

HFDAG Information



Cherwell gets their figures wrong

It has been clear recently that Cherwell District Council has:

1 Wrongly calculated the housing supply needs in the District, arriving at the hugely wrong conclusions that they need land for more than 4000+ new houses

2 Failed to take into account the views of the Minister of Housing and the new NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework).

They have calculated that only prospective actual builds be used to assess the land supply (in their Annual Monitoring Report Dec 2011) which are constrained by financial difficulties, whereas they should be using the total numbers of approved building approvals, such as Bankside Phase 1, for 1092 houses and Canalside of 1050. By far enough to cover the 5 year need of 820 homes.

HFDAG has also complained about the numbers and sent our a Press Release with our analysis of the need, showing that around 820 houses, only, are needed in Banbury over the next 5 years to meet the trend of growth in the town.

So this letter has been sent from Sir Tony Baldry to CDC and they have commented as below.

SIR TONY BALDRY M.P.



HOUSE OF COMMONS
LONDON SW1A 0AA

Sue Smith
Chief Executive
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Bodicote, Banbury OX15 4AA

19th June 2012

Housing in Hook Norton

I was somewhat confused.

I understand that in respect of planning application for housing at Bourne Lane in Hook Norton that Planning Officers are recommending to Councillors that this planning application should be approved apparently on the grounds that the Council does not have an adequate five-year housing supply and that, as a consequence, if this particular planning application were to be refused, the District Council would be vulnerable to being overturned on appeal.

I do not think that the Planning Minister in the House of Commons could have made it any clearer in statements to me that the new National Planning Framework makes it clear beyond doubt that when considering whether a local authority has an adequate five-year housing supply that all existing planning permissions for housing should be taken into account, even if building work has not actually started.

On that basis, and counting in developments such as Bodicote/Bankside, I had understood that there was no dispute and that Cherwell has a more than adequate five-year housing supply for the foreseeable future and obviously extra sites being identified in due course as part of the existing ongoing work on the Local Development Plan.

So I am somewhat confused as to the advice being given to elected members in respect of this particular application at Hook Norton.

I should be grateful for your advice.

Email: tony.baldry.mp@parliament.uk
Website: www.tonybaldry.co.uk

This is what CDC are now saying, it seems to be an introduction to a climb-down, let's hope so. For if the MP is right then developments at North Hanwell Fields and Southam Road are not required.

Comment of HPPDM on MP's letter

- Sir Tony Baldry MP has written to the Chief Executive setting out that his understanding of the NPPF was that it "makes it clear beyond doubt that when considering whether a local authority has an adequate five-year housing supply that all existing planning permissions for housing should be taken into account...[and that]... on that basis, and counting in developments such as Bodicote/Bankside, I had understood that there was no dispute and that Cherwell has a more than adequate five-year housing supply".

Whilst the publication of the NPPF provides for some potential changes in the way that housing land supply is calculated, a full and formal review of housing supply taking into account these changes in circumstances, will be presented to the Council's Executive shortly. Until that time, it has been calculated that the current housing land-supply position, as reported at the Adderbury Inquiry, following the Bodicote decision, is 3.1 years.

- By way of clarification, the proposed draft submission Local Plan has not yet been published for consultation, but has been approved for consultation by the Executive.

- An email from a local resident has been received, also copied to the members of the Planning Committee, summarised below;
 - objecting to the content of the recommendation
 - setting out that the reasoning is not consistent with the guidance in the NPPF and that the tests in the document have been incorrectly applied
 - questions the methodology for calculating housing land supply
 - questions the assessments of the merits or otherwise of the scheme
 - questions the assessment of the impact of the scheme, including the highway safety, school and sustainability considerations
 - questions the impact of the proposal on the locally designated area of high

landscape value - questions the degree of consultation, the level of engagement with the community and the impact of other development in the village.