

## WEST SOMERSET LOCAL PLAN TO 2032

### MATTER 2 AGENDA

15 MARCH 9:30

#### **Strategic Housing Market Areas and the Objectively Assessed Housing Need**

#### **Please read the Inspector's Note that accompanies this Agenda**

*Issue 1: Subject to the caveat set out within it, Framework paragraph 47 requires the objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area to be met in full. The West Somerset local planning authority area is smaller than the administrative area of the District and appears to comprise more than one HMA. Has the Council met the requirement of Framework paragraph 47 in addressing the needs of the HMA and if not, in what way(s) has it failed to do so and how can this be corrected?*

1. In 2008 (EB1) the Northern Peninsular HMA included North Cornwall. That is now part of the Cornwall HMA. Where in the evidence base is the re-assessment of HMA boundaries that brought about this change and when did it happen?
2. Is there a case for the HMA to be a smaller geographical area based perhaps on one or more of the sub areas that the Council refers to?
3. Does the 2008 document (EB1) assess the full range of market signals in reaching its conclusions? If not, which ones are not assessed?
4. How have the two subsequent whole-HMA reviews (EB3 and EB21) assessed and reviewed market signals and their effect, in particular 'affordability'?
5. What is the basis for the apportionment of the HMA OAHN to local planning authority areas? Is this robust?
6. Notwithstanding criticisms by some, no alternative OAHN for either the HMA or the plan area has been put forward. Is there a view as to what it should be?

*Issue 2: The most recent information made available by the Council on the OAHN is included within the papers to the Local Development Panel on 25 November 2015. This continues to argue that the 2900 dwellings being planned for is above the OAHN. Is this analysis robust and, if not, in what way is it deficient and what are the implications for the OAHN?*

This issue addresses the second stage of Framework paragraph 47 and requires the Council to explain why it is not planning for the OAHN. That explanation appears to be in the third bullet of the justification of policy SC2. As set out in the Note, the 2900 dwellings figure being planned for may well be above the OAHN but does not appear related to it in any obvious way. A number of questions therefore arise.

1. If it is right that the plan does represent a continuation of past policies, what is the evidence that those policies have delivered the required level and type of housing?
2. How does the plan accord with the requirements set out in Framework paragraph 50?
3. If the answer to Q2 is policies SC3 and SC4, do these policies meet the requirements of Framework paragraph 50 or should they quantify the requirements? If not, why not? If 'yes', what should those numbers be in any policy revision?
4. The Exmoor National Park Authority (ENPA) explains its concern but confirms that it is not seeking a change in the figure of 2900 dwellings. I am not clear therefore why the plan is unsound or how the suggested changes, one of which relates to the justification, the other of which refers to a document in the evidence base, relate to soundness. Equally however, I am unclear about the basis on which the Council objects to the point raised.
5. Is the ENPA proposing to accommodate some of the plan area's requirement for affordable housing?

**Confirmed Participants:** Exmoor National Park Planning Authority; North Devon Council; House Builders' Federation; Wyndham Estate; West Somerset Council