

**EAST CAMBRIDGESHIRE
LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION**

**MATTER 2, MATTER 3 AND
MATTER 4**

**BLOOR HOMES EASTERN
ID: 983134**

HEARING STATEMENT

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Matter 2: Vision And Objectives And Development Strategy	2
3. Matter 3: Objectively Assessed Needs	4
4. Matter 4: Housing And Employment Land Requirements	7

Appendices

Appendix 1: Peterborough City Council AMR 2017 extract	10
Appendix 2: Peterborough Housing Development Report 2017 extract	11

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Hearing Statement has been prepared by Carter Jonas LLP on behalf of Bloor Homes Eastern. Bloor Homes Eastern controls land off Fordham Road in Isleham including most of the site allocation Ref. ISL.H4.
- 1.2 As set out in our representations to the Proposed Submission East Cambridgeshire Local Plan (ECLP), we support the proposed allocation of the site, but object to parts of the development strategy which is relevant to some of the issues raised in the Inspector's Questions for Matters 2, 3 and 4.

2. MATTER 2: VISION AND OBJECTIVES AND DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Issue 1: Whether the Spatial Vision for East Cambridgeshire is justified, effective, consistent with national policy and positively prepared?

17. Are the key local plan issues and objectives which have been identified relevant; justified; and consistent with National Policy?

2.1 No comments.

Issue 2: Does the overarching development strategy for the Plan present a positive framework which is consistent with national policy, justified and effective, and will contribute to the achievement of sustainable development within the District?

2.2 No comments. Comments on housing matters are set out below.

18. Nearly half of the housing requirement set out within the submitted Local Plan is proposed to be delivered on strategic sites at Ely, Kennett, Littleport and Soham. Is the strategy and distribution of development justified, effective, positively prepared and consistent with the particular circumstances of East Cambridgeshire District?

2.3 No comments.

19. Will the development strategy achieve the Council's vision and strategic objectives and deliver sustainable development for East Cambridgeshire? Does Policy LP3 clearly set out the distribution of development and is the settlement hierarchy justified? Does the evidence suggest that some settlements should be placed at different levels within the hierarchy? If so, what implications would this have, if any, on the development strategy?

2.4 In our representations to Policy LP3 on behalf of Bloor Homes Eastern we supported the proposed settlement hierarchy and the classification of Isleham as a 'Larger Village'. The role of Isleham in the settlement hierarchy reflects the range of services and facilities that the village contains. We maintain our position and have no further comments on the settlement hierarchy.

2.5 We comment in more detail on housing matters in the written statements for Matter 3 and Matter 4, and therefore we seek to provide overarching comments below pursuant to the housing-related strategic objective i.e. to deliver homes and jobs needed for the district. We note that the Inspector does not ask a specific question about the proposed use of the 'Liverpool' approach to deal with any shortfall in calculating the housing land supply position in Policy LP2, which is related to the housing objectives and sustainable development, and as such our comments on this policy approach are set out in the following paragraphs.

2.6 Paragraph 47 of the NPPF seeks to "boost significantly the supply of housing" and expects local planning authorities to "...use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area..." and "...for market and affordable housing, illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a housing trajectory for the plan period and set out a housing implementation strategy for the full range of housing describing how they will maintain delivery of a five-year supply of housing land to meet their housing target...". The housing-related strategic objective seeks to deliver the houses and jobs needed.

2.7 However, the development strategy, as set out in Policy LP2, is based on the following:

- not planning to meet the objectively assessed housing needs identified in the Objectively Assessed Housing Need Report October 2016 [Doc Ref. PE06];
- transferring 1,125 dwellings from East Cambridgeshire's housing needs to Peterborough;

- ignoring the current under-delivery of housing against adopted housing targets (see Table 2 on pg.9 of Annual Monitoring Report 2016-17 [Doc Ref. M02B]); and
- not delivering sufficient housing to meet affordable housing needs, as demonstrated in the Annual Monitoring Report 2016-17 [Doc Ref. M02B] – see Table 6 on pg.11.

The inability to deliver housing and affordable housing is a particular failure of Proposed Submission ECLP, in that the amount of affordable housing that has been delivered during the plan period so far has fallen well short of what is required to meet identified needs, and the affordable housing needs are not being met elsewhere within the housing market area either (including in Peterborough where some of East Cambridgeshire's housing needs will be transferred). We comment on these matters in more detail in the written statements to Matter 3 and Matter 4. In summary, it is clear that the housing-related strategic objective will not be delivered through Policy LP2, and this outcome is contrary to Paragraph 47 of the NPPF.

- 2.8 The proposed use of the 'Liverpool' approach to deal with a housing shortfall when calculating the housing land supply position is inconsistent with the housing-related strategic objective, in that it seeks to further delay the delivery of housing and affordable housing despite monitoring data demonstrating past under-delivery against targets.
- 2.9 The previous under-delivery of housing during the plan period indicates that the alternative 'Sedgefield' approach should be used because it would address any housing land supply shortfall as quickly as possible, and this approach is consistent with national guidance on this matter as contained in Paragraph 035 (ID: 3) of the Planning Practice Guidance. As set out in our representations to Proposed Submission ECLP, the 'Liverpool' approach is not the approach used by the Council previously, and was not the approach recommended by the LP Inspector for the 2015 Local Plan or for the 2015 Witchford Appeal (Appeal Ref: APP/V0510/A/14/2224671).
- 2.10 The 'Sedgefield' approach has therefore been the preferred method for housing land supply monitoring for the adopted Local Plan, and is currently used elsewhere in Cambridgeshire (with the one exception of Fenland).
- 2.11 In our representations we submitted the following documents to support the use of the 'Sedgefield' approach:
- LP 2015 Inspector's Interim Conclusions – see Paragraph 37
 - LP 2015 Inspector's Report – see Paragraph 34 BP1
 - Land off Field End, Witchford Appeal Decision (Ref: APP/V0510/A/14/2224671) – see Paragraph 26
 - 5 Year Housing Land Supply Assessment January 2017 – see Paragraph 6.1
- 2.12 Therefore, we conclude that there is no evidence to justify the use of the 'Liverpool' approach as proposed in Policy LP2, and there has been no change in circumstances since the adoption of the 2015 Local Plan to justify the use of an alternative method. The use of the 'Liverpool' approach is inconsistent with the housing-related strategic objective and Paragraph 035 (ID: 3) of the Planning Practice Guidance, and is inconsistent with the aim of Paragraph 47 of the NPPF to boost significantly the supply of housing. In our representations, we requested that all references to the 'Liverpool' approach are deleted from Policy LP2. The implications of this requested change is that the Council may, as a result, not be able to demonstrate a rolling 5 year housing land supply unless more housing growth is delivered through existing draft allocations, or additional sites capable of delivering housing early in the Local Plan period are identified.

3. MATTER 3: OBJECTIVELY ASSESSED NEEDS

*Issue 1: Whether the Council's approach to calculating its full, objectively assessed needs is justified, based on up-to-date and reliable evidence, effective, positively prepared, and consistent with national policy?
Objectively Assessed Need*

20. What is the implication of there being a different time period for housing need and employment growth? What is the justification?

3.1 No comments.

Employment:

21. Is the objectively assessed need for economic development based on an appropriately defined functional economic market area?

3.2 No comments.

22. Is the need for 6,000 jobs consistent with the evidence? In particular, why is there such a difference between the East of England Forecast Model (EEFM) of 2014 and 2016 (7,100 jobs and 4,820 jobs respectively)? How do past trends inform the figure of 6,000 new jobs within the submitted Local Plan? How has the potential to reduce the level of out commuting been taken into account in calculating the 44.4 ha 'need' for employment land within the district?

3.3 No comments.

23. Is the assumption that employment land would be lost to other uses, over the plan period, @0.98 ha per annum justified? Is it correct that the requirement for employment land to cater for both job creation, and the loss of existing employment land to other uses, is for around 66 ha of employment land allocations?

3.4 No comments.

Housing:

24. Is the Council's use of the standard methodology to determine local housing need, referred to within the consultation draft of the National Planning Policy Framework¹, justified, positively prepared, effective, consistent with national policy, and an appropriate alternative methodology to that set out within the Planning Practice Guidance²?

3.5 The proposed standard methodology, as contained in the 'Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places' consultation (September 2017) and carried forward into the NPPF revisions (March 2018), have not yet been adopted by the Government in their final format, and as such the policy requirements and implementation of revised guidance are not confirmed and may be subject to further change. The proposed transitional arrangements for plan-making in the NPPF revisions would mean that the standard methodology will not apply to the Proposed Submission ECLP; Paragraph 209 of the NPPF Revisions document indicate that the new guidance will not apply for the purposes of examining plans until 6 months after the final document has been published. Furthermore, it is clear from Paragraph 61 of the NPPF Revisions and the 'Local Housing Needs Assessment' section in the proposed revisions to the Planning Practice Guidance indicate that the proposed standard methodology is the starting point for determining local housing needs, and it represents a minimum figure subject to assessment of factors that may justify an uplift. For all these reasons, the use of the proposed standard methodology is not justified and is not consistent with national guidance (or draft revisions to national guidance). The Objectively Assessed Housing Need Report October 2016 should instead be used.

3.6 Furthermore, the use of the proposed standard methodology allows the Council to adjust the start of the plan period to 2016, reset monitoring targets, and effectively ignore the past under-delivery of housing and

affordable housing against adopted Local Plan targets, and as a result those needs will not now be met and are not factored into any uplift to the proposed standard methodology figure for East Cambridgeshire.

25. How does this methodology compare in absolute numerical terms to the more traditional approach set out within the Planning Practice Guidance and which has been followed within the October 2016 Objectively Assessed Housing Need paper (PE6)? What is the Council's reason to alter its approach to the calculation of its objectively assessed need between the publication of the Further Draft Local Plan in February 2017 and the Proposed Submission version of November 2017?

- 3.6 The Objectively Assessed Housing Need Report October 2016 [Doc Ref. PE06] identifies a need for 12,900 dwellings (586 dwellings per annum) between 2014 and 2036. The outcome of the proposed standard methodology is explained in Paragraph 3.3.3 of the Proposed Submission ECLP and would require 11,960 dwellings (598 dwellings per annum) between 2016 and 2036 (assuming none of the identified housing growth is displaced to Peterborough). As set out above however, the use of the proposed standard methodology allows the Council to adjust the start of the plan period to 2016, reset monitoring targets, and effectively ignores the past under-delivery of housing and affordable housing against adopted Local Plan targets and does not therefore provide an effective methodology for meeting the actual housing needs of the District.

26. Is it appropriate that PE 6, which forms part of the Council's evidence base, relies on a district wide update of the relevant element of the 2013 SHMA, which covers the whole of the Cambridge Housing Market Area? Does the geographical extent of the HMA still remain appropriate and justified? Does the continued reliance on the wider 2013 SHMA remain consistent with the advice within the PPG, 'that local authorities should co-ordinate future housing reviews so they take place at the same time'³, given that it informed the adopted Local Plan, which the submitted plan seeks to replace?

- 3.7 We consider that, at the very least, there should have been a review of the HMA in order to determine whether the geographical extent remains appropriate and to consider the relationship with plan-making in neighbouring authorities. For example, Cambridge City and South Cambridgeshire District have agreed to start preparing a joint Local Plan in 2019, which is likely to have implications for East Cambridgeshire in terms of housing and development needs. The joint Local Plan for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire will need to take into account the growth anticipated by the National Infrastructure Commission within the Cambridge-Milton Keynes-Oxford Corridor with associated economic and housing growth. As far as we are aware no discussions on these matters have taken place for Proposed Submission ECLP.

27. Are the housing figures and assumptions contained within PE6, robust and justified? Do they take into account recent DCLG household projections, appropriate market signals, forecast jobs growth and the need for adequate levels of affordable housing to be provided? Has an allowance been made for vacancy rates and second homes with reference to existing and future housing stock?

- 3.8 The Objectively Assessed Housing Need Report was prepared in 2016, and as such PE6 should be updated to reflect more recent demographic and economic data. Those updates would have been made if the Council had not decided to use the proposed standard methodology as the basis for determining objectively assessed needs instead. This would likely lead to an increase in the District's housing need which would require either more housing growth to be delivered through existing draft allocations, or additional sites capable of delivering housing early in the Local Plan period to be identified.

28. What assessment has taken place of the needs of particular groups, by household size, type and tenure, including self-build and custom housebuilding? What assumptions have been made to calculate the need for specialist housing types, for example, housing for older people and students, and for households with specific needs, to ensure that the appropriate level of need is made explicit within the plan to enable provision and delivery of the required levels and type of housing? Does the housing figure require any amendment to cater for these needs?

- 3.9 No comments.

29. Is the plan clear as to the identified need for additional pitches for gypsies and travellers and travelling show people and is the identified need soundly based and supported by robust and credible evidence base consistent with the 'Draft Guidance to local housing authorities on the periodical review of housing needs- Caravans and Houseboats DCLG 11 March 2016'?

3.10. No comments.

4. MATTER 4: HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT LAND REQUIREMENTS

Issue 1: Whether the Council's approach to calculating its housing and employment requirements is justified, based on up-to-date and reliable evidence, effective, positively prepared, and consistent with national policy?

Housing:

30. Is the identified overall housing requirement of 10,835 dwellings or 542 per annum (dpa) over the plan period justified and consistent with national policy?

- 4.1 The overall housing requirement of 10,835 dwellings is not justified or consistent with national policy because the figure is based on the use of the standard methodology for calculating housing needs which is not yet adopted guidance. Furthermore it seeks to transfer a proportion of housing needs to Peterborough which will have negative consequences for sustainability, housing and transport within East Cambridgeshire. . In particular, there will be an adverse impact on the delivery of affordable housing, the needs of which are not currently being met and will not be met in the future should this unsound approach for housing needs be adopted. We commented on the use of the standard methodology in Matter 3, and comment on the transfer of housing needs to Peterborough and affordable housing needs below.
- 4.2 Paragraph 47 of the NPPF expects local planning authorities to “*boost significantly the supply of housing*” and to “*use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area....*”. Paragraph 50 seeks to “*deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities....*”. The development strategy contained in Policy LP2 of the Proposed Submission ECLP, including the overall housing requirement, does not comply with this national guidance. The use of the proposed standard methodology for calculating housing needs is not adopted national guidance and therefore cannot be justified.
- 4.3 The findings of the Objectively Assessed Housing Need Report October 2016 [Doc Ref. PE06], which identified a need for 12,900 dwellings (586 dwellings per annum) between 2014 and 2036, is consistent with national guidance subject to updates to demographic and economic data.

31. Do either of the two parts of the second bullet point within Paragraph 14 of the Framework apply to meeting East Cambridgeshire's objectively assessed needs? If so, how?

- 4.4 East Cambridgeshire does contain designated nature conservation sites and heritage assets, and some land within the District is affected by flooding. The Cambridge Green Belt extends into a limited part of the District at the south western boundary, around the villages of Bottisham, Lode and Swaffham Bulbeck. These designations and constraints will limit or restrict development in some areas, but sufficient unconstrained land exists elsewhere within East Cambridgeshire to accommodate the full objectively assessed housing needs (as derived from the Objectively Assessed Housing Need Report October 2016 updated as appropriate). We conclude that the second bullet point of Paragraph 14 does not apply to plan-making for East Cambridgeshire.

32. What is the justification to discount the OAN figure by 1,125 dwellings and to rely on Peterborough to contribute to the delivery of East Cambridgeshire's needs? What evidence is there that Peterborough has previously delivered the housing needs of East Cambridgeshire, and will continue to do so, and when?

- 4.3 There is no justification to discount the objectively assessed housing need figure in order to transfer some of that need to Peterborough. There are sustainability reasons, related to transport, housing and affordable housing, which justify an approach that seeks to meet the full objectively assessed housing needs entirely within East Cambridgeshire. There are no planning reasons or particular environmental or other constraints that justify the decision to transfer some of the District's housing needs to Peterborough. The decision to transfer housing needs to neighbouring authorities to the north also provides no assistance to those with a need for housing and affordable housing in the villages in the southern part of the District, such as Isleham.

- 4.4 Paragraph 47 of the NPPF expects local planning authorities to “*boost significantly the supply of housing*” and to “*use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area....*”. Paragraph 182 identifies the four soundness tests that the Inspector will assess the submission version of the Local Plan against. The ‘positively prepared’ test is relevant to housing need, and states: “*the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development*”.
- 4.5 The decision to transfer housing needs from East Cambridgeshire to Peterborough would be inconsistent with the above national guidance and with the principles of sustainable development. As set out in our representations to Proposed Submission ECLP, there will be particular negative consequences in terms of housing and transport. If the full objectively assessed housing needs will not be met within the local area the outcome will be that East Cambridgeshire will become less equal because people’s needs are not being met locally, and house prices will go up more quickly because demand will exceed supply, exacerbating inequality; it is only those who can afford to pay higher prices will have their needs met. If housing is redirected to areas beyond East Cambridgeshire this will increase travel distances by car for journeys to work and other purposes with an associated increase in emissions, and make travel by sustainable modes of transport less likely.
- 4.6 The decision to transfer housing needs from East Cambridgeshire to Peterborough is not addressing the current shortfall in the delivery of affordable housing. Table 6 on pg.11 of the Annual Monitoring Report 2016-17 [Doc Ref. M02B] highlights the significant under-delivery of affordable housing in East Cambridgeshire against identified needs in all monitoring years. The identified need is 2,854 affordable dwellings between 2014 and 2036, which equates to approximately 130 dwellings per year. Those affordable housing needs are not being met elsewhere within the housing market area either because all of the Cambridgeshire authorities are unable to deliver sufficient levels of affordable housing to meet their own needs. The under-delivery of affordable housing is particularly relevant in the context of the decision to transfer some housing needs, including affordable housing, to Peterborough because monitoring data demonstrates that affordable housing targets are not being met there either.
- 4.7 Paragraphs 5.5 to 5.8 and Table 4 of Peterborough City Council’s Annual Monitoring Report 2017 provides details of affordable housing completions – see extract in **Appendix 1**. The adopted affordable housing target for Peterborough is that 30% of all dwellings on sites of 15 or more dwellings should be affordable. The monitoring data in Table 4 shows that in most years since 2011 the affordable housing target has not been met in Peterborough; 2011 is the start year for the adopted East Cambridgeshire Local Plan when the policy approach to transfer housing needs to Peterborough applied. Paragraph 5.8 of the Peterborough AMR refers to further analysis in the Housing Development in Peterborough 2017 document. Table 1 in the Housing Development in Peterborough 2017 document provides a summary of housing completions, including affordable housing completions for the period from April 2011 – see extract in **Appendix 2**. The data in Table 2 shows that since 2011 only 22.6% of the total amount of housing completions has been affordable, compared with an overall affordable housing target of 30%.
- 4.8 Therefore, the housing monitoring data in the AMR 2017 and Housing Development in Peterborough 2017 documents demonstrate that Peterborough is not delivering sufficient affordable housing to meet its own needs. In these circumstances it cannot be justified to transfer some of East Cambridgeshire’s housing and affordable housing to an area which is also not meeting its own affordable housing needs. An outcome which results in the full objectively assessed affordable housing needs not being met is unsound and not consistent with national guidance, and the decision to transfer that need to Peterborough has not and will not address the affordable housing needs in East Cambridgeshire and the Cambridgeshire HMA.
- 4.9 We request that the approach to transfer 1,125 dwellings of East Cambridgeshire’s housing needs to Peterborough should be deleted from Policy LP2.

33. The soundness of individual site allocations will be considered at Stage 2 of the Examination, and I will not be considering individual site allocations in any detail at this stage. However, is the assumption that 1060 dwellings will be delivered over the plan period as a result of windfall developments and unallocated Community Land Trust sites realistic and justified by evidence?

4.10 No comments.

Employment:

34. Is the scale of the allocation of some 154 hectares of land for employment purposes justified, effective, and consistent with national policy? How does this proposed quantum of employment land relate to, and compare with the objectively assessed needs of the district?

4.11 No comments.

APPENDIX 1: PETERBOROUGH CITY COUNCIL AMR 2017 EXTRACT

- 5.4 Table 5.2 below outlines the dwelling completions by area for the monitoring year and since the Core Strategy DPD was adopted in 2009. Within the current monitoring period there was a loss of 8 dwellings, giving a lower net completions figure.

Table 3: New dwelling completions by area

Location	Minimum requirement at 2009 – Policy CS2	% of minimum requirement	Completions 2016/17	Completions since 2009
City of Peterborough				
City Centre	4,300	17%	353	1,410
District Centres	1,300	5%	49	381
Peterborough Urban Area	4,400	17%	429	2,437
Urban Extensions				
Hampton	4,100	16%	54	1,086
Paston Reserve	1,200	5%	0	371
Norwood	2,300	9%	0	0
Stanground South	1,500	6%	123	1,196
Great Haddon	5,300	21%	0	0
Villages				
Key Service Centres	600	2%	59	408
Limited Growth Villages	450	2%	36	199
Small Villages	50	<1%	12	69
The countryside	0	0%	6	24
Totals	25,500		1,211	7,671

Net Affordable Dwellings

- 5.5 Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy sets a target that 30% of all dwellings, on development sites of 15 or more dwellings should be provided as affordable houses.
- 5.6 There were 129 affordable housing completions in the monitoring year (2016/17). This formed 10.6% of all completions, however the requirements in Policy CS2 is for 30% on sites bringing forward 15 or more dwellings. Therefore, 129 completions brought forward 13.2% of completions for qualifying sites. The table below gives a breakdown of affordable housing completions since 2009.

Table 4: Affordable housing completions

Year	Total dwelling completions on qualifying sites	Net affordable housing completions	Affordable housing as a % of completions on qualifying sites
2009/10	993	692	69.7%
2010/11	617	326	52.8%
2011/12	703	114	16.2%
2012/13	665	281	42.3%
2013/14	769	143	18.6%
2014/15	1219	507	41.6%
2015/16	828	168	20.3%
2016/17	977	129	13.2%
2009 - 2016	6771	2360	34.8%

- 5.7 As you can see from the table above in the 2016/17 year 13.2% of all dwellings on development sites of 15 or more dwellings have been provided as affordable homes which is below the 30% target set out in Policy CS8, however the cumulative total is above this figure at 34.8%
- 5.8 More detailed information and analysis on housing development in the Peterborough District between 1 April 2016 and 31 March 2017 has been published on the council's website in a separate document titled 'Housing Development In Peterborough 2017'.

Self-Build and Custom Housing

- 5.9 The Self-build and Custom Housebuilding (S&CH) Act 2015 (as amended) obliges a local authority to maintain a list of people and groups interested in building their own homes, on a 'register'. The Government has issued Regulations to assist in implementing the Act.
- 5.10 As set out in the Regulations, Part 1 of a register comprises those people and organisations who meet all of the eligibility criteria, including the local connection test. Part 2 comprises those people and organisations who meet most, but not necessarily all, the eligibility criteria. The council has a duty to *'give suitable development permission in respect of enough serviced plots of land to meet the demand for self-build and custom housebuilding in the authority's area'*¹ (i.e. to meet the demand for the number of applicants on Part 1 of their register) within a 3 year period, post the end of the base period. If the register is not split into a Part 1 and Part 2 by a local authority, then all on the register are assumed to be qualifying as if within a Part 1.
- 5.11 As set out within the Regulations, the monitoring period for self-build and custom housing is 31 October – 30 October. Therefore the period reported on within this AMR is the period ending 30 October 2016. At the end of this period there were 3 individuals on the register for Peterborough, as set out in table 5 below. Table 6 sets out the permissions required and the actual number granted in order to meet the demand identified on the register.

Table 5: Self-build and Custom Housing Register

Base Period	Number On Part 1 at end of base period	Number On Part 2 at end of base period	Permissions Granted
31 Oct 2015 – 30 Oct 2016	3	0	N/A
31 Oct 2016 – 30 Oct 2017	W	A	
31 Oct 2017 – 30 Oct 2018	X	B	
31 Oct 2018 – 30 Oct 2019	Y	C	
31 Oct 2019 – 30 Oct 2020	Z	D	

Table 6: Self-build and Custom Housing Permissions

3 year period	Permissions Required (doesn't apply to anyone on Part 2)	Permissions Granted to date in period	Requirement met?
31 Oct 2016 – 30 Oct 2019	3	(to be set out in next AMR)	To be confirmed post 30 Oct 2019
31 Oct 2017 – 30 Oct 2020	W		To be confirmed post 30 Oct 2020
31 Oct 2018 – 30 Oct 2021	X		To be confirmed post 30 Oct 2021
31 Oct 2019 – 30 Oct 2022	Y		To be confirmed post 30 Oct 2022
31 Oct 2020 – 30 Oct 2023	Z		To be confirmed post 30 Oct 2023

¹ see the S&CH Act, as amended by the Housing and Planning Act, section 2(A)(2)

**APPENDIX 2: PETERBOROUGH HOUSING DEVELOPMENT REPORT 2017
EXTRACT**

HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN PETERBOROUGH DISTRICT 1 APRIL 2016 to 31 MARCH 2017

The figures in this report are from an annual survey undertaken by the Sustainable Growth Strategy Section of the Growth and Regeneration Service. Planning applications for residential development are noted once permission has been granted and these applications are annually monitored, site by site, in order to report the status of development.

The detailed information set out in the tables of the main report is used primarily for monitoring planning policies set out in the adopted Peterborough Core Strategy, adopted 2011, the Peterborough Site Allocations adopted on 18 April 2012 and the City Centre Plan adopted 17 December 2014. This year, for the first time, this report is also including statistics from a base date of 2011 in preparation for the base date in the emerging Local Plan. The summary statistics set out below are also of interest to a wider audience.

The results shown below are for the monitoring year just completed as well as cumulative totals since 1 April 2009 and 1 April 2011.

Table 1: Headline figures

Dwellings	2016/17	Cumulative totals since 1 April 2009	Cumulative totals since 1 April 2011
Completed	1211	7,778	5,940
Lost	8	122	100
Net gain	1203	7,656	5,840

Dwellings completed on PDL	883	5,188	3,735
% completed on PDL	72.9%	66.7%	62.9%

Affordable housing completions	129	2,359	1,341
% of completions affordable	10.7%	30.3%	22.6%

% of all new dwellings completed at:

Less than 30 dph	45.5%	25.6%	24.9%
30 – 50 dph	28.9%	47.4%	47.9%
Above 50 dph	25.6%	27.0%	27.2%

Average net density of dwellings completed on sites of 10 or more	30.3	35.2	33.9
---	------	------	------

dph = dwellings per hectare