

## Matter 17 Hearing Statement (ID:48)

For Persimmon Homes & Charles Church Lancashire | 22-163

In relation to Copeland Local Plan Examination



**Project:** 22-163  
**Hearing:** Copeland Local Plan Examination  
**Client:** Persimmon Homes & Charles Church Lancashire  
**Date:** December 2022  
**Author:** Stephen Harris

This report has been prepared for the client by Emery Planning with all reasonable skill, care and diligence. No part of this document may be reproduced without the prior written approval of Emery Planning. Emery Planning Partnership Limited trading as Emery Planning.

# Contents

|    |                       |   |
|----|-----------------------|---|
| 1. | Response to Matter 17 | 1 |
|----|-----------------------|---|



# 1. Response to Matter 17

**Matter 17 The Supply and Delivery of Housing Land Issue-Whether the approach towards the supply and delivery of housing land is justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Relevant policy: H3PU**

**17.1 What is the estimated total supply of new housing in the plan period 2021- 2038 and how does this compare with the requirement?**

- 1.1 Policy H2PU sets out two figures, these being 146 dwellings per annum and 200 dwellings per annum. We have made representations on the applicable requirement in Matter 4. Our position is that if there is a choice between these two figures the requirement should be a minimum of 200 dwellings per annum. Permission considers the requirement to be 300 dwellings.
- 1.2 Table 2 of Appendix E of the Plan identifies consents, windfall and allocations for 4,881 homes. With a requirement of 200 dwellings per annum, the total requirement for the plan period would be 3,400 dwellings. On these figures there is an oversupply of some 1,441 dwellings but as paragraph 1.7 states all these sites may not be delivered as well as helping improve the range and choice of housing. With regard to Matter 4, it also assists in providing additional homes for economically active households to meet the proposed jobs to be created over the plan period.

**17.2 What is the estimated total supply in the plan period from: a) Completions since 31 March 2021 b) Sites under-construction c) Planning permissions d) Proposed allocations e) Windfall sites**

- 1.3 The LPA sets these out in Table 2 of Appendix E of the Plan.

**17.3 What are the assumptions about the scale and timing of supply and annual rates of delivery from these various sources? Are these realistic? How do they compare to previous rates?**

- 1.4 The trajectory is based on the Delivery Assumptions in Table 1 of Appendix E unless developers have provided site specific data. It will be necessary for the Examination to be informed of the latest position for each site as for example for the two Persimmon allocations, we consider that both sites should be pushed back 12 months for the following reasons:
- For the Persimmon site at Marchon (HWH5), Table 4 of the Plan sets out that 35 dwellings would be built on the site from 2023/24 with development continuing to the end of the plan period at that same rate of 35 dwellings per hectare. Given the current planning application we would not expect a planning consent on the site until mid-2023 at the earliest. Given the remediation then required, we would not expect first completions until 2024/25 at the



earliest. This would push the site back in the housing trajectory by at least 35 dwellings, although the current build rate for Permission for the site would be between 35 and 40 dwellings so we would still expect the allocation to deliver in full in the plan period.

- Table 4 of the Plan sets out that 12 dwellings would be built on the site in 2023/24 and 10 dwellings in 2024/25. Given that the site does not have a current planning application we would not expect a planning consent on the site until late 2023 at the earliest. We would expect first completions in 2024/25 at the earliest. This would push the site back in the housing trajectory by at least 12 months but the site would still deliver in the 5 year period.

1.5 As to other sites in the trajectory, we have concern on the level of information provided when considered against the PPG<sup>1</sup> and the Framework. The main omission from Appendix E, EB39 and EB40 is the planning status for each site and who the developer is. We trust that the Examination will have this information for the Hearing Session. We have undertaken an initial assessment of the allocations at Whitehaven to illustrate our issues at this stage.

- HWH1 - First completions are due in 24/25, but from Appendix E, EB39 and EB40 there is no reference to a planning application or when an application is to be submitted.
- HWH2 - First completions are due in 24/25, but Application 4/18/2287/001 was refused on 18<sup>th</sup> August 2022. We are not aware of an appeal having been submitted. Clarity is required on the planning status of that site going forward.
- HWH3 – An application was submitted by Story Homes in August 2022 for 109 dwellings which is 11 less than the 120 in the trajectory.
- HWH4 – This site was promoted by Persimmon at Submission stage but is no longer being promoted by them. Appendix E, EB39 and EB40 do not set out who the developer, if any, is and the timetable for an application.
- HWH5 – as set out in 1.4 above.
- HWH6 – permission was approved for Gleeson Homes in March 2022 for 40 dwellings which is 5 more than in the trajectory.

1.6 From this assessment of the allocations in Whitehaven, we have concerns on the scale and timing of supply of sites in the trajectory. We will review the LPA's statement on Matter 17 and the Examination will need to conclude on the robustness of the trajectory.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph: 060 Reference ID: 61-060-20190315, Paragraph: 016 Reference ID: 3-016-20190722 to Paragraph: 022 Reference ID: 3-022-20190722



**17.4 How has flexibility been provided in terms of the housing land supply? Are there other potential sources of supply not specifically identified? Can this be specified?**

- 1.7 As noted in answer to 17.1, there is some 1,441 dwellings additional supply against the 200 dwelling requirement in Policy H2PU.

**17.5 In overall terms, would the Local Plan realistically deliver the number of houses required over the Plan period?**

**17.9 Would the Local Plan realistically provide for a five-year supply on adoption? Will a five-year supply be maintained?**

- 1.8 The answer to 17.5 and 17.9 can only be made after the Examination considers Question 17.3. However, based on the trajectory from 23/24, there would be 2,349 dwellings completed against a requirement of 1,050 (200 dwellings per annum x 5 years + 5% buffer). Persimmon's representations consider the requirement should be 300 dwellings per annum. Based on the trajectory the LPA could still demonstrate a 5 year supply. As noted above the LPA needs to evidence the proposed delivery of each site.

**17.10 Is Policy H3PU justified, effective and consistent with national policy?**

- 1.9 The objection by Persimmon to Part 3 of Policy H3PU was set out in their representations and it was proposed to be amended as follows:

"If evidence suggests that, at the end of any monitoring year, housing delivery has ~~exceeded~~ **has fallen below** expectations within the Sustainable Rural Village and Rural Village tiers in the settlement hierarchy which may put the overall Development Strategy at risk the Council will consider carrying out a full / partial Local Plan Review."

- 1.10 It is considered that the above policy amendment would mean that Policy H3PU is more positively prepared and is necessary to make it sound. Persimmon's overall objection to the policy as drafted is that housing requirements should be treated as minima and not ceilings.
- 1.11 We consider that a shortfall in housing delivery has the greatest harm if housing to meet the demographic and economic objectives is not being delivered. We do not consider there is harm in delivering more houses than the minimum in specific locations.
- 1.12 In any event we do not see how there would be such an exceedance for a partial or full plan review to arise given that the figures in Table 2 are based on delivery of allocations, extant consents and a windfall allowance. The only way any meaningfully sized developments could come forward is through the engagement of paragraph 11(d) of the Framework or Policy DS4PU and that would only occur should the LPA not be able to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, which would be as a result of the sites in the



trajectory not delivering. The engagement of a 5-year supply is not an automatic route to a planning approval as there are other criteria, for example in Policy DS4PU and/or other material considerations to consider which may be delivery in a certain settlement.

- 1.13 Persimmon's representations to Policy DS4PU proposed a change to enable windfall sites to come forward not just at town or Local Service Centres, but also at Sustainable Rural Villages. We consider that with that change it would enable a positive policy context to enable further sites to come forward if required and we therefore question the need for part 3 of Policy H3PU and propose it is deleted. In addition, the cost, resources and time for a partial or full review is considered excessive for one issue particularly when there are other policies in the Plan to control housing delivery.



# emery

PLANNING

2-4 South Park Court, Hobson Street  
Macclesfield, Cheshire, SK11 8BS

+44 (0)1625 433 881

Regus House, Herons Way  
Chester Business Park, CH4 9QR

+44 (0)1244 732 447



[emeryplanning.com](https://www.emeryplanning.com)