that 2 'outlets' will be operational on this site. Once the A15 roundabout is constructed the next phase of development will be unlocked and given the investment it is reasonable to anticipate that the landowners will secure developers to help re-coup their significant infrastructure investment. The development programme anticipates the delivery of both the roundabout and the housing development accessed from the roundabout during the five year period. In addition the new roundabout will open additional opportunities for retail and employment development.

Other Site Allocations

Q22. CL525 – Former CEGB Power Station, Lincoln – 250 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years. However, the Central Lincolnshire Plan Viability and Community Infrastructure Levy Study¹⁴ indicates that “...The biggest constraint and abnormal cost for this site is the need to relocate the existing EON / Western Power cabling and kit which would involve a five year lead in time to move, and requires some 80% of the £5.226m costs upfront to facilitate... Given the site’s complications and abnormal works required to clear this site for development, delivery is not expected to take place in the first five years of the plan, and this scheme should be considered as part of the medium to longer term strategy” Is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

There has been considerable progress with this site since the CL Whole Plan Viability report was completed in April 2016. An outline planning application was submitted in July 2016 for an anticipated 330 units on this site. Discussions are ongoing with the developer of this site and the Council are working with the developer, the HCA and representatives from the GLLEP to look at funding to bring forward this site and overcome the infrastructure requirements. There is a small area of the site close to the main access into the site which could be developed without the requirement for the pylon and sub -station to be relocated. It is expected therefore that some units would be able to come forward for development early on i.e. 2019/20 without the need for upfront significant infrastructure investment.

Q23. CL704 – Land rear of Newark Road, Lincoln – 150 units are estimated to come forward all within 2019/20. Is this correct? What is the delivery based on?

The site is a wholly flatted development consisting of 3 blocks. All are expected to be complete within the same year. The site has planning permission and the developer is currently in the process of discharging all conditions on the site.

Q24. CL4652 – Land at Usher Junior School, Lincoln – 60 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years. The Committee’s response to the Inspector’s Initial Questions indicates that this involves the possible loss of a playing field. What is the position regarding this site? Will it be necessary to provide alternative provision? Is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

This site contained the former Usher School which was officially closed in August 2008 following a Lincolnshire County Council school consolidation programme when a number of academies were formed in Lincoln. Following closure, the school was demolished in 2012 so therefore there is no functional school playing field remaining and the site is therefore available for development subject to approval from Secretary of State. This site is adjacent to two other development sites, one which is currently being developed and directly adjacent is another site which has been proposed for allocation for housing in the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan.

Q25. CL4686 – Gateway Riverside Housing Zone, Gainsborough – 120 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years. Does the reduction in capacity as a result of the Local Development Order affect the delivery of the site and the number of dwellings likely to be achieved in the next five years? Is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on? What is the relationship with allocations CL4687, CL4688, CL4689? Will these sites be delivered jointly or are they independent of one another?

The reduction in capacity will not impact on the delivery rate. West Lindsey District Council and the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) are still committed to accelerate delivery of the site, as the site is considered one of the two key strategic sites in the Greater Gainsborough Housing Zone. As part of the Housing Zone designation, the Council has received extra funding (including one dedicated officer to assist with delivery of Housing Zone sites) and professional support from the HCA.

The site also forms part of the Council's £18 million Gainsborough Regeneration programme and the Council is investigating the possibility of developing a marina to the South of the site. The Council has been actively advertising the site and have attracted developer interest.

The Local Development Order granted in 2016 is an equivalent of an outline consent. Therefore, the current assumption of commencement in 2018/19 and completion envisaged from 2019/20 onwards, at 40 dwellings a year is considered realistic.

Allocations CL4687, CL4688 and CL4689 all form part of the Housing Zone programme, whilst these sites will achieve the same amount of support from the Council and the HCA, they will be delivered separately. CL4687 and CL4688 are both Council's assets and will form Phase 1 of Council's Development Partnership. CL4689 is in separate private ownership and currently has interest from a different developer.

Q26. CL1014 – Grantham Road, Sleaford – 260 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years, with 20 units delivered in 2017/18. What is the position regarding planning application 14/1257/OUT? Should conditions need to be discharged, legal agreements signed and reserved matters submitted and approved is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What is the reason for increasing delivery to 80 dpa in years 4 and 5? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

A Reserved Matters application by a housebuilder is currently being considered for 199 dwellings to the south of Grantham Road. The relevant planning conditions are in the process of being discharged and the S106 has been completed and signed alongside the related outline application. The site north of Grantham Road is owned by same housebuilder and it is anticipated that to benefit from the economies of their existing commitment, the northern part of site will be subjected to detailed proposals during the construction works south of Grantham Road so as to enable development to the north to commence alongside or upon completion of the first phase. Therefore, the assumed trajectory of this site is realistic, reasonable and justified.

Q27. CL417 – Land off Moor Lane, Branston – 73 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years, with 20 units delivered in 2017/18. Does the planning permission relate to a full or outline application? If outline is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

The site has been acquired by Lovell Homes for a 73 unit scheme and pre-application discussions are taking place regarding submission of a reserved matters applications. This application is expected in October, and the trajectory on the site assumes starting in late 2017 and completion by late 2019, which is considered to be realistic, reasonable and justified.

Q28. CL418 – Land at Silver Street, Branston - 188 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years, with 40 units delivered in 2017/18. Does the planning permission relate to a full or outline application? If outline is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

Reserved Matters have been granted for 198 dwellings on this site, conditions have been discharged and works have started. The site is being developed by Taylor Wimpey.

Q29. CL4667 – Land south of Fen Road, Heighington – 49 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years, with 40 units delivered in 2017/18. Does the planning permission relate to a full or outline application? If outline is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

Full permission has been granted on the site and it is being developed by Lindum. The trajectory reflects their build out rates as a regional builder.

Q30. CL904 – Land northwest of Metheringham – 140 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years. Is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

There is no significant new infrastructure needed to enable this site to come forward. It is a greenfield site and there are no other major applications or allocations in Metheringham creating a strong market for the development of this site.

Q31. CL906 – Land at Top Farm, Navenby – 125 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years, with 30 units delivered in 2018/19. What is the status regarding any planning applications on this site? The Committee's response to the Inspectors' Initial Questions refers to active owners pursuing applications and appeals. Is a development proposal subject to an appeal? Is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based

An appeal has been dismissed on this site on design grounds. Re-submission of a full application for 127 dwellings is due to be reported with, the Committee understands, a positive recommendation for decision at 18 October committee of the applicable district council. The site is controlled by developers (Linden and Lindum) and is in a strong market area and therefore there can be confidence in anticipation of early commencement and completion.

Q32. CL994 – Land east of Lincoln Road, Skellingthorpe – 180 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years, with 20 units delivered in 2017/18. Does the planning permission relate to a full or outline application? If outline is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

Planning Committee has made a resolution to grant for full permission subject to S106 agreement on this site. S106 Agreement is in preparation off back of agreed Heads of Terms. The site controlled by a developer within a strong market area and therefore there can be confidence in early commencement on this site.

Q33. CL4496 – Land east of Grantham Road and south of Millers Road, Waddington - 142 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years, with 40 units delivered in 2018/19. Does the planning permission relate to a full or outline application? If outline is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

Outline permission has been granted on this site and it is currently being marketed. The trajectory assumption is based on purchase and submission of an early submission of a Reserved Matters Application and commencement of development summer 2017, allowing for 18 months to build out 40 units. This is considered to be realistic, reasonable and justified.

Q34. CL4469 – Land east of Canterbury Drive, Washingborough - 185 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years, with 50 units delivered in 2018/19. Does the planning permission relate to a full or outline application? If outline is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

Outline permission has been granted on this site and it is currently being marketing. The site is located within a strong housing market area. The assumed trajectory for this site is based upon purchase and submission of an early Reserved Matters Application and commencement of development.

Q35. CL1491 – Land east of Prebend Lane, Welton - 175 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years, with 35 units delivered in 2017/18. Does the planning permission relate to a full or outline application? If outline is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

The application is an outline application but the Committee and applicable Council firmly believes this is justified. The delivery information has come from Beal Homes (the landowner and developer of CL1491) in September 2016. It is envisaged that the first 30-35 units will be older person's accommodation under phase 1 of the scheme.

Q36. CL1100 – Land north of Witham St Hughs (Phase 3) – 360 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years, with total output in years 4 and 5 of 120 dpa. How many developers are envisaged to be working on the site? Is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

It is envisaged that there will be two developers on site in year 3, and 3 developers in years 4 & 5. Over the past 15 years, which includes the initial early phases of development at Witham St Hughs and construction throughout the recession, on average, 70 dpa have been built. The trajectory for 40 units per outlet and three outlets are based on improved market conditions and developer confidence.

Q37. CL3018 – Billingham Field, Mill Lane, Billingham – 120 units are estimated to come forward in the next five years. Is planning permission and/or a developer in place? Is the estimated delivery realistic, reasonable and justified? What evidence is the delivery trajectory based on?

Planning permission has been granted, subject to S106, on the neighbouring site. Whilst it is not known whether a developer is on board at this time, it is anticipated that this site will naturally be the next to come forward in Billingham as it neighbours this site and has suitable direct access from Mill Lane. The delivery timescales for this site are realistic, reasonable and justified.

Issue 6d – Five Year Housing Land Supply Conclusion

Q38. Having regard to the answers provided to the questions above, is the trajectory on page 109 of the Local Plan justified and will there likely to be a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites on adoption of the plan?

The Trajectory on page 110 (not p109) needs to be replaced with an updated version to take account of the latest position of sites with permission, including the sites proposed through the modifications process. An updated version forms a suggested modification (modification Main/SC/39). As the methodology used in the Five Year Housing Land Supply Report – September

2016 (document ref. **E007D**) does not include the current monitoring year, and projects forward from 1 April 2017, this clearly demonstrates that there will be a five year supply upon adoption of the plan.

Q39. Is there likely to be a sufficient supply of housing land throughout the lifetime of the plan?

Yes. The trajectory indicates a peak of house building from 2018/19 to 2027/28, with the later years of the plan tailing off when a number of allocations have been completed. The plan allocates sufficient housing to meet the overall target of the plan period, and also identifies additional growth that can come forward during the plan period from a number of SUEs which are expected to be completed post-2036, and other Broad Location for Future Growth in policy LP54 which can be delivered from 2026 if economic and house building factors are triggered.

Q40. What flexibility does the plan provide in the event that the SUEs and other large housing sites do not come forward in the timescales envisaged? Is it necessary to have a review mechanism in the Plan to consider progress against the delivery of these sites and to identify any appropriate steps to help increase supply, if appropriate?

See response to Q9 of Matter 4, repeated here also:

The Committee (and promoters of each SUE, as joint signatories of the SUE Topic Papers, E014A2 – E014H2) firmly believe the SUEs are not only deliverable, but a cautious approach taken to the trajectory of delivery. However, by way of contingency:

- LP54 Part A allows delivery on four of the SUEs to be delivered quicker than anticipated, bring forward dwellings from beyond the plan period, which could make up for any ‘losses’ made on one of the other SUEs which is not delivering.
- LP2 is a flexible policy, with a very conservative allowance for windfall accounted for in terms of meeting the plan’s housing target.
- LP57 allows, in principle, for MOD land to come forward for residential purposes, but no allowance has been made for this in the in terms of meeting the plan’s housing target.

Overall, the Committee believes it should be the overall delivery of housing which should be monitored closely, not just those of SUEs (as suggested by the question), and that action should be taken if the overall delivery of housing does not perform as anticipated, which, ultimately, could be the triggering of a Local Plan review. To include a specific policy which ‘triggered’ release of additional land if the SUEs did not deliver as expected, could have the unintended consequences of releasing land when, overall (on all sites), the delivery of housing has been good and on track.

The Committee is not, therefore, suggesting any modifications in response to this question.

Issue 6e – Broad Locations for Future Growth – Policy LP54

Q41. What is the justification for identifying broad locations for future growth? What are the locations based on and how have they been determined? Are the locations justified, and are the criteria to trigger their development clear, reasonable and justified?

The justification for the inclusion of Broad Locations for Future Growth is in paragraph 3.3.6 of the Local Plan. The Broad Locations for Future Growth, including the remaining growth on SUEs, are situated at or near to the main urban areas of Central Lincolnshire. It is considered that development of this strategic scale would generally only be appropriate at the main urban settlements, and that these sites are also well placed to align to where the majority of job growth in Central Lincolnshire will occur (see policy LP5). The locations are justified and criteria for triggers are clear, reasonable and justified.

See also explanation as set out at Appendix 6 (p545), of the IIA (E001C).