



## Notice of a public meeting of

### Local Plan Working Group

- To:** Councillors Merrett (Chair), Ayre, Barnes, D'Agorne, Funnell, Horton, Reid, Simpson-Laing, Steward, Warters and Watt (Vice-Chair)
- Date:** Wednesday, 17 December 2014
- Time:** 5.30 pm
- Venue:** The George Hudson Board Room - 1st Floor West Offices (F045)

### AGENDA

#### 1. **Declarations of Interest**

At this point in the meeting, Members are asked to declare:

- any personal interests not included on the Register of Interests
- any prejudicial interests or
- any disclosable pecuniary interests

which they may have in respect of business on this agenda.

#### 2. **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 4)

To approve and sign the minutes of the meeting of the Local Plan Working Group held on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2014.

### **3. Public Participation**

At this point in the meeting, members of the public who have registered their wish to speak, regarding an item on the agenda or an issue within the remit of the Working Group, may do so. The deadline for registering is **5.00 pm on Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> December 2014**.

#### **Filming or Recording Meetings**

“Please note that an audio recording may be made of this meeting and that includes any registered public speakers, who have given their permission. This recording can be played back at <http://www.york.gov.uk/webcasts>

Residents are welcome to photograph, film or record Councillors and Officers at all meetings open to the press and public. This includes the use of social media reporting, i.e. tweeting. Anyone wishing to film, record or take photos at any public meeting should contact the Democracy Officer (whose contact details are at the foot of this agenda) in advance of the meeting.

The Council’s protocol on Webcasting, Filming & Recording of Meetings ensures that these practices are carried out in a manner both respectful to the conduct of the meeting and all those present. It can be viewed at [http://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/download/3130/protocol\\_for\\_webcasting\\_film\\_and\\_recording\\_of\\_council\\_meetings](http://www.york.gov.uk/downloads/download/3130/protocol_for_webcasting_film_and_recording_of_council_meetings)

### **4. City of York Local Plan Housing Options. (Pages 5 - 28)**

The purpose of this report is to update Members on the progress of the Local Plan following the Council Resolution on 9<sup>th</sup> October 2014 and to outline what actions are being taken to respond.

### **5. Any other business which the Chair considers urgent under the Local Government Act 1972.**

Democracy Officer:

Name: Laura Bootland

Contact Details:

- Telephone – (01904) 552062
- E-mail – laura.bootland@york.gov.uk

For more information about any of the following please contact the Democratic Services Officer responsible for servicing this meeting:

- Registering to speak
- Business of the meeting
- Any special arrangements
- Copies of reports and
- For receiving reports in other formats

Contact details are set out above.

**This information can be provided in your own language.**

**我們也用您們的語言提供這個信息 (Cantonese)**

**এই তথ্য আপনার নিজের ভাষায় দেয়া যেতে পারে। (Bengali)**

**Ta informacja może być dostarczona w twoim własnym języku. (Polish)**

**Bu bilgiyi kendi dilinizde almanız mümkündür. (Turkish)**

**یہ معلومات آپ کی اپنی زبان (بولی) میں بھی مہیا کی جاسکتی ہیں۔ (Urdu)**

** (01904) 551550**

This page is intentionally left blank

City Of York Council

Committee Minutes

---

Meeting	Local Plan Working Group
Date	20 October 2014
Present	Councillors Merrett (Chair), Ayre, Barnes, D'Agorne, Funnell, Horton, Reid, Semlyen, Simpson-Laing, Steward and Watt (Vice-Chair)

---

### 9. **Declarations of Interest**

At this point in the meeting, Members were asked to declare any personal, prejudicial or pecuniary interests they may have in the business on the agenda. None were declared.

### 10. **Minutes**

Resolved: That the minutes of the last Local Plan Working Group held on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2014 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

### 11. **Public Participation**

It was reported that there had been one registration to speak under the Council's Public Participation Scheme.

Alan Charlesworth had registered to speak on behalf of 'Keep Earswick Rural'. He raised concerns about over-provision of sites, growth predictions and the quantity of housing proposed in the draft Local Plan. He asked on behalf of the group that the Council takes time to build and honest, solid plan.

The Chair responded to advise that the Plan needed to be viable and deliverable and housing figures needed to be set at a level which will enable the plan to pass the inspection stage.

**12. Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Additional and Revised Sites**

Consideration was given to a report which advised Members of the current position with regard to the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan for North Yorkshire, York and North York Moors. Approval was required for the Additional or Revised Sites consultation document (attached at Annex of the report) for consultation purposes.

Officers outlined the report and stated that the draft plan had been devised in conjunction with North Yorkshire County Council and the North York Moors National Park Authority and the additional and revised sites had been received as a result of the Issues and Options consultation. Further views on the additional sites/revised information would be sought in the next stage of preparation of the Joint Plan, the Preferred Options in June 2015.

Member's queried if the consultation would be separate to any consultations on the Local Plan. Officers confirmed it would.

Members were happy to agree the recommendations to Cabinet.

**Resolved:** That the Local Plan Working Group recommends Cabinet Members to:

- i. Note the current position of the Minerals and Waste Joint Plan.
- ii. Approve the Joint Minerals and Waste Plan Additional or Revised Sites documents for the purpose of consultation.
- iii. Give authorisation to the Cabinet Member for Environmental Services, Planning and Sustainability to make non-substantive editorial changes to the draft consultation documents prior to publication.

**Reason:** In order for the document to progress to public consultation.

Cllr D Merrett Chair  
[The Meeting Started at 5.00 pm and Finished at 5.15 pm].

This page is intentionally left blank





---

**Local Plan Working Group****17th December 2014**

Report of the Director for City and Environmental Services

**City of York Local Plan - Housing Options****Purpose of the Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to update Members on the progress of the Local Plan following the Council Resolution on 9<sup>th</sup> October 2014 and to outline what actions are being taken to respond.
2. The Council resolution of Council on 9<sup>th</sup> October 2014 states that the draft local plan approved by Cabinet on the 25<sup>th</sup> September 2014 *'does not accurately reflect the evidence base and is therefore not based on objectively assessed requirements, is not the most appropriate strategy and has ignored reasonable alternatives rather than to test the approach against them and is not deliverable over the plan period and is contrary to the combined methodological approach of the Leeds City Region'*.
3. The motion also states that *'Council believes that the current proposals fail to adequately reflect the results of the citywide consultations undertaken in July 2013 and July 2014' and that 'the current proposals will result in the plan being found unsound by the planning inspector leaving the city vulnerable'*.
4. The motion requests that *'in order to accurately reflect objectively assessed requirements officers should produce a report on the housing trajectory to be brought back to the next meeting of the Local Plan Working Group (LPWG) along with the relevant background reports. The LPWG will then agree an accurate analysis of the housing trajectory that is objective, evidence based and deliverable. This analysis will then be used to inform housing allocations and a new proposed Local Plan to be brought back to the next LPWG for discussion and recommendation to Cabinet in November'*.

5. This report seeks to outline the requirements placed on the Council through national guidance and to present to Members an assessment of housing requirement options for the Local Plan drawing on existing published evidence. It follows on from the Local Plan Housing Seminar held for all Members on the 1<sup>st</sup> December 2014 chaired by the Planning Advisory Service.
6. Members are aware that delay in bringing forward a Local Plan for York risks a series of planning applications which are not supported by the majority of members but will be NPPF compliant and therefore may be upheld in inspection or enquiry. This risk grows the longer the City is without evidence of an emerging plan. Members should be aware that the evidence base is a key part of inspectors' considerations of any planning application. The evidence base enables some policy choices for members. Failure to make decisions on the evidence base increases the risk that the Council does not have an emerging plan and is unable to resist applications.

### **Background – Policy Context**

7. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF published in 2012) requires that Local Planning Authorities identify the objectively assessed need for housing in their areas, and that Local Plans translate those needs into land provision targets. Like all parts of a development plan such housing targets should be informed by robust and proportionate evidence.
8. Paragraph 17 of NPPF sets out a set of core land-use planning principles which should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. This includes the following principle:

*“Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. Plans should take account of market signals, such as land prices and housing affordability, and set out a clear strategy for allocating sufficient land which is suitable for development in their area, taking account of the needs of the residential and business communities”.*

9. Paragraph 47 of NPPF states that local planning authorities should:

*“ 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, as far as is consistent with the policies set out in this Framework, including identifying key sites which are critical to the delivery of the housing strategy over the plan period”.*

10. Paragraph 159 of NPPF states that “Local Planning Authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area” and they should:

- *prepare a Strategic Housing Market Assessment to assess their full housing needs, working with neighbouring authorities where housing market areas cross administrative boundaries. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment should identify the scale and mix of housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period which:*
  - *meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change;*
  - *addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community (such as, but not limited to, families with children, older people, people with disabilities, service families and people wishing to build their own homes);*
  - *caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand; and*
  - *prepare a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period.*

11. National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) was published in March 2014. It includes guidance for local planning authorities in objectively assessing and evidencing development needs for housing. It states that:

*“The assessment of development needs is an objective assessment of need based on facts and unbiased evidence. Plan makers should not apply constraints to the overall assessment of need, such as limitations imposed by the supply of land for new development, historic under performance, viability, infrastructure or environmental constraints. However, these considerations will need to be addressed when bringing*

*evidence bases together to identify specific policies within development plans<sup>1</sup>.*

12. NPPG's section on housing and economic development needs assessments deals with housing in three sub-sections: the approach to assessing need; the scope of assessments and the methodology for assessing housing need. The first two sections provide general guidance, covering both housing and economic development. The third is specific to housing and puts forward a standard methodology for assessing housing needs. It advises that other methodologies are possible, but that the standard one is recommended and that any authority that chooses to depart from it should explain why. In summary, the steps in the method are as follows:

- Define the housing market area – where the housing market area covers more than one authority, the assessment should relate to this larger area ;
- Refer to the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) household projections – the CLG projections (which in turn are derived from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) population projections) provide the '*starting point*' estimate of housing need;
- Adjust for factors that are not captured in the CLG projections – this stage may include the following:
  - Update the projections to take into account the latest available information;
  - If using the latest CLG projections which is the 2011-based interim projection and only extends to 2021, '*assess likely trends after 2021 to align with development plan periods*';
  - Adjust for other local circumstances, including exceptional or one off events either past or expected, such as the building of an urban extension or a new university;
  - If market signals show that planning in the past has undersupplied need, adjust the CLG projection upwards; and
  - If the demographic projection does not provide a sufficient labour supply to match the expected growth in jobs, adjust them upwards.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph: 004 Reference ID: 2a-004-20140306

13. NPPG also notes that the CLG projections are trend-based, that is they carry forward past trends in population and household formation. Accordingly they cannot predict the impact of changes which are not captured in past trends, such as changing economic circumstances or government policy. NPPG also states that assessing housing needs is not an exact science and that many of the questions needed to be addressed have no definitive answer.
14. The Planning Advisory Service (PAS) also provides guidance to local authorities on plan-making. The Planning Advisory Service is a national organisation funded by central government which essentially promotes best practice in Planning. The role of PAS is to help local authorities to get an up to date local plan in place so that they have a framework for making local decisions. PAS have produced guidance on undertaking their assessment of housing need in their technical advice note 'Objectively Assessed Need and Housing Targets', Technical Advice Note, June 2014. Their definition of total housing need is as follows - *'The housing that households are willing and able to buy or rent, either from their own resources or with assistance from the state'*. They consider that total need, or demand, equals the total housing that would be provided across both the market and affordable housing sectors, if land was not constrained by planning. This is why the assessed total need is often described as a policy-off estimate.
15. PAS state that in practice this unconstrained demand is difficult to measure, because planning generally does constrain housing development and has done so for many decades. When assessing future demand by projecting forward past trends, as in the national CLG household projections, they are also projecting forwards the effect of those past trends and therefore will generally underestimate the unconstrained total need. It is clear therefore that any policy considerations should be separate from the objective assessment of housing need.

## **Background – Local Plan Preferred Options and Publication Draft**

### **Preferred Options**

16. The Preferred Options Local Plan (June 2013) set out four options for how the Plan should seek to address the housing requirement:
  - A baseline demographic position of 850 homes/yr;

- A housing to support economic growth scenario of 1090 homes/yr that responded to the council's stated economic ambition ;
  - A scenario to address the forecast need for affordable homes through cross subsidy from market housing of 1500 homes/yr; and
  - A scenario to address both forecast need and current backlog of affordable homes of 2,060 homes/yr.
17. Consultants Arup in their report published to support the Local Plan Preferred Options (Housing Requirements in York, Arup 2013) analysed the merits of each of the four options and their conclusion was that the housing to support economic growth scenario of 1090 homes per annum provided the scale of housing growth required to support the employment growth forecast in the 'City of York Economic and Retail Growth and Visioning Study (Deloitte, 2013)' and would provide choice for those who may take up new jobs in York rather than commuting into the authority area. This represents an integrated approach to housing and employment growth to ensure there is a consistent and holistic policy stance in the Plan. This fits with advice in NPPF and NPPG which advises that housing needs assessments should have regard to future employment.
18. Arup also considered that the options to deliver 1,500 homes per annum and 2060 homes per annum but concluded that both these figures would mean such a significant step up in delivery rates that they would be considered aspirational rather than realistic. Thus not meeting the requirements of NPPF<sup>2</sup>.

### **Publication Draft**

19. The 2014 update of housing requirements for York (Housing Requirements in York, Arup 2014) has sought to understand implications of new guidance (NPPG, PAS etc) and the most up to date datasets on population and housing growth.
20. The Publication Draft Local Plan as approved by Cabinet on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2014 put forward the following position in terms of the Local Plan housing requirement:
- A trend based assessment of household growth to support the Plan's economic ambition of 870 (based on the demographic

---

<sup>2</sup> NPPF Paragraph 154.

baseline of 838 plus the economic impact of a further 32 homes per annum);

- Further provision to address the backlog from previous under delivery of 126 (calculated based on historic completion rates using base date of 2004, RSS start date);
- This equated to an annual housing requirement of 996 dwellings per annum (total plan requirement of 15,936 dwellings<sup>3</sup> (1 April 2014 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2030).

21. Officers recommended in the Publication Draft Plan that the trend based assessment of household growth to support the Plan's economic position of 870 homes per annum (rounded from 869 in the Arup report) should be used as the objectively assessed need figure for the Plan. This aligns the approach to both economic and housing growth.
22. Officers recommended in the Publication Draft Plan that the 'backlog' from the period 2004 (RSS base date) to the start date of the Plan (2014) should be added to the whole plan requirement (referred to as the Liverpool method) rather than over the first five years of the plan (referred to as the Sedgefield Method). This was considered to be the most robust approach given this is the base date of the only adopted plan for York, coupled with the fact it would be unrealistic to meet this backlog over the first five years of the plan.

## **Analysis**

### **Baseline**

23. The 2011 based interim household projections (covering the period 2011 to 2021) in England were published by Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) on 9th April 2013. These projections represent the most up to date data on household numbers and formation rates and draw on the 2011 Census results.
24. The interim 2011 based household projections for York forecast a growth of 7,000 dwellings between 2011 and 2021, equating to an annual average growth rate of 636 dwellings. This is substantially lower than the previous 2008 based household projections which showed that

---

<sup>3</sup> The buffer as required by NPPF of either 5% or 20% dependent on past delivery rates is not considered as part of the objective assessment of housing need as it is a supply related issue – i.e. moving forward supply from later in the plan period rather than an addition to the demand figure.

between 2011 and 2033 the number of households in York was forecast to grow by 24,800 dwellings. This equated to an annual average growth rate of approximately 1,180 dwellings.

25. A major difference between the 2011 based interim projections and the previous projections are the updated assumptions surrounding household structure and a break in the long term trend in declining household size. There has been criticism in recent examinations that the household size assumptions contained in the interim 2011 based projections are drawn from a five year period when the housing market was in severe recession and that using these rates for a projection of need 'locks in' the recessionary trend. Conversely the previous 2008 projections are drawn from a five year period which includes the peak of the housing market and arguably therefore represent an over optimistic picture in respect of falling household size.
26. Arup in their 2014 report (Housing Requirements in York) advise that looking ahead as the housing market emerges from recession it is likely that the longer term picture of household size over the plan period to 2030 is likely to fall somewhere between the assumptions used in the 2008 and interim 2011 based projections. This formed the basis of the work undertaken by Arup which is highlighted in paragraph 31 of this report.
27. In January 2014, the Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) released a guidance note entitled '*Understanding recent changes in household formation rates and their implications for planning for housing in England*'. In it they concluded that:
  - Whilst the 2011 census results suggest a slowdown in the fall in average household size, this was influenced by increased international migration, the economic downturn and the effects of a long period of poor housing affordability. If conditions in the housing market and the economy more generally improve there may be a return towards previous trends.
  - Authorities need to consider their own specific situation carefully in the light of what the latest projections suggest for their area.
  - Plan makers should consider whether the average household size trends in the latest projections are a prudent basis for planning. (Arup considered the local drivers of average household size in York in Section 3.4.3 of the 2014 report, and conclude that the



slowdown in the fall in average household size is related to the economic downturn, rather than a longer-term trend.)

- The projections should be extended beyond the end date of 2021 to the end of the plan period. However, **a simple extrapolation of numbers should not be used**, as this will only tell you what would happen if the trends assumed were to continue, which may not be the most likely outcome.

28. This approach is also adopted in the support and guidance provided by the Planning Advisory Service, including their '*Objectively assessed need and housing targets: Technical advice note*' guidance. It states that plan makers should **use the interim 2011-based assumptions to 2021, and then should then assume the rates of change in earlier projections**. This method is known as 'indexation'.

29. This approach has been borne out by recent Examination outcomes, for example Lichfield:

*[...] although the household representation rates in the 2011 CLG household projections are lower than those in the 2008 projections, this is a result of poor economic conditions that the latter projection took account of. However, over the longer term household representation rates have been rising and the fall in these rates identified in the 2011 projection is likely to have been driven by short term factors such as the impact of the recession, constraints on housing supply and constraints on mortgage lending. It is reasonable, therefore, to assume that beyond 2021 (the end of the period covered by the 2011 projection) household representation rates will resume their long term rise.*

30. It was also supported in principle by the Inspector for the South Worcestershire Development Plan who supported the 'index' approach to applying household formation rates post 2021.

31. In their 2014 report Arup took household growth directly from the interim 2011 household projections for the period 2011 to 2021. This is the most up to date source of data available. For the period 2021 to 2030 the rate of change from the 2008 based projections (the most recent data source for this period of time) has been applied to the numbers from the interim 2011 based projections. This reflects the likelihood that an improving economy will begin to increase the housing requirement in the plan period. Table 1 shows what the indexation approach means for York's objectively assessed housing need, compared with simply carrying forward the interim 2011 based assumptions.

Table 1

Source	2011 households	2031 households	Absolute change	% change	Annual average change (21 years)
2008 based household projections	88,200	113,000	24,800	28.1%	1,181
<b>Interim 2011-based household projections (indexed)</b>	<b>83,500</b>	<b>101,100</b>	<b>17,600</b>	<b>21.1%</b>	<b>838</b>
Interim 2011-based household projections (extrapolated)	83,500	96,900	13,400	16.0%	638

NB. Shaded rows are considered unlikely to be sound.

32. Using the 2011 based household formation rate data from 2011 to 2021 (the end date of the 2011 interim household projections) and then indexing the household formation rates from 2021 to 2031 using the 2008 based household formation rates this indicates **a demographic derived objectively assessed need for 838 dwellings per annum.**
33. Further work on household formation rates has been requested by officers from Arup and is detailed in paragraph 59 of this report.

### Economic Forecasts

34. As part of identifying objectively assessed need, the NPPG states that plan makers should make an assessment of the likely change in job numbers based on past trends and/or economic forecasts. Any plan that doesn't take account of economic growth is likely to be considered 'unsound' by the inspector. This has been seen at recent examinations at Cheshire East, East Staffordshire and Chiltern.
35. The economic forecasts for York have been updated by Oxford Economics (OE). These updates include the production of a base forecast and two additional scenarios:
- **The base scenario:** which reflects how global and national trends are expected to apply to York;
  - **Base Scenario Sensitivity test:** where higher levels of migration are assumed and where it is assumed that there is a faster recovery from the current economic downturn; and
  - **Scenario 2:** which assumes a faster rate of growth in the following sectors of the York economy: advanced manufacturing; science

and research; financial and professional services; and tourism and leisure.

36. The main conclusion of the updates is that forecast employment growth is expected to grow at greater than the regional and national averages. It will impact on the requisite housing requirements, as there is a relationship between the provision of the appropriate quantum and range of housing, in the right locations and economically successful areas.
37. The OE model uses the latest release of ONS population data (2012 mid year estimates). The model uses the ONS assumptions about natural change (birth and death rates) but recognises that net migration is economically driven and so is inherently shaped by economic prospects of an area *'the rational being that migrants are attracted to areas where there are perceived to be employment opportunities.'*<sup>4</sup>
38. The OE projections consider that that the growth of the work age population will slow down in the future from an average of 0.9% per year from 2003 to 2013 to only 0.1% per year between 2013 to 2030, which is in line with national trends. This means that, to deliver the anticipated jobs growth, particularly in the policy on scenarios, increased economic activity rates of existing residents and continued net in-migration are required.
39. It was considered that the base scenario represents the most realistic forecast because it is most evidenced approach and fits with NPPG guidance regarding the use of baseline rather than 'policy-on' scenarios when considering objectively assessed need.
40. **Applying average household size to the OE base forecasts suggests a figure of 870 homes per year to support economic growth.** This is comparable to the demographic-derived objectively assessed needs figure of 838 dwellings per annum plus a further 32 dwellings per annum.

## Backlog

41. NPPG states that in assessing housing requirements, Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) should reflect the consequences of past under delivery, as household projections are trend based and do not reflect unmet needs. The NPPG suggests that LPAs **'take a view'** on the extent of past under delivery. It does not set out an approach to determining how under delivery should be calculated.

---

<sup>4</sup> York Economic Forecasts Briefing Note, OEF, March 2014

42. The PAS technical advice notes advises that backlog is defined as under-provision that has accrued against any previous development plan target. They state that the dates of the plan period are fundamental to the calculation of whether there has been a backlog against the requirement that was in place over that period.

### **Base Year**

43. Prior to the abolition of the Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) in 2013, it was the accepted practice that either the RSS or a Local Plan adopted post RSS (as it needed to be in conformity with the RSS) provided the 'base year' for considering completions against the established housing requirement.
44. Since the introduction of NPPF and the subsequent abolition of RSS the practice has been less straightforward, especially when, as is the case in York, authorities didn't have an adopted plan in place at the point of the abolition of the RSS. In addition, case law from recent appeals and Examinations of Local Plans/Core Strategies do not present a consistent picture of the base year and how any backlog calculation should be approached.
45. Arup suggest in their report that a base year of 2004 could be appropriate for the calculation of backlog given this is the base date of the only adopted plan for York and also given experience at other plan inspections which have taken a similar approach. Arup suggest that whilst a case could be made that the RSS requirement was not 'objectively assessed' and now has no status in planning law terms since it was abolished in 2013, in the absence of a subsequent Local Plan, it is the only Plan in the past 10+ years which has set a target housing requirement for York. Furthermore the requirement in RSS for York is broadly consistent with the household projections available at that time.
46. The PAS technical advice note also advises that calculations of persistent under delivery should be based on an analysis of completions against previous requirements using data representative of the whole economic cycle, which may be from the last ten years.
47. Arup looked at the approach taken by several of York's neighbouring authorities who are seeking to establish a more recent 'base year' for the Plan (2011 or 2012) as a basis for determining the extent of under-delivery. The benefit of setting a more recent base year would be that 'backlog' would only be calculated for between 1 and 3 years rather than from 2004 (RSS base date). The justification for using a more recent base year would be that the 2011 Census is an actual count of the

population so presents an accurate start point for future housing requirements and that the RSS was abolished and no longer carries any weight and that the housing requirement in RSS was not 'objectively assessed' as the NPPF now requires.

48. Since the publication of NPPG and the technical work by Arup a further court case ( Zurich Assurance Limited V Winchester City Council and South Downs National Park Authority) makes important points about addressing housing backlog. The Inspector concluded that there was no reason for someone seeking to draw up a current estimate of population growth and housing requirements looking into the future from 2011 to 2031 and using up-to-date evidence to do so, to add on to the estimated figures any shortfall against what had been estimated to be needed in the previously modelled period.
49. Table 2 shows the calculations of backlog against the two alternative base dates 2004 and 2012.

Table 2: Housing Completions and Targets

Year	Net Housing Completions	Target Publication Draft	Target - Economic	Target - Demographic	Backlog Publication Draft	Backlog Economic	Backlog Demographic
2004/05	1160	640	640	640	520	520	520
2005/06	906	640	640	640	266	266	266
2006/07	798	640	640	640	158	158	158
2007/08	523	640	640	640	-117	-117	-117
2008/09	451	850	850	850	-399	-399	-399
2009/10	507	850	850	850	-343	-343	-343
2010/11	514	850	850	850	-336	-336	-336
2011/12	321	850	850	850	-529	-529	-529
2012/13	482	970	860	844	-488	-378	-362
2013/14	345	1090	870	838	-745	-525	-493
Totals 2004 base	6007	8020	7690	7642	-2013	-1683	-1635
Annual backlog requirement					126 p.a.	105 p.a.	102 p.a.
Totals 2012 base	827	2060	1730	1682	-1233	-903	-855
Annual requirement					77 p.a.	56 p.a.	53 p.a.

**Table Notes:**

The calculation of backlog against the target from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012 (the base date of the Preferred Options Local Plan) onwards is subject to change depending on the final

decision on the Local Plan housing requirement.

The column titled 'Target Publication draft' is based on the Preferred Options Local Plan requirement from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014 of 1090 homes per annum. For the first half of monitoring year 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 to 30 September 2012 the backlog is measured against 6 months of the RSS target (425) and for the second half of the monitoring year 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013 it is measured against 6 months of the Preferred Options Local Plan target (545).

The column titled 'Target Economic' is based on the Arup economic based option from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014 of 870 homes per annum. For the first half of the monitoring year 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 to 30 September 2012 the backlog is measured against 6 months of the RSS target (425) and the for the second half of the monitoring year 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013 it is measured against 6 months of the Arup economic based option (435).

The column titled 'Target Demographic' is based on the Arup demographic based option from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014 of 838 homes per annum. For the first half of the monitoring year 1<sup>st</sup> April 2012 to 30 September 2012 the backlog is measured against 6 months of the RSS target (425) and the for the second half of the monitoring year 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2013 it is measured against 6 months of the Arup economic based option (419).

### **The Sedgefield or Liverpool Method – How to deal with the backlog over the plan period**

50. There are two different approaches to how the 'backlog' of housing delivery can be approached in setting the future housing requirement; as follows:
- The 'Sedgefield approach' seeks to meet the backlog by loading the 'unmet provision from proceeding years' within the first five years of the plan.
  - The 'Liverpool approach' or 'residual approach' seeks to meet the backlog over the whole plan period.
51. The PAS technical note states that there is no guidance or advice which sets out the preferred approach. However the 'Sedgefield approach' is more closely aligned with the requirements of the NPPF and the need to boost significantly the supply of housing and remedy the unsatisfactory consequences of persistent under delivery. Inspectors' decisions in relation to S78 appeals<sup>5</sup> confirms their preference for this approach.

---

<sup>5</sup> Appeal against planning refusals

52. In terms of recent local plan examinations not all local authorities have been required to add the preceding years undersupply to the future requirement. When required, in most cases, the Inspector has accepted the Liverpool approach (to make up the past under-delivery over the whole plan period). The reasons given for this are to ensure that there is a **realistic prospect** of achieving the planned land supply (NPPF, para 47) and to ensure that the plan is 'aspirational but also **realistic**' (NPPF para 154).

## Summary of Options

Table 3 – Options

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
	Publication Draft	Publication Draft with 2012 base	Economic impact with 2004 base	Demographic baseline with no economic impact - 2004 base	Economic impact with 2012 base	Demographic baseline with no economic impact - 2012 base
Demographic baseline	838	838	838	838	838	838
Economic Impact	32	32	32	0	32	0
Backlog (2004 base date)	126	N/A	105	102	N/A	N/A
Backlog (2012 base date)	N/A	77	N/A	N/A	56	53
Average Annual Requirement	996	947	975	940	926	891
Total Plan Requirement	15,936	15,152	15,600	15,040	14,816	14,256

53. Option 4 and 6 above are demographic led and do not align economic and population growth. This is not considered to represent a strategic coherent approach, is contrary to national guidance and is considered likely to be rejected as unsound by the inspector as detailed in paragraph 34 of this report.
54. The Publication Draft projection (option 1 above) is considered the most robust by officers. However, **with increasing degrees of risk that the Plan would be judged unsound at inspection**, the options 2, 3 and 5 above would provide a technical base for a potentially sound plan.

## Alternative Approaches

### Leeds City Region Methodology – Objectively Assessed Need

55. The Leeds City Region (LCR) partnership of which York is a member, commissioned in Autumn 2013, work from Edge Analytics to derive a common methodology for establishing the Objectively Assessed Need for housing. This work was commissioned to help promote a shared approach that would enable a better understanding of the evidence and assumptions that underpin the assessment of need. It is a component of a wider piece of work that is hoped will reduce the risk of Plans failing at examination because the evidence of housing need and impacts on neighbouring authorities are not fully documented and understood. Consequently a key requirement of the work is to provide a robust methodology that will survive the level of scrutiny experienced at an examination in public. (The same is true of the Arup methodology set out above.)
56. The methodology sets out a 4 stage process:
- Inputs and assumptions which includes previous housing delivery and the assumptions that underpin the economic forecast for job growth which will have implications for the scale of housing growth
  - Population forecasts using official forecasts from ONS and any alternatives including housing led or job led forecasts of population growth
  - Household forecasts; bringing together the analysis of population growth scenarios and testing this against different assumptions about household formation
  - Outcomes; presented as a series of scenarios for Objectively Assessed Need which show the possible range of housing growth that can then be tested against other policy considerations to derive the Plan requirement.
57. The analysis then explores the impact that different assumptions may have on the various components of the methodology. Examples include the effect of economic activity rates on job led population growth, how



migration shapes population change, how household formation rates vary through the cycle of the housing market.

58. The City Region Partnership considered the methodology report from Edge early in 2014 and both the Heads of Planning and Planning Portfolio Holders groups agreed the recommendations in the report and the adoption of a common methodology. Although the methodology as outlined above has been signed off by LCR the interim results of the work have not been finalised. There are implications for every authority in the LCR and therefore the city region and member authorities do not consider it appropriate to publish. The final report is due to be brought back to LCR meetings in February 2015.

### **Further work – Sensitivity Testing**

59. Following the member seminar on housing numbers held on the 1<sup>st</sup> December 2014 officers have asked consultants Arup to do further work on sensitivity testing the housing options in the 2014 Arup report. This will include looking in more detail at the issue of household formation and headship rates and the linkages between the latest population and household projections. In summary the work will include:
- A detailed analysis of the 2012 Sub National population projections to include sensitivity testing of any potential variants of this projection as these figures will underpin the latest CLG 2012 based household projections when they are issued (current expected date for release is February 2015).
  - Further sensitivity testing of how population growth is converted into household growth; and
  - Sensitivity testing of the propensity to form households to include any local evidence.

### **Options**

Option 1: Members consider whether they can agree any of the four options considered sound against the evidence base as set out in table 3, resulting in annual average requirements of 996, 975, 947 or 926 houses respectively, enabling a review of the proposals map and associated assessments based on this agreement;

Option 2: Request officers to undertake further technical work to provide a full risk assessment of the options included in table 3. In undertaking this work incorporate the further work being undertaken by Arup as outlined in paragraph 59 of this report and report the outcomes of the work to LPWG in January 2015.

Option 3: Instruct officers to undertake an alternative approach.

### **Impact of delay and Analysis of Options**

60. As the financial, risk and legal implications make clear, there are significant risks to delay in progressing the Local Plan. In particular members are reminded that:
- the city is vulnerable to uncontrolled and unsupported development which does not deliver the infrastructure required
  - the council is at risk of spending considerable sums seeking to resist unwelcome applications through the appeals process
  - It is extremely difficult to set a Community Infrastructure Levy without a Local Plan, risking the council's ability to fund infrastructure investments over the next fifteen years, including transport, education and affordable housing
61. The next stage depends on which option LPWG recommends. If Option 1 is chosen and the LPWG agrees an annual average housing requirement then officers will review relevant elements of the Publication Draft including the Proposals Map for consideration by LPWG and Cabinet early in 2015. If LPWG recommends Options 2 or 3, further additional reports will be required first.
62. Given the issues set out in paragraphs 6 and 59, officers' recommendation is option 1 and LPWG are asked to consider which average annual housing requirement they can agree.

### **Council Plan**

63. The information in this report accords with the following priorities from the Council Plan
- Create jobs and grow the economy
  - Get York moving
  - Build strong communities
  - Protect the environment

## Implications

64. The following implications have been assessed.

- **Financial (1)** – Work on the Local Plan is funded through the Local Plan Reserve. A review of the Local Plan reserve is being undertaken to see whether all commitments can be funded. There are financial implications arising from both the holding the local plan housing seminar and in addition from the need to further update the local plan evidence base and supporting documents. Over the last four years, significant sums have been expended on achieving a robust evidence base, carrying out consultations, sustainability and other appraisals, policy development and financial analyses. Whilst this work remains of great value, the longer it takes to agree the housing trajectory, the more will have to be redone at additional cost.
- **Financial (2)** - managing the planning process in the absence of a Plan will lead to significant costs to the council in managing appeals and examinations
- **Human Resources (HR)** – The production of a Local Plan and associated evidence base requires the continued implementation of a comprehensive work programme that will predominantly, although not exclusively, need to be resourced within City and Environmental Services (CES).
- **Community Impact Assessment** A Community Impact Assessment (CIA) has been carried out for the local plan to date and highlights the positive impact on the following groups: age, disability and race.
- **Legal (1)** – The procedures which the Council is required to follow when producing a Local Plan derive from the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012. The legislation states that a local planning authority must only submit a plan for examination which it considers to be sound. This is defined by the National Planning Policy Framework as being:

- **Positively Prepared:** based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements;
  - **Justified:** the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence;
  - **Effective:** deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities; and
  - **Consistent with national policy:** enable the deliver of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.
- 
- **Legal (2)** The Council also has a legal duty to comply with the Statement of Community Involvement in preparing the Plan. (S19(3) 2004 Act). Planning Inspectorate guidance states that “general accordance” amounts to compliance.
  - **Legal (3)** The Council also has a legal “Duty to Co-operate” in preparing the Plan. (S33A 2004 Act).
- 
- **Crime and Disorder** – The Plan addresses where applicable.
  - **Information Technology (IT)** – The Plan promotes where applicable.
  - **Property** – The Plan includes land within Council ownership.
  - **Other** – None

## Risk Management

65. In addition to the points made at paragraphs 6 and 60, and compliance with the Council’s risk management strategy, the main risks in producing a Local Plan for the City of York are as follows.

- The risk that the Council is unable to steer, promote or restrict development across its administrative area
- The potential damage to the Council’s image and reputation if a development plan is not adopted in an appropriate timeframe.
- Risks arising from failure to comply with the laws and regulations relating to Planning and the SA and Strategic Environmental Assessment processes and not exercising local control of developments.
- Risk associated with hindering the delivery of key projects for the Council and key stakeholders.

- Financial risk associated with the Council's ability to utilize planning gain and deliver strategic infrastructure.

66. Measured in terms of impact and likelihood, the risks associated with this report have been assessed as requiring frequent monitoring.

### Recommendations

67. It is recommended that Members:

Consider whether they can agree any of the three options considered sound against the evidence base as set out in table 3, resulting in annual average requirements of 996, 975, 947 or 926 houses respectively, enabling a review of the proposals map and associated assessments based on this agreement;

Reason: So that an NPPF compliant Local Plan can be progressed

### Contact Details

**Author:**

Rachel Macefield  
Forward Planning Team  
Manager  
Tel: 551356

**Chief Officer Responsible for the report:**

Sarah Tanburn  
Interim Director of City & Environmental  
Services  
Tel: 551330

**Report  
Approved**



**Date** 09.12.14

**Specialist Implications Officer(s)** N/A

**Wards Affected:** *List wards or tick box to indicate all*

All

**For further information please contact the author of the report.**

**Background Papers:**

Housing Requirements in York: Assessment of the Evidence on Housing Requirements in York (Arup, May 2013)

Housing Requirements in York: Evidence on Housing Requirements in York: 2014 Update (Arup, September 2014)

Glossary of Abbreviations

CES – City & Environmental Services

CLG - Department of Communities and Local Government

LCR – Leeds City Region

LPA – Local Planning Authority

LPWG – Local Plan Working Group

NPPF – National Planning Policy Framework

NPPG – National Planning Practice Guidance

OE – Oxford Economics

ONS – Office for National Statistics

PAS – Planning Advisory Service

RSS – Regional Spatial Strategy

RTPI – Royal Technical Planning Institute

This page is intentionally left blank




# York's Objectively Assessed Need for Housing

Chris Tunnell, Arup

ARUP

# Government priorities for delivering housing

- To meet full needs for market and affordable housing, unless not consistent with other government policies
- To proactively drive and support housing growth
- To be plan-led, empowering people to shape their surroundings
- To protect the Green Belt



# National Planning Policy Framework

## **Presumption in favour of sustainable development**


Where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:

- any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or
- specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.” (NPPF Para 14)

# National Planning Policy Framework

Housing evidence base should identify the scale and mix of housing which:

- meets household and population projections, taking account of migration and demographic change;
- addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community; and
- caters for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand. (NPPF Para 159)
- Five year housing land supply: 5% buffer or 20% buffer (moved forward from later in the plan period). (NPPF Para 47)
- Local Plans should be based on ‘adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence
- ‘Aspirational but also realistic’ (Para 154)



# Additional National Guidance

<p>National Planning Practice Guidance</p>	<p><b>Household projections</b> published by the Department for Communities and Local Government should <b>provide the starting point estimate</b> of overall housing need.</p> <p><b>Household projections are trend based</b>, i.e. they provide the household levels and structures that would result if the assumptions based on previous demographic trends in the population were to be realised in practice.</p> <p>Household-projection based estimates of housing need <b>may require adjustment</b> to reflect factors affecting local demography and household formation rates.</p>
<p>RTPI Guidance Note ‘Understanding Recent Changes in Household Formation Rates’</p>	<p>Interim 2011-based census results suggest a fall in average household size, this was <b>influenced by increased international migration, the economic downturn and the effects of a long period of poor housing affordability</b>.</p> <p>The projections should be extended beyond 2021 to the end of the Plan Period. However, a <b>simple extrapolation of numbers should not be used</b>, as this would only assume current trends continued and ‘lock-in’ recessionary conditions.</p>
<p>Planning Advisory Service ‘Objectively Assessed Need and Housing Targets: Technical Guidance’</p>	<p>It states that plan makers should <b>use the interim 2011-based assumptions to 2021, and then should then assume the rates of change in earlier (2008-based) projections</b>. This method is known as ‘<b>indexation</b>’.</p> <p>This approach has been successfully tested at Examination outcomes.</p>

# Challenges


- Population and household projections keep being updated – 2008-based, 2010-based, interim 2011-based, 2012 based
- Recession has challenged some of the assumptions used
- Average household size – long-term decline has slowed (likely as a result of the recession, expected to revert to previous trends)
- Requirement to take neighbours' position into account, through the duty to co-operate.
- Expectation that the housing number is up-to-date and tells a story at Examination.
- Similarly, challenges of failing to address OAHN and having levels of unmet need could constitute '**very special circumstances**' - justifying inappropriate development on Green Belt land.

# Challenges: Population and Housing Projections

- **Population projections** keep being updated 2008-based, 2010-based, interim 2011-based, 2012 based.
- Recession has challenged some of the assumptions used, which particularly impacted the interim 2011-based population assumptions.
- The most up-to-date evidence in relation to household requirements for York is the DCLG interim 2011-based household projections. However, these projections **only run to 2021**.
- To determine a housing requirement for the Plan Period (to 2030/2031), we need to project these populations forward across the decade from 2021 – 2030/31.
  - Extrapolation is discredited by the RTPPI, for the assumptions this makes on current trends and ‘locks-in’ recessionary trends.
  - ‘Indexation’ using the most up-to-date projections is preferred.

# Methodological Approach (Indexing 2011 household projections)

- Period 2011-2021(Period **A**), the household growth is taken **directly from the interim 2011-based household projections**. This is the most up-to-date source of data available.
- For 2022-2031(Period **B**), the rate of change from the 2008-based projections (the most recent data source for this period of time) has been applied to the numbers from the interim 2011-based projections.



- Reflects the likelihood that an improving economy will begin to increase the housing requirement.
- Approach is supported by national policy, guidance and recent Examinations (as set out above).



# Challenges: Population Projections

Source	2011 population	2031 population	Absolute change	% change	Annual average change (21 years)
2008 based sub national population projections	202,800	242,700	39,900	19.7%	1,900
2010 based sub national population projections	198,700	222,800	24,100	12.1%	1,148
Interim 2011 based sub national population projections (indexed)	197,800	224,700	26,900	13.6%	1,281
2012 based sub national population projections	197,800*	223,500	24,600	12.4%	1,171
Difference between the 2012 based and 2008 based projections	-5,000	-19,200	-15,300		
Difference between the 2012 based and 2010 based projections	-900	+700	+500		
Difference between the 2012 based and interim 2011 based projections	0	-1,200	-2,300		

Comparing population projections to 2031

# Challenges: Household Projections

Source	2011 households	2031 households	Absolute change	% change	Annual average change (21 years)
2004 based household projections (indexed)	87,000	107,000	20,000	23%	952
2008 based household projections	88,200	113,000	24,800	28.1%	1,181
Interim 2011 based household projections (indexed) (preferred method)	83,500	101,100	17,600	21.1%	838
Interim 2011 based household projections (extrapolated) but unrealistic because of economic upturn	83,500	96,900	13,400	16.0%	638
Difference between the interim 2011 based (indexed) and 2008 based projections	-4,700	-11,900	-7,200		

Comparing household projection to 2031

# Challenges: Components of Change

- Components of change comprise natural change (births and deaths) and migration (internal and international).
- The 2011-interim population projections comprise components of population growth and change up to 2021. As these projections are interim, projections are not made beyond 2021.
- Further work is being undertaken to assess the impact of a net decrease in migration on the 2012-based sub-national population projections. Recent research of Inspector's reports for sound Local Plans and Core Strategies considered that few Local Authorities were pursuing a 'component-led' housing requirement (i.e. variants of internal or international migration levels).

# Components of Change

Figure 2 Comparison of population growth projections in surrounding authorities to York


Data source	Component	East Riding	Hambleton	Harrogate	Leeds	Ryedale	Selby	York
2008 based sub national population projections (2008-2033)	Net natural change	-1,700	-3,000	-2,400	130,700	-3,000	3,600	15,100
	Net internal migration	88,600	11,800	23,800	-82,900	8,400	17,900	-12,300
	Net international migration	12,300	2,400	7,500	180,600	5,000	2,500	47,600
	Net cross border migration	-2,300	0	0	300	0	-2,500	0
	<b>Total population change</b>	<b>80,900</b>	<b>10,200</b>	<b>27,600</b>	<b>227,200</b>	<b>9,500</b>	<b>22,100</b>	<b>51,100</b>
2010 based sub national population projections (2010-2035)	Net natural change	-22,000	-3,100	-4,200	121,100	-3,800	4,100	11,100
	Net internal migration	64,300	10,800	21,500	-24,200	5,900	14,500	4,000
	Net international migration	5,000	100	200	66,600	2,400	2,600	15,500
	Net cross border migration	0	0	-2,300	-2,500	0	-2,500	200
	<b>Total population change</b>	<b>45,700</b>	<b>7,100</b>	<b>16,300</b>	<b>158,300</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>20,200</b>	<b>30,100</b>
Interim 2011 based sub national population projections (2011-2021)	Net natural change	-4000	400	1,100	45,000	-1,000	2,800	5,800
	Net internal migration	25,600	2,800	5,400	11,700	2,200	6,000	1,000
	Net international migration	3,000	0	1,100	34,300	1,000	1,300	8,300
	Net cross border migration	0	0	900	-1,000	0	-1000	100
	<b>Total population change</b>	<b>23,900</b>	<b>3,200</b>	<b>7,300</b>	<b>88,900</b>	<b>1,800</b>	<b>9,900</b>	<b>14,800</b>
2012 based sub national population projections (2012-2037)	Net natural change	-24,500	-3,700	-5,400	106,200	-3,900	2,600	9,700
	Net internal migration	49,600	7,900	24,000	-41,800	6,300	11,000	-5,700
	Net international migration	7,700	0	-7,400	57,900	0	2,500	22,700
	Net cross border migration	-2,500	0	0	-2,500	0	0	2,500
	<b>Total population change</b>	<b>32,800</b>	<b>3,500</b>	<b>10,500</b>	<b>119,300</b>	<b>3,000</b>	<b>15,100</b>	<b>29,000</b>

# Challenges: Household Size (Part 1)

- Average household size – long-term decline has slowed (likely as a result of the recession, expected to revert to previous trends)
- Looking ahead as the housing market emerges from deep recession, we can expect the longer term picture of household size over the plan period to fall somewhere between the assumptions used in the 2008 and interim 2011-based projections.
- Currently undertaking further work to assess the ‘nature’ of the Economic Recession and Recovery, to determine whether the economy will have reverted to pre-recession levels in 2021 or whether recovery is likely to take place later.

# Challenges: Household Size (Part 2)

- Neither the 2008 based or interim 2011 based household formation rates are ideal as individual datasets for understanding the housing requirement
- Current approach therefore uses the 2011 interim household projections, indexed from 2021 to 2031 – as this provides the most robust and up-to-date position that can be ascertained using current data sources.
- 2012 Household projections are anticipated in February 2014.



— Average household size (calculation)    ◆ Average household size (projection)





Figure 18 Percentage of young adults (20-34 year olds) living with parents

# What does the data tell us?

We've looked at different sources of data:

Source	Annual requirement / projection	Comment
RSS	850	2008 onwards
2008-based	1,181	
Interim 2011-based	838	Indexed past 2021
OEF base	869	



# Historic Housing Completions and Impact on Requirements (Part 1)

There are three components to consider in **determining backlog**:

- The ‘**base year**’ for the calculation of under delivery or ‘backlog’;
- Whether the LPA has a **record of persistent under delivery** (to determine the buffer required); and
- Whether the additional requirement generated from the backlog is **applied to the first 5 years** of the housing requirement (Sedgefield approach) **or the whole plan requirement** (Liverpool approach).

The National Planning Practice Guidance states that LPAs are required to ‘*take a view on the extent of past under delivery*’.



## Base Year (Part 2)

- Prior to the abolition of Regional Spatial Strategies in 2013, it was the accepted practice that either the RSS or a Local Plan adopted post RSS (as it needed to be in conformity with the RSS) provided the ‘base year’ for considering completions against the established housing requirement. This would suggest **2004**.
- Understood that several of York’s neighbouring authorities are **seeking to establish a more recent ‘base year’ for the Plan** (i.e. 2011, 2012 and 2013), which would mean **backlog would only be ‘counted’ for between 1 and 3 years**. This is justified through using the 2011 Census as the actual count of the population, so this present an accurate start point.
- Approach to ‘Base Year’ **remains unclear** with recently found sound Local Plans setting their Base Year to 2011, 2012 or 2013, whilst other Local Authorities specifically required not to amend the base year if this would result in unaddressed backlog (North Warwickshire Inspector’s report).

# Base Year (Part 2)

Table 3 – Options

	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Option 5	Option 6
	Publication Draft	Publication Draft with 2012 base	Economic impact with 2004 base	Demographic baseline with no economic impact - 2004 base	Economic impact with 2012 base	Demographic baseline with no economic impact - 2012 base
Demographic baseline	838	838	838	838	838	838
Economic Impact	32	32	32	0	32	0
Backlog (2004 base date)	126	N/A	105	102	N/A	N/A
Backlog (2012 base date)	N/A	77	N/A	N/A	56	53
Average Annual Requirement	996	947	975	940	926	891
Total Plan Requirement	15,936	15,152	15,600	15,040	14,816	14,256

## Buffer (Part 3)

- Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should:

*“identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years’ worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land.”*


- Neither the NPPF or recent NPPG define the time period which qualifies as ‘persistent under-delivery’
  - For most planning appeals and plan examinations this is considered to be a period of consistent under-delivery, below the target requirement for five years.
  - York has under-provided by 1,653 net dwellings, or 22% against the stepped RSS target.
  - Therefore likely that ‘persistent under-delivery’ applies to York
  - Consider backlog against past under-supply

# Approach to Backlog (Part 4)

- Liverpool or Sedgefield Method:
  - Liverpool ‘Residual Approach’ seeks to meet the backlog over the whole plan period.
  - ‘Sedgefield Approach’ seeks to meet the backlog by front-loading unmet provision within the first five years of the Plan.
- Whilst the Sedgefield approach is becoming more common (from Inspector’s Reports between March- September) and the PAS technical note stating that this approach aligns more with the requirements of the NPPF, there is also a need to ensure that the plan is *‘aspirational but also realistic’*
- Considered that York should adopt the ‘Liverpool residual approach’ of addressing backlog over the whole Plan Period to ensure the annual requirement is ‘achievable’.

# York Completions

Completions 2000 – 2014 = average 648 dwellings per annum



# Linking housing and economy

- National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) states that: ‘Plan makers should make an assessment of the likely growth in job numbers based on past trends and/or economic forecasts as appropriate’
- If not – likely to lead to increased commuting

Source	Annual requirement / projection	Comment
Objectively assessed need	838-869	
Housing to support economic growth	877	OEF Scenario 2

# Duty to Cooperate: Household Projections in Surrounding Authorities

Figure 1 Comparison of household growth projections in surrounding authorities to York<sup>1</sup>

Local Authority	2003 Projected Household Growth (2006 to 2026) <sup>2</sup>		2004 Projected Household Growth (2006 to 2026)		2006 Projected Household Growth (2006 to 2026)		2008 based Projected Household Growth (2006 to 2026)		Interim 2011 based Projected Household Growth (2011 to 2021)		2012 based Projected Household Growth (2012 to 2037)		RSS Annual Allocation 2008-2026	Annual average net completions, 2004 - 2012 <sup>3</sup>	Adopted / Emerging Core Strategy annual average requirement
	Total	Annual average	Total	Annual average	Total	Annual average	Total	Annual average	Total	Annual average	Total	Annual average			
East Riding of Yorkshire	37,130	1,857	47,000	2,350	51,000	2,550	42,000	2,100	13,421	1,342	32,800	1,312	1,150	997	1,400
Hambleton	7,110	356	9,000	450	9,000	450	6,000	300	2,506	250	3,500	140	280	210	285 <sup>4</sup>
Harrogate	15,010	751	19,000	950	23,000	1,150	16,000	800	5,307	530	10,500	420	390	359	390
Leeds	52,140	2,607	66,000	3,300	113,000	5,650	111,000	5,550	40,815	4,082	119,300	4,772	4,300	2,780	4,375 <sup>5</sup>
Ryedale	3950	198	5,000	250	7,000	350	5,000	250	1,286	129	3,000	120	200	146	200
Selby	7,110	356	9,000	450	10,000	500	11,000	550	4,603	460	15,100	604	440	470	450
York	- <sup>6</sup>	-	22,000	1,100	28,000	1,400	26,000	1,300	6,987	699	29,000	1160	850	648	N/A

<sup>1</sup> Annual averages are calculated by dividing by n years rather than n+1 years, in order to allow comparisons between reports.

<sup>2</sup> The 2003 household projections were only produced at a regional level. Therefore a calculation based on the 2004 household projections has been carried out. The 2003 household projections predicted a 17,700 annual increase in households in Yorkshire and the Humber up to 2026. The 2004 household projections predicted an annual increase of 22,000 households in the region up to 2026. The district level 2003 household projections have been calculated by using 79% of the 2004 district household projections.

<sup>3</sup> Figures taken from the respective LPAs Annual Monitoring Reports

<sup>4</sup> Hambleton Core Strategy, Adopted April 2007. Core Strategy sets out 285 annual average net additional dwellings between 2008 and 2021, based on 320 units per annum from 2004 until 2011, 290 units per annum between 2011 and 2016 and 260 units per annum between 2016 and 2021.

<sup>5</sup> Leeds City Council (2012) The Leeds Publication Draft Core Strategy, sets out to deliver 70,000 net additional dwellings per annum between 2012 and 2028, this equates to an annual average of 4,375. This figure is also included in the Proposed Main Modifications document, submitted to the Inspector in May 2014.

<sup>6</sup> 2003 data is not available for this update.

This page is intentionally left blank