

DACORUM SITE ALLOCATIONS LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION HEARINGS

AGENDA – DAY 2

Wednesday 5 October 2016 at 10.00am

Venue: Bulbourne and Gade Rooms, Civic Centre,
Marlowes, Hemel Hempstead, HP1 1HH

MATTER 4 – HOUSING

Please note:

- All participants are encouraged to familiarise themselves with the hearing statements (and additional evidence) produced by the Council and other parties in respect of the matters addressed at this session. These are available on the examination website.
- Most references to questions refer to those posed by the Inspector in her Schedule of Matters, Issues and Questions (already circulated).
- In order to make efficient use of time whilst allowing each participant the opportunity to put their case, the hearing will be run as a 'rolling programme', with no set timings for agenda items. The matters to be discussed will be dealt with in Agenda order unless any participants have time constraints, in which case the programme will be adjusted by agreement at the commencement of the hearing.
- The hearing will run until around 17.00 with a mid-morning and mid-afternoon break.

1. Inspector's Introduction
2. Initial statement by the Council (if required)
3. Is the overall amount of housing provision and its distribution in the Plan consistent with the CS? How has the actual number of dwellings allocated been arrived at? Why the buffer? Should it be greater as suggested by some representors?
4. Specifically, should more housing be allocated and if so would this be possible prior to the completion of the Green Belt review?

5. In the light of Government's stated objective in paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework of boosting significantly the supply of housing, should the Council be seeking to constrain the release of the Local Allocations? If so, what is the rationale for this?
6. Is it assumed that all sites, both commitments and allocations, will be developed during the Plan period? Are all of these sites likely to be developed? What account is taken of windfalls? What rate of windfall development is anticipated over the Plan period?
7. I have looked at the housing trajectory in the CS and the most recent Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). The level of housing completions in the AMR technical appendix (table 7.1) appears to be lower than those projected in the housing trajectory in the CS, produced a few years ago. Is there an explanation for this? Are there any signs of improvement? Is the early partial review taking account of this ongoing shortfall? Does the Council have a strategy for remedying this? Is the housing trajectory in the Plan realistic?
8. Where are the existing housing commitments? What form do they take – large or small site? Is their distribution in accordance with the CS?
9. If sites are deleted from the Plan it seems likely that others will have to be found? If so, is the Council putting forward any additional sites?
10. What is the current position with regard to housing supply? Is there a 5 year supply? Is there a 5% buffer? Is there any justification for a 20% buffer?
11. What are the main findings of the Viability Study? Has this work indicated that any sites or uses are likely to be unviable? What are the implications? Is more work necessary?
12. How have site densities been determined? How rigid are these figures?
13. At what stage is an allocation considered to be implemented? Given this should any of the site allocations be taken out of the Plan?
14. What is the threshold for the inclusion of sites and why?
15. What are the targets for the provision of affordable housing? What has been achieved in recent years?
16. Is the type and size of housing provided/planned meeting/likely to meet the needs of the area?

17. Are the allocations based on a robust assessment of infrastructure requirements and their deliverability, including expected sources of funding?
18. In assessing the speed at which development will come forward on certain sites, has full regard been had to the proposed East Hemel Hempstead Relief Road?
19. Overall, does the Plan deal adequately with uncertainty? Is sufficient consideration given to monitoring and triggers for review?
20. Any Other Relevant Matters
21. Close