

**Town & Country Planning Act 1990**

**Appeal against refusal by Stevenage Borough Council of application 19/00474/FPM for**

**Demolition of existing office building (Use Class B1) and structures, and construction of seven apartment buildings comprising 576 dwellings (Use Class C3) together with internal roads, parking, public open space, landscaping, drainage and associated infrastructure works**

**at**

**Land West of Lytton Way, Stevenage, SG1 1AG**

**Appellant**

**Hill Residential Ltd**

**STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND ON 5 YEAR LAND SUPPLY BETWEEN**

**HILL RESIDENTIAL LTD**

**AND**

**STEVENAGE BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**9 June 2021**

**APPEAL REFERENCE APP/K1935/W/20/3255692**

## Stevenage Borough Housing Land Supply - Statement of Common Ground

1. This SoCG sets out the respective positions of Hill and Stevenage Borough Council (SBC) in relation to 5 year housing supply.
2. This SoCG sets out the parties respective positions on the methodology for calculating five year supply, the buffer required, to the position with regards particular sites in dispute, and the number of years supply that each party considers can be demonstrated.
  - under construction
  - with detailed permission
  - with prior notification
  - outline/subject to S106
  - deliverable, and
  - windfalls.

### Methodology

3. SBC considers that the *Liverpool methodology* should be used to calculate 5 year supply.
4. Hill considers that the *Sedgefield methodology* should be used.

### Buffer

5. The parties agree that a 20% buffer is required as under the Housing Delivery Test 2020 (published January 2021) Stevenage achieved 64%. The buffer is required where delivery falls below 75%.

### Sites

#### ***Sites under construction***

6. The parties agree that that there are **418** homes under construction.

#### ***With detailed permission***

7. SBC considers that there are **715** homes with detailed permission and which will deliver within the 5 year period.
8. Hill considers that the **645** homes can be considered deliverable, a difference of **70** homes.

9. The difference lies in the development of the Matalan site. SBC considers all **526** homes will be delivered by March 2025. Hill considers that a maximum of **456** could be delivered in the period to March 2026.

10. The parties disagree over the timings for delivery and the delivery rate.

***With prior notification***

11. The parties agree that prior notifications of **23** homes can be considered to be deliverable.

***Outline/subject to S106***

12. SBC considers a total of **1,540** homes are deliverable.

13. Hill considers that this should be reduced to a maximum of **231** homes. A difference of **1,309**.

14. All 3 sites are disputed.

**SG1 town centre redevelopment phase 1**

15. SBC considers that the site will deliver **760** homes in the in the 5 year supply.

16. Hill previously gave SBC the benefit of the doubt that the site could deliver homes within the 5 year period. As matters stand the S106 has not been issued. One of the landowners within the SG1 application site, Rank, has written to the Council strongly objecting to the development and stating that *“there is no certainty the development can be delivered in respect of Plot C”* (CD3.13.2). Whilst none of the early phase housing is in Plot C, that land needs to be bound by the S106 agreement. It must be considered highly unlikely that Rank will enter into the S106 with such strong objections and lack of certainty over its future, and therefore significant uncertainty about when that the planning permission can be issued. Accordingly Hill considers that there is not clear evidence that SG1 will deliver homes with the five year period. A reduction of **760**.

17. The parties also disagree over the timings for delivery and the delivery rate.

**H03 – north of Stevenage**

18. SBC considers the site will deliver **525** homes.

19. Hill considers a maximum of **226** could be delivered in the 5 Year period, a reduction of **299**.

20. The parties disagree over the timings for delivery and the delivery rate.

### **BHS**

21. The Council considers that the site will contribute **250** homes.
22. Hill considers that the site cannot be considered as deliverable as it does not yet have a planning permission and there is no evidence of house builder involvement. A reduction of **250** homes.

### **Deliverable**

23. SBC considers that **724** homes in this category will deliver by March 2026.
24. Hill consider that this figure should be reduced to a maximum of **312** homes, a reduction of **412**.
25. 3 sites are disputed.

### **HO2 – west of Stevenage phase 1**

26. SBC considers the site can deliver **390** homes.
27. Hill considers a maximum of **188** could be delivered in the 5YS, a reduction of **202**.
28. The parties disagree over the timings for delivery and the delivery rate.

### **HO1/6 Pin Green School**

29. SBC considers **50** homes to be deliverable.
30. Hill considers that there is not clear evidence of deliverability, a reduction of **50**.

### **HO1/11 – west of North Road (Rugby Club)**

31. This site is allocated in the local plan. SBC considers the site will deliver **160** homes in the 5 year period.
32. Hill considers the site does not meet the definition of deliverable given there is no planning permission in place or submitted, and development of the site is dependent upon the relocation of the rugby club on to a site in the Green Belt in North Hertfordshire. A reduction of **160** homes.

### **Windfalls**

33. Windfalls are allowed for by SBC at **20** per year, for 4 years. Given the lead in times for development, any site which would deliver homes by March 2023 would need to have been consented by September 2021, and hence have a planning application currently submitted. Hill

considers that windfalls, if they are to be included, should only be allowed from 2023/24 onwards. Accordingly we reduce the HLS by **20** homes from **80** to **60**.

34. Table 1 below sets out a comparison of SBC's and Hill's position on supply

**Table 1: Comparison of sources of supply**

	SBC	Hill	Difference	Cumulative Difference
Under construction	418	418	0	0
With detailed permission	715	645	-70	-70
With prior notification	23	23	0	-70
Outline/subject S106	1,540	231	-1,309	-1,379
Deliverable	724	312	-412	-1,791
Windfalls	80	60	-20	-1,811
Total	3,500	1,689	-1,811	-1,811

#### Calculations of 5 year supply

35. Table 2 sets out a comparison of the five year supply assessments.

36. The Council's stated position is that with a 20% buffer, and using the *Liverpool* methodology, it can demonstrate a supply of 3,500 homes equating to a supply of **5.46** years.

37. Hill's position is that that using a 20% buffer and the *Liverpool* methodology the supply is 1,689 homes, equating to a supply of just **2.63** years.

38. Using *Sedgefield*, a 20% buffer and SBC's own assessment of a deliverable supply, the Council can only demonstrate **4.23** years. Using Hill's assessment of deliverable supply, only **2.04** years can be demonstrated.

Table 2: comparisons of five year supply

	Liverpool (20% buffer)		Sedgefield (20% buffer)	
	SBC	Hill	SBC	Hill
A OAN per year	380	380	380	380
B Local Plan period (years)	20	20	20	20
C Housing requirement 2011 - 2031 (AxB)	7,600	7,600	7,600	7,600
D Completions 1/4/2011-31/3/2021	2,256	2,256	2,256	2,256
E Target 1/4/2011 - 31/3/2021	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
F Surplus/Shortfall at 31/3/2021 (E-D)	-1,544	-1,544	-1,544	-1,544
G Target 1/4/2021 to 31/3/2026 (Ax5)	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900
H Surplus/Shortfall to be made up	772	772	1,544	1,544
I Buffer (20%) (G + H) *0.2	534	534	689	689
J Total requirement (G + H + I)	3,206	3,206	4,133	4,133
K Deliverable supply 1/4/2021 to 31/3/2026	3,500	1,689	3,500	1,689
L Years supply (K/J) x 5	5.46	2.63	4.23	2.04

## Signatures



Colin Campbell  
Head of Planning  
Hill Residential Limited  
For the Appellant



Zayd Al-Jawad  
AD Planning & Regulation  
Stevenage Borough Council  
For the Local Planning Authority