

**Thanet District Local Plan Examination**

**Hearing Statement**

**Matter 8 – Housing Land Supply**

**12th April 2019**

**Gillings Planning on behalf of Millwood Designer Homes**

**March 2019**

## Matter 8 – Housing Land Supply

This Statement is prepared by Millwood Designer Homes and responds to issue 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 only.

### Issue 1 – Five Year Housing Land Requirement

Q5 – If there is an under supply, should this be addressed within the next five years (Sedgefield) or over the remainder of the plan period (Liverpool)? Is the Council's approach consistent with the PPG which advises that the LPA should aim to deal with any undersupply within the first 5 years of the plan period where possible?

As noted in Matter 2, it is noted that the response from Ptarmigan Land will propose that in order to secure a robust 5 year land supply, the Liverpool approach should be adopted for the first five years and Sedgefield thereafter. This approach is supported as it reflects the reliance on the Strategic Sites which deliver later in the plan period.

### Issue 2 – Supply Methodology

Q6. What evidence is there to indicate that the sites without planning permission will come forward as illustrated in the housing trajectory?

As addressed in detail under Matter 5, site SP15 is proposed to come forward in accordance with the trajectory. A full case is made in respect of Matter 5, Issue 5, Question 15.

Q7. Have the same lead-in times and build-out rates been applied to sites without planning permission? How do they vary?

The lead-in and build out rates for Westgate are based specifically upon the evidence and justification provided by the developer. They do therefore differ from other sites, but are considered reasonable, appropriate and justified in respect of SP15.

### Issue 3 – Components of Supply

Q2. What evidence is there to support the housing trajectory for Westgate-on-Sea (Policy SP15)? Does this adequately reflect the time it will take to bring development forward and the necessary infrastructure requirements for the site?

As addressed in detail under Matter 5, site SP15 is evidenced to come forward in accordance with the trajectory. A full case is made in respect of Matter 5, Issue 5, Question 15.

### Issue 5 – Future Supply

Q1 - How has the Council arrived at the figures in the Housing Trajectory for years 6-10 and 11-15?

Q2 – What factors were considered in arriving at the figures in the Housing Trajectory? Are they justified and based on appropriate available evidence?

The trajectory is based on discussion and agreement with the Strategic Sites, and specifically for Westgate, is agreed within the SOCG. The factors considered include those identified by respondents as directly affecting deliverability (as set out in Matter 5).

It is noted that a 5 year supply will be required at the point of adoption of the Plan. We are aware the Council are providing a revised trajectory to ensure this is the case. We support this objective.

## Issue 6 – Flexibility

**Q1 – What flexibility does the Plan provide if some of the larger sites do not come forward in the timescales envisaged?**

It is considered that flexibility on delivery is built into the Plan, as delivery is generated by a range of site and sources (both in terms of size and form) which reduces any over reliance single providers or site. However it is acknowledged that the Strategic Sites play a key role.

Further, although there is no formal recognition within the draft Plan of the need for a future review (within 5 years), this remains within the Authorities control, should the delivery of both Strategic Sites and other sites not come forward within the timescales envisaged

**Q2 Is it necessary to have a review mechanism in the Plan to consider progress against these, and other sites, and to identified any appropriate steps to increase supply if required?**

In this specific case of Thanet, where the Authority has been directed to update the LDS within 6 months of adoption to provide for a review, it is not necessary to include a review mechanism specifically. However, there is no objection to the potential for such a review being introduced in the Plan.