



























development. If the Council were required to allocate more sites to cover average requirement for the first five-year period, this might undermine the delivery of that infrastructure, and therefore the wider Local Plan strategy; and

- Thanet has an emergent development market, but there is a real possibility that driving high levels of requirement in the early years might undermine the viability of some sites, or result in lowered viability, which again could affect the delivery of services and infrastructure, as well as affordable housing.

Taking a “stepped approach” to the housing target is considered to be realistic and deliverable, consistent with the known intentions of developers and house builders, and does not place unrealistic expectations on the house building industry to deliver much higher levels of housing in a relatively short space of time. It also means that the Council can seek to ensure the delivery of sustainable development, supported by services and infrastructure. There has been a shortfall in delivery over the early years of the formal Plan period – the Council has adopted the ‘Liverpool’ methodology to address this, by spreading the shortfall in the early years across the plan period (see also Matter Statement 8).

## **Q2. Does the stepped trajectory reflect the type and size of sites proposed for new residential development in the Plan?**

The Council has phased more of the smaller allocated sites in the early phases of the plan period since delivery of the larger Strategic sites is more likely to happen later in the phasing periods.

### ***Issue 6 – Housing Requirement***

## **Q1. Is the housing requirement justified and is it based on robust, up-to-date and available evidence? If not, what should the housing requirement be?**

The Council considers, in the light of the evidence set out above in relation to the SHMA, that the housing requirement is robust and justified by the available evidence.

## **Q2. Policy SP11 states that provision is made for a ‘total’ of 17,140. Is this consistent with the evidence-base, or should the figure be referred to as a minimum?**

The Council considers that the requirement set out in the draft Plan is evidence-based and is the appropriate target. It should be noted that the draft Plan makes provision for more than that figure. It is proposed to amend Table 3 to reflect the total requirement and provision (see Matter Statement 8).