

## EAST RIDING OF YORKSHIRE COUNCIL

Report to: The Cabinet  
14 July 2005

Wards:

All wards

---

### Third annual update on the position with the 'Managed Release of Residential Development Sites'

---

Report of the Director of Corporate Policy and Strategy

#### A. Executive Summary

The report highlights that the number of dwellings completed in the East Riding in 2004 (financial year) was substantially above the housing provision requirement. This was the case in three of the four sub areas set out in the Joint Structure Plan (JSP).

The report then:

- assesses the level of provision in each sub area against the housing requirement for the initial seven years of the JSP
- finds the proportion of completions on previously developed land rose to almost 50% in 2004;
- reviews the number of houses completed on previously-developed windfall and small sites and re-assess the allowances made for those likely to come forward in the future, and;
- analyses the number of houses that have been granted on the various 'pragmatic exceptions'

In light of the housing supply/completion position at the end of the 2004 financial year (section 3), the report then considers (section 4) whether the prevailing approach to the managed release of residential development sites (as set out in the Council's adopted Interim Policy Guidance) should be revised. Particular attention is given to the position in the Western JSP sub area and to the numbers of dwellings coming forward on the windfall and small sites and on the 'pragmatic exceptions' sites.

#### B. Community Aims

A Well Managed Authority  
Greater Prosperity  
Healthy Environment  
Improved Health  
Lifelong Learning  
Reduced Crime

## **C. Recommendation and Reason for Recommendation**

It is recommended that:

- (a) with the exception of recommendation (b), the prevailing approach to the release of residential development sites as set out in the Council's adopted Interim Policy Guidance (IPG) on the 'The Managed Release of Residential Development Sites', October 2003 be reaffirmed,
- (b) major Greenfield sites with the approximate capacity of 365 dwellings be released in the Western Joint Structure Plan sub area,
- (c) a separate report be submitted to The Cabinet as soon as possible that outlines a comprehensive and systematic approach for the release of major Greenfield sites that would be used subsequently to release the sites in the Western Joint Structure Plan sub area referred to in recommendation (b),
- (d) the release of Greenfield sites under the 'pragmatic exceptions' categories continue to be kept under close scrutiny and only those applications that fully comply with the exception definition and the revised Development Plan should be approved, and
- (e) a further monitoring report be submitted to The Cabinet on the housing supply/ completion position at the end of the 2005 financial year on whether the prevailing approach to the managed release of residential development sites should be revised.

### **1. Background**

- 1.1 The full Council adopted Interim Policy Guidance (IPG) on the 'The Managed Release of Residential Development Sites' on 15 October 2003 (min 1032). This included an approach on how all planning applications for residential development will be treated.
- 1.2 The approval was given subject to an annual monitoring report being submitted to The Cabinet on the housing supply/ completion position. This was to allow consideration of whether the prevailing approach to the release of sites should be revised.
- 1.3 The Cabinet has considered two previous annual monitoring reports. The first was on 9 December 2003 that reviewed the position at mid 2003 (min 1717). The second was on 21 July 2004 that reviewed the position at 1 April 2004 (min 1978). The approach set out in the IPG was reaffirmed on both occasions.
- 1.4 This report reviews the approach again in the light of the number of house completions in 2004 (financial year), the housing supply position at 1 April 2005 and the strategic housing requirement set out in the Joint Structure Plan (JSP) that has recently been adopted. It then considers whether the current approach to 'Managed Release' should be revised.

### **2. House completions**

#### *Numbers completed*

- 2.1 The table below sets out the number of house completions there has been in each of the four JSP sub areas in the 2004 financial year (i.e. 1 April 2004 to 31 March 2005). These numbers are compared with the housing provision requirement in the JSP. A map of the sub areas is attached at Appendix A.



- 2.5 It is interesting to note that house completions for 2004 decreased in three of the four sub areas in comparison to the previous year. Nevertheless, the table shows that the total number of completions has been substantially above the total JSP housing requirement figure in each of the seven years except 1999.
- 2.6 Government guidance advises local planning authorities should manage the land supply to meet the annual average strategic housing requirement each year. While there may be a variation in the level of delivery from year to year, it is important that the overall levels set for the plan period are being met. Table 3 below gives the total number of houses that have been completed in each of the four JSP sub areas between 1998 and 2004 compared with the total strategic housing requirement.

Table 3: Housing completion numbers between 1998 and 2004

JSP sub area	Total number of houses completed 1998 - 2004	Strategic housing requirement in JSP for 1998 - 2004	Over (+)/ Under(-) Provision	
			(no.)	%
Northern	3021	2050	+ 971	+ 47
Central	4886	3800	+ 1086	+ 29
Eastern	1867	1400	+ 467	+ 33
Western	1138	1100	+ 38	+ 3
Total ER	10912	8350	+ 2562	+ 31
Total JSP area	14918	14350	+ 568	+ 4

- 2.7 This table illustrates that the total provision over the last seven years in the Western JSP sub area has been almost that planned for, with an overprovision of only 38 houses (3%). However there has been a considerable over-provision in each of the other three JSP sub areas involving: 467 houses (33%) in the Eastern JSP sub area, 971 houses (47%) in the Northern JSP sub area and 1086 houses (29%) in the Central JSP sub area.

***% of completions on previously-developed land***

- 2.8 One of the key objectives of managing the release of residential sites is to maximise the proportion of dwellings built on 'recycled' land. Analysis of the housing completions in 2004 shows that 49.6% were on previously-developed land. This is a continuation of the increase that was recorded last year, as shown in Table 4. Although Policy H2 of the Joint Structure Plan sets a target that "at least 30% of new dwellings in the East Riding should be on previously-developed land and buildings", Government advice in PPG3 makes it clear that it is committed to maximising the use of previously- developed sources. Hence, whilst this recycling level above the JSP target should be welcomed, it should not lead to a diminution in the commitment to increase it further providing that does not conflict with other material considerations (e.g. the need to prevent development in unsustainable locations or to locations to maintain for example an appropriate supply of employment land).

Table 4: Proportion of houses completed on previously-developed land, 2001 to 2004

	2001	2002	2003	2004
Proportion of completions on previously-developed land (%)	20.1	18.3	32.0	49.6

### *Previously-developed windfall sites*

- 2.9 An analysis has been made of the numbers of dwellings granted permission on previously-developed **windfall**<sup>1</sup> sites in 2001 to 2004. These are set out in Table 5 below. They give an updated basis to that used in the original IPG for estimating the number of dwellings that may be granted consent on such sites in addition to those already identified in the 2005 Housing Land Position Statement (HLPS). By restricting the calculation to previously-developed sites only, it ignores any consents granted on the ‘pragmatic exception’ sites (that are dealt with separately in paragraph 2.18 below).

*Table 5: Dwellings granted consent on previously-developed windfall sites 2001 to 2004*

<b>Sub area</b>	<b>2003 IPG allowance (pa)</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>Average</b>
Northern	25	38	192	196	182	608	152
Central	50	120	176	297	127	720	180
Eastern	30	49	88	119	243	499	125
Western	15	51	44	79	96	270	68
Total	120	258	500	691	648	2097	524

- 2.10 The table shows that the total number of dwellings granted on these previously-developed windfall sites in each of the JSP sub areas has been significantly higher than that allowed for in the adopted IPG in all four years. The average of the total granted each year (524) is over 4 times that allowed for in the IPG (120).
- 2.11 It is clear that the emphasis on the redevelopment of previously-developed land introduced by PPG3 has been a major influence in this significant increase and the Council’s IPG has, no doubt, been a contributory factor. Government advice in ‘Planning to Deliver’<sup>2</sup> recognises that windfall sites make an important contribution to housing supply and that their impact should not be underestimated.
- 2.12 It is accepted that predicting the rate at which consents will continue to be granted on previously-developed windfall sites is somewhat uncertain. Nevertheless, it is clear that the estimates included in the IPG are extremely conservative and need to be more realistic. Indeed as the total numbers granted in 2003 (691) and 2004 (648) represented 58% and 56% of the total housing requirement in their years (1200 and 1150 respectively), the contribution they will make to future completions needs to be assessed carefully. An assessment has therefore been made of the number and proportion of the dwellings granted consent on previously-developed windfall sites over the last four years (Table 5) that had been completed by 31 March 2005. This is set out in Table 6 below

---

<sup>1</sup> Those sites not allocated in the Local Plan but involve 0.25 hectares or more or involve 5 dwellings or more

<sup>2</sup> Planning to Deliver – The Managed Release of Housing Sites, DETR, July 2001

Table 6: Number and proportion of dwellings granted consent on previously-developed windfall sites in 2001 to 2004 completed by March 2005

Sub area	2001		2002		2003		2004	
	number completed	%	number completed	%	number completed	%	number completed	%
Northern	28	74	113	59	130	64	0	0
Central	113	94	101	58	101	34	2	2
Eastern	42	86	41	47	16	13	0	0
Western	51	100	38	88	11	14	0	0
Total	234	91	293	60	258	37	2	0

2.13 This table shows that the average rate of completions on such sites within the first and second years are low (0% and 37% respectively). However, a higher proportion (60%) of the consents granted in 2002 had been completed within 3 years and almost all (91%) of the consents granted in 2001 had been completed by 31 March 2005. This pattern is not unexpected with the 'lead in' time such previously-developed sites can involve.

2.14 In making the calculations of future housing supply to March 2009 (section 3 below), it is therefore proposed that the allowance for those dwellings that will come forward on previously-developed windfall sites be based on 70% of the average annual number of houses that have been granted consent in each sub area in 2001 to 2004 (a 30% discount has been allowed to account for the contention that previously-developed sites will start to become exhausted). A 3-year allowance (for 2005, 2006 and 2007) of that figure would then be taken in expectation that few of those sites granted consent in 2008 and 2009 will have been completed by 31 March 2010. This calculation would result in figures for each of the sub areas of: 320<sup>3</sup> for the Northern sub area, 380 for Central, 260 for Eastern and 140 for Western.

2.15 These allowances will need to be kept under close review in subsequent annual reviews to ensure that they remain robust and do not substantially under/over estimate the number of dwellings completed on previously-developed windfall sites.

#### ***Previously-developed small sites***

2.16 An analysis of the completions on previously-developed small<sup>4</sup> sites in 2001 to 2004 is set out in Table 7 below. It gives an updated basis to that used in the original IPG for estimating the completions that may be achieved on such sites. These would be completions in addition to those already identified in the HLPS or that may arise as windfall sites. By restricting the calculation to previously-developed sites only, it eliminates any distortion in the calculations from completions on greenfield sites through 'old'<sup>5</sup> consents and any 'pragmatic exceptions'.

Table 7: Annual dwelling completions on previously-developed small sites 2001 to 2004

	<b><i>2003 IPG allowance (pa)</i></b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>Totals</b>	<b>Average</b>
Northern	45	27	41	40	52	160	40
Central	50	28	25	33	70	156	39

<sup>3</sup> For example this involves 152 average per annum (see table 5) x 70% x 3 years

<sup>4</sup> Those sites not identified in the Housing Land Position Statement that involve less than 0.25 hectares or 5 dwellings

<sup>5</sup> Consents granted prior to the introduction of the restrictions on the release of Greenfield sites.

Eastern	40	41	55	40	45	181	45
Western	40	21	21	10	28	80	20
Total	175	117	142	123	195	577	144

- 2.17 The table shows that the completions on previously-developed small sites were reasonably consistent. However, apart from the Eastern area, the average level of completions on such sites has been less than the allowances made in the existing IPG. It is therefore proposed that in making the calculations of future housing supply (section 3 below) the annual allowance levels for the four sub areas be amended to: Northern 40, Central 40, Eastern 45 and Western 20.

***Pragmatic exceptions***

- 2.18 Members will recall that as part of the Managed Release approach, there are a number of ‘pragmatic exceptions’ to a complete moratorium on Greenfield development. The number of applications and dwellings that have been approved under each exception in 2004 are set out in Table 8 below, alongside those granted in 2003 (which was the first year of such exceptions).

*Table 8: Pragmatic exceptions approved in 2004 (compared with 2003)*

Pragmatic exception type (IPG para 55)	2004		2003	
	Number of Applications	Number of Dwellings	Number of Applications	Number of Dwellings
A) Completion of largely developed sites	7	54	12	40
B) Wholly affordable housing	0	0	0	0
C) Housing for special housing needs	0	0	0	0
D) Infilling	16	31	15	21
E) Essential to mixed use development	0	0	0	0
F) Reuse and adaptation of agricultural buildings	9	10	12	20
G) Redevelopment of agricultural buildings	11	117	3	31
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>112</b>

- 2.19 This table shows that there was almost a doubling of the number of dwellings granted on ‘pragmatic exception’ sites in 2004 in comparison to the previous year. This number represented 18% of the total housing provision requirement for 2004.
- 2.20 These exceptions were limited to four types, with none approved for categories B, C or D (in either year). Over half (117 dwellings) were on 11 sites involving the redevelopment of agricultural buildings and 54 were on 7 sites involving the completion of largely developed sites. The other two types, infilling and the reuse/adaptation of agricultural buildings, involved a large number of sites (25 in total) with a small number of dwellings individually.

### 3 Housing supply

- 3.1 The housing supply position in each of the four JSP sub areas at 1 April 2005 is derived from the housing land information <sup>6</sup>. Schedules of the sites have been placed in Group offices <sup>7</sup>. The final four columns in each schedule show the:
- number of houses on sites with planning permission where development had commenced,
  - number of houses on sites with planning permission where development had not yet commenced,
  - area (hectares) of previously-developed land that would be identified in the 2004 Housing Land Position Statement that did not have planning consent, and,
  - area (hectares) of Greenfield land that would be identified in the 2004 Housing Land Position Statement that did not have planning consent.
- 3.2 The number of houses that could be expected to come forward on the sites in the first three categories (i.e. excluding the Greenfield sites) is then combined with those that can be expected to be developed on additional ‘windfall’ and small previously-developed sites to give the total supply .
- 3.3 Table 9 below shows the housing supply position in each of the JSP sub areas for a 5-year period 2005 to 2009 (1 April 2005 to 31 March 2010). It represents an updated version of Table A in the adopted IPG.

*Table 9: Housing supply position within Joint Structure Plan Sub Areas from April 2005*

<b>Sub area</b>	<b>Northern</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Western</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Sites with consent and started	355	1255	381	164	2155
Sites with consent but not started (70% of total capacity)	265	435	681	155	1536
Brownfield land in HLPS without consent (50% of total capacity)	58	110	38	68	274
Brownfield windfall sites allowance <sup>8</sup>	320	380	260	140	1100
Brownfield small sites allowance <sup>9</sup>	200	200	225	100	725
<b>Total April 2005 supply</b>	1198	2380	1585	627	5790
<i>Total April 2004 supply</i>	<i>1322</i>	<i>2368</i>	<i>1510</i>	<i>665</i>	<i>5865</i>

- 3.4 This Table shows that despite a further year’s completions the total supply has in fact increased in the Central and Eastern sub areas and decreased only marginally in the Western sub area. This is, like the last two years, primarily a result of two factors. Firstly, previously-developed windfall sites coming forward at very high levels. Secondly, sites with consent being started and so their full capacity can now be counted instead of an allowance of only 70%. These factors

<sup>6</sup> This information forms the basis of the Housing Land Position Statement that is published annually following discussion with representatives of the house building industry.

<sup>7</sup> Schedules of the sites involved are available on request from the Forward Planning Manager.

<sup>8</sup> See paragraph 2.13 for the basis of the calculation

<sup>9</sup> See paragraph 2.16 for the basis of the calculation

are undoubtedly a direct result of the restrictions being applied to greenfield sites through the IPG.

- 3.5 Table 10 below gives the total supply compared with the total housing numbers expected to be provided in the five years 2005 to 2009 in the JSP (this represents an updated version of Table B in the adopted IPG). The table also shows the number of years provision that that housing supply would represent (and compares it with that of last year).

*Table 10: Housing provision and supply position for the JSP sub areas*

<b>Sub area</b>	<b>Northern</b>	<b>Central</b>	<b>Eastern</b>	<b>Western</b>
Joint Structure Plan housing provision figure to 2005-09	1000	2050	1000	1250
Total supply at April 2005	1198	2380	1585	627
Number of years supply at April 2005	6.0	5.8	7.9	2.5
<i>Years supply at April 2004</i>	<i>6.4</i>	<i>5.5</i>	<i>7.6</i>	<i>2.9</i>

- 3.6 The Table highlights that the number of years supply has increased in the Central and Eastern JSP sub areas (to 5.8 and 7.9 years respectively) in comparison with the strategic housing requirements set out in the JSP. The increase in the Central sub areas is contributed to by the planned reduction in the housing requirement in future years.
- 3.7 The supply in the Northern and Western sub areas have decreased from 6.4 to 6.0 years and from 2.9 to 2.5 years respectively. The length of supply in the Western sub area has been affected by the planned increase in the housing provision requirement to 250 pa in 2005 and subsequent years.
- 3.8 However, the total supply includes allowances for the full five years on small sites and years 3, 4 and 5 on brownfield windfall sites. The number of years supply is therefore exaggerated when the total supply is less than 5 years as it includes allowances for the later years. A revised and more robust way of calculating the supply in the situation where the supply is less than 5 years would be to compare the 'identified' supply<sup>10</sup> with the annual requirement net of the completions on small sites (and to allow for brownfield windfall sites only when the supply is more than 2 years).
- 3.9 For the Western area the supply of 387 (164 + 155 + 68) would be compared with the net requirement of 230 per annum (250 less 20 completions per annum on small sites). This would give a supply of 1.7 years (rather than the 2.5 years in Table 10).

## 4 Discussion

- 4.1 Government advice states that as part of the 'Plan, Monitor and Manage' approach introduced by PPG3, local planning authorities should: "*control the **pattern** and **speed** of urban growth, ... and deliver the local authority's **recycling target***". This is set out in the Council's IPG as one of its key objectives. Each of these three aspects is discussed below in the light of the house completion and supply position set out in sections 2 and 3 above.

<sup>10</sup> The capacity of sites with consent and started, the allowance for sites with consent but not started and the allowance for Brownfield land in HLPS without consent (from Table 9).

### *Pattern of urban growth*

- 4.2 The Regional Spatial Strategy and the Council's recently adopted Joint Structure Plan set out the locational principles and strategy for development in the East Riding. Together they:
- establish the four functional sub areas and their respective priorities, and
  - identify those settlements that are to be the focus of most development.
- 4.3 The JSP sets out the following approach for housing provision in each of the four sub areas (see Plan at Appendix 1):
- A 'Northern' sub area that is largely rural based on the Vale of York and parts of the Yorkshire Wolds where there will be a reduced level of development to achieve a slower rate of growth;
  - A 'Central' sub area that surrounds, and is heavily influenced by, the City of Hull where development will be focussed on the City to support urban regeneration initiatives there;
  - An 'Eastern' sub area including the whole of the coastal strip from Flamborough Head to Spurn Point where development will be maintained to support regeneration and market renewal in the absence of any likely significant employment growth, and;
  - A 'Western' sub area based on the port of Goole and surrounding towns where there will be increased development in response to the strategic economic and regeneration focus on the area
- 4.4 The JSP has introduced a fundamental change to the existing settlement hierarchy from the previous Humberside Structure Plan by seeking to focus development on a limited number of settlements that are identified in JSP policies DS1 to DS3.
- Cottingham, Anlaby/Willerby/Kirkella and Hessle are identified, together with the City of Hull, as the 'Sub-Regional Urban Area' (DS1);
  - Beverley, Bridlington and Goole are identified as Principal Towns (DS2), and;
  - Driffield, Elloughton/Brough, Hedon, Hornsea, Howden, Market Weighton, Pocklington, Snaith and Withernsea are identified as Towns (DS3).
- 4.5 Outside of these DS1 to DS3 settlements, the forthcoming Local Development Framework will designate a few 'smaller settlements' where, in accordance with JSP policies DS4 and H7, only limited development will be allowed when it is demonstrated that it meets local needs, contributes to sustaining the role of the settlement and avoids unacceptable long distance commuting. Only wholly affordable housing proposals will be allowed under JSP policy DS4A in any settlement not identified by policies DS1 to DS4.
- 4.6 As mentioned in 4.4, this pattern of development marks a fundamental change from the previous dispersed pattern of development encouraged by the former Humberside Structure Plan. A substantial number of houses that benefit from extant consents granted under the previous approach will continue to be completed in the DS4 and DS4A settlements. However, it is important that the new concentrated pattern of development is implemented now that the JSP is adopted and can be given full weight in the determination of planning applications. Any method for the release of sites, arising from either this (or a subsequent) update or in the Local Development Framework, will also need to have particular regard to the new locational principles and strategy for development set out above.
- 4.7 A number of workshops/seminars will be held in the near future to discuss this new approach with Members and various other stakeholders.

### *Speed of urban growth*

- 4.8 PPG3 states that local planning authorities “*should seek only to identify sufficient land to meet the housing requirement set as a result of the RPG and strategic planning processes. In doing so they do not need to consider all the land in their area: they should not extend the search further than required to provide sufficient capacity to meet the agreed housing requirement*”. This was confirmed in the Kitchen Lane appeal decision of January 2004 that concluded the release of the greenfield site relatively close to the centre of Beverley “*would not accord with national and regional guidance and the thrust of emerging local policy and that there is no necessity for its release at this time*”. The Government Office has also made it clear that it does not wish to see greenfield releases in areas where take up has been at a higher rate than envisaged as this would prejudice the strategy in RPG and the JSP.
- 4.9 Table 3 shows that development rates over the first seven years of the JSP have been significantly above the strategic housing requirement in three of the four East Riding JSP sub areas. Only in the Western sub area have completions been close to the requirement (+3%). The over provision has been substantial in each of the others with 29% in the Central sub area, 33% in the Eastern and 47% in the Northern.
- 4.10 If this level of over supply continues then there is a significant risk that the RSS/JSP strategy (see paragraphs 4.2 to 4.4 above) will be prejudiced. Over-provision of new housing can have a particular adverse impact on demand for the existing housing stock (a key factor in the aspirations for the regeneration of the City of Hull<sup>11</sup> and the East Riding towns such as Bridlington, Goole and Withernsea) and on creating unnecessary car journeys if housing is supplied in the wrong locations.
- 4.11 A judgement therefore needs to be made on whether the total existing supply, including the rate that consents will come forward on unidentified sites, is sufficient to result in the annual housing provision requirements in the draft JSP being met. If so, then no further greenfield sites need be released.
- 4.12 The number of consents being granted on unidentified previously-developed windfall and small sites (Tables 5 and 7) will assist in achieving the housing provision requirement and realistic account needs to be taken of the likely levels of the rate that non-allocated consents/completions are occurring. This is important as the level of previously-developed windfall and small sites in recent years has been significant. Adjustments have therefore been made to those allowances for each of the sub areas in comparison to those originally set out in the IPG.
- 4.13 The number of dwellings granted on windfall sites (648) and completed on small sites (195) in 2004 represents 73% of the housing provision requirement (of 1150). If the number granted on the pragmatic exceptions (212, Table 8) is also added, then the total of consents granted on non-allocated sites in 2004 represented 92% of the requirement for that year. Whilst there might not be any objection to these sites individually against the Council’s present approach under the IPG, it must remain a concern that if each year’s completions is being compensated for by consents on non-allocated sites then the sizeable existing ‘pool’ of consents will not be reduced. This substantially reduces the Council’s ability to control the speed of urban growth.
- 4.14 The level of supply in the **Northern, Central and Eastern** sub areas at 1 April 2005 all remain substantial with 6.0, 5.8 and 7.9 years respectively. Indeed, the total supply in the **Central and Eastern** sub areas has increased from the previous year despite a further year’s completions (see Table 10). In addition, provision in each of these three sub areas over the first 7 years of the JSP period has been significantly above the requirement, with a 47%, 29% and 33% over-

---

<sup>11</sup> Being addressed through a number of initiatives, notably the Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder

provision respectively (see Table 3). The housing provision requirement in the Northern and Eastern areas was also substantially exceeded in 2004 (see Table 1).

- 4.15 Furthermore, although the future housing provision requirement in the Eastern sub area remains the same at 200 per annum, the annual requirement will reduce in the Northern sub area to 200 in 2005 and to 400 by 2006 in the Central sub area. This reduction in the Central JSP sub area should help support the regeneration of the housing market in Hull, including the work of the Pathfinder.
- 4.16 It is therefore proposed that no change be made to the present approach on the release of major Greenfield sites in the Northern, Central and Eastern sub areas.
- 4.17 Completions in the **Western** sub area were low in the years 1999-2001, but these have increased substantially and they were significantly above the JSP annual housing requirement of 150 in 2002 and 2003 and the requirement of 200 in 2004 (by 43%, 83% and 25% respectively). The requirement increases to 250 in 2005 and thereafter in recognition of the sub area's identification in the RSS and JSP as a 'priority for growth' to build on its multi-modal transport links and good prospects for employment growth.
- 4.18 Goole has been found to display problems of housing stress similar to those of the 'Pathfinder' areas, such as Hull, albeit on a smaller scale. As a result, the Council has been successful in provisionally securing funds from the Regional Housing Board, Housing Corporation and English Partnerships to improve housing and neighbourhoods in Goole.
- 4.19 The Council has been concerned over the effect that new housing development in Goole will have on the fragile demand for the existing stock. It considered that excess provision could have a disproportionate adverse effect on the objectives of the co-ordinated programme of interventions that will be required to provide a high quality and sustainable mixed housing market in Goole. The decision was taken as part of last year's update report that no further releases should be made in Goole although there was only a 2.9 year supply at that time.
- 4.20 This decision has been tested by two planning appeals in 2004. The first (an informal hearing for a site at Oak Avenue, Old Goole) was dismissed in August 2004. The Inspector considered that *"a significant addition to the supply in the town on a Greenfield site could further reduce the fragile demand for the existing stock"*. The second appeal (a public inquiry for a site at Bretton Avenue, Goole) in March 2005 was also dismissed, but that Inspector was of the view that the controlled release of sites in Goole would not harm the housing initiatives unduly and that there is an *"urgent need to release more housing land in Goole"*. The principal reason he did not allow the appeal was that *"a comprehensive and systematic approach"* is required so that *"willy-nilly"* releases of Greenfield sites in the area do not undermine the current Managed Release strategy.
- 4.21 The total supply in the Western sub area has now reduced from 2.9 years to 1.7 years at 1 April 2005 on the basis of the revised calculation (see paragraphs 3.8 and 3.9). This level of supply is insufficient to secure the increased strategic housing provision of 250 for 2005 and thereafter, and further releases will be required if the JSP's strategy for the sub area is not to be jeopardised.
- 4.22 There has been a recent improvement in the housing market in Goole recently and it is considered appropriate to release some major Greenfield sites to satisfy market demand and ensure that the strategic housing requirement can be met. However, the area of land released needs to be controlled carefully to avoid the situation whereby a substantial 'pool' of sites exists that would affect the housing market in the area if its recent buoyancy was to reverse.

- 4.23 It is therefore proposed that a further two years' supply (net of expected completions on previously-developed windfall sites and completions on small sites) be released in the Western JSP sub area. This would take the supply on all sites up to 3.7 years. This would involve the release of capacity for a further 365 houses<sup>12</sup>.
- 4.24 There is a need to ensure that a comprehensive and systematic approach mechanism is put in place for their release so that the most sustainable sites are released. A separate report outlining a draft mechanism for the release of major Greenfield sites will be submitted to the Cabinet as soon as possible, which would then be able to be applied to the Western sub area.

### ***Recycling target***

- 4.25 The proportion of housing completions achieved on previously-developed land (sometimes referred to as 'recycled' or 'Brownfield' land) in 2004 has shown a further substantial and welcome increase from the previous levels. The 2004 proportion of almost 50% is above the target of 30% set out in the JSP, but this level is not intended to act as a limit if further appropriate sites come forward. This further increase is undoubtedly a result of the restrictions on the development of Greenfield sites being applied through the IPG.

### ***Greenfield 'pragmatic exceptions'***

- 4.26 In view of the Government Office advice on not risking the RSS/JSP strategy and the substantial over-provision of new dwellings in 2003, it was agreed as part of last year's update on Managed Release that the number of dwellings granted on the 'pragmatic exception' sites should be "kept under close scrutiny in future and that only those applications that fully comply with the exception definition and are in sustainable locations for the scale of the development proposed should be approved". Despite this close scrutiny, almost twice the number of dwellings was granted on these 'exception' sites in 2004 as in 2003.
- 4.27 Table 8 shows that no dwellings were approved in 2004, as in 2003, for wholly affordable housing (IPG para. 55B), for specialist housing needs (IPG para. 55C) or for housing essential to the viability of mixed use developments (IPG para. 55E), yet they remain potentially necessary exceptions to the restrictions to secure other important objectives and should therefore be retained.
- 4.28 IPG paragraph 55A allows for the completion of the remaining portions of allocated sites or sites with lapsed planning consent that are largely complete and where it would be beneficial to the character and/or amenity of the area if the development was completed. When this exception was included it was intended that it would be used to allow small numbers of dwellings to complete a site that was almost finished. Whilst 5 of the applications approved involved a total of 12 dwellings, 1 application (in Leconfield) involved 10 dwellings and another (in Gilberdyke) involved 32 dwellings.
- 4.29 IPG paragraph 55D allows for infilling within development limits. 31 dwellings were approved on such plots in 2004, but this was on 16 sites (an average of 2 dwellings per site). Similarly, IPG paragraph 55F allows for the reuse of agricultural buildings within or contiguous with development limits and 10 dwellings were granted in 2004 on 9 small sites.
- 4.30 117 dwellings were approved on 11 sites involving the redevelopment of agricultural buildings (IPG para 55G). Whilst 12 dwellings were on 6 sites, all but one were in settlements with few

---

<sup>12</sup> This represents 2 years' housing requirement (2 x 250) less 2 years' Brownfield windfall allowance (95 – see Para 2.14) and 2 years' small sites allowance (40 – see Para 2.17)

services and facilities. Four of the remainder (Vandon Lodge, Hook, 34 dwellings; Back Westgate, Hornsea, 15; Ings Lane, Keyingham, 15, and; Holme Road, Market Weighton, 32) all secured the removal of an Intensive Livestock Unit from within a settlement. The other was a former farmstead in Anlaby that had been encircled by residential development and was allowed on appeal. Whilst this total level of development is of concern, it would be hard to justify the refusal of any of these sites given the particular circumstances.

- 4.31 The total number of dwellings approved on ‘pragmatic exception’ sites in 2004 (212), is of concern as it represents 18% of the East Riding’s housing requirement for that year. Future releases on a similar level could contribute to the housing provision requirement being exceeded or other objectives (such as not approving development in unsustainable locations) being undermined. Some development (such as infilling) can make better use of land within development limits (another PPG3 objective), but it should be emphasised that there is no need to rely on these pragmatic exceptions to meet the overall housing requirements and they should not be approved when they do not meet other relevant considerations, particularly the new direction being applied by the Joint Structure Plan (see para 4.6).
- 4.32 Many of these pragmatic exceptions were in locations outside the DS1, DS2 and DS3 settlements, e.g. those at Leconfield and Gilberdyke. Any such proposals in the future will be affected by the changes to the Development Plan now that the JSP is adopted (paras 4.2 to 4.7 above). Provided these ‘pragmatic exceptions’ are determined in accordance with that revised Development Plan, then this is likely to reduce their numbers substantially.
- 4.33 It is therefore proposed that no changes be made to the categories of ‘pragmatic exceptions’, but they kept under continued close scrutiny and only those applications that fully comply with the exception definition and the revised Development Plan should be approved

## **5 Conclusion**

- 5.1 It is clear that house completions in 2004 were substantially higher than that planned in the Northern, Eastern and Western JSP sub areas despite the restrictions that have been in placed on the release of Greenfield sites. In addition, despite a further year’s completions the total available supply is still substantial in the Northern, Central and Eastern JSP sub areas.
- 5.2 It is therefore concluded that additional greenfield land release at this stage in the Northern, Central and Eastern JSP sub areas will risk exacerbating the prevailing substantial level of over-provision of house completions in the East Riding. This would be contrary to national advice and will prejudice the strategy in RPG and the JSP.
- 5.3 The supply in the Western JSP sub area is now only 1.7 years and the housing provision requirement has increased to 250 per annum for 2005 and each year thereafter. A recent appeal decision has also highlighted that there is an urgent need for more housing land in Goole. However, any sites should be released in a comprehensive and systematic manner (see paragraph 4.20). It is proposed that a report be submitted at the earliest opportunity setting out a draft mechanism for the release of sites in the Western JSP sub area.
- 5.4 The pattern of future urban growth will be affected by the ‘new’ Development Plan strategy arising from the JSP’s adoption (see paras 4.2 to 4.6). This will need to be reflected in the determination of all future planning applications and it will have a particular effect on the approach to development outside the identified Sub Regional Urban Area and the Towns.

- 5.5 In view of the revisions to the Development Plan following the JSP's adoption, it is proposed that no changes be made to the categories of 'pragmatic exceptions' at this time, but that they should continue to be kept under close scrutiny and only those applications that fully comply with the exception definition and the revised Development Plan should be approved.

Jack Blackmore  
Director of Corporate Policy and Strategy

**Contact Officer:** Pete Ashcroft  
Spatial Planning Manager  
**Telephone Number:** 01482 391737  
**E.mail:** pete.ashcroft@eastriding.gov.uk

### **Background Papers**

1. Interim Policy Guidance on the Managed Release of Residential Development Sites, October 2003.
2. Planning Policy Statement 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development', 2005
3. Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 'Housing', 2000
4. Planning to Deliver, DETR, 2001
5. Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and the Humber (RSS12 ), 2004
6. Joint Structure Plan for Hull and the East Riding, 2005
7. Appeal decision APP/E2001/A/03/1120953, Land east of Kitchen Lane, Beverley, January 2004
8. Appeal decision APP/E2001/A/04/1141866, Land north of Oak Avenue, Old Goole, August 2004
9. Appeal decision APP/E2001/A/03/1125541 & 04/1147059, Land south of Maple Walk, west of Hook Road and north of Bretton Avenue, Goole, March 2005

