

PHASE 3
MATTER 10



JohnsonMowat
Planning & Development Consultants

Examination of the City of York Local Plan
Matters, Issues and Questions for the Examination

Phase 3 Hearings

Matter 10 – Housing Mix and Density

July 2022

CLIENT: Taylor Wimpey



CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

2.0 RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR'S QUESTIONS



1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This response has been prepared on behalf of Taylor Wimpey in relation to their land interests at Strategic Site ST7, east of Metcalfe Lane, York which is a proposed allocation in the Publication Draft Local Plan.
- 1.2 There are three parties with interests in proposed allocation ST7, who have in the past submitted individual and joint representations to the Local Plan as well as attended the Phase 1 Hearings. The recent submissions to the June 2021 Updated Evidence consultation were presented as a consortium response with the following three companies represented.
- **Barratt David Wilson Homes (Barton Willmore)**
 - **Taylor Wimpey (Johnson Mowat)**
 - **TW Fields (PB Planning)**
- 1.3 This response included a critique of the housing requirement undertaken by Lichfields, as well as input from SLR and Pegasus in relation to landscape and heritage considerations of the updated evidence.
- 1.4 Whilst the ST7 developers support the principle of the ST7 allocation disagreement remains with the size of the proposed ST7 allocation as currently drafted. The primary objections remain as follows:
- The site access roads are too long and no doubt costly. Extending the limit of development in the allocation to reduce the access roads would improve deliverability.
 - The developers do not accept the land between the allocation and the edge of the main urban area needs to be Green Belt and collectively request the Council entertain a slightly expanded ST7 (expanded westwards) to marginally reduce the gap whilst maintaining a degree of separation.
 - Whilst the developers are prepared to support the garden village concept in its current shape and form, however the dwellings likely to be delivered are unlikely to be able to sustain the community facilities sought by the Council which then may undermine the principal of the garden village. In short, the allocation needs to be slightly larger.



- 1.5 Alternative development options have been presented to the Council for a new Garden Village of either 845 homes, 975 homes or 1,225 homes. The final detail of the ST7 allocation will be determined at the Phase 3 Local Plan Examination Hearings.

- 1.6 The content of previous submissions remains relevant, including the Publication Draft submissions in February 2018, July 2019 Proposed Modifications, Phase 1 Hearings and Phase 2 Hearing Statements and the June 2021 Modifications and Evidence Base Consultation. In addition to this statement relating to Examination Matter 10, it should be noted that statements have also been prepared for Matter 1 and 4 on behalf of Taylor Wimpey, and Johnson Mowat will be representing Taylor Wimpey at the Phase 3 Examination Hearing sessions relating to Matters 1, 4 and 10.

- 1.7 A Statement of Common Ground specific to Policy SS9 (Site ST7) has been drafted and it is anticipated that by the time the Phase 3 Hearings commence the Statement of Common Ground will be signed by all parties.



2.0 RESPONSE TO INSPECTOR'S QUESTIONS

Matter 10 Housing Mix and Density (Policies H2, H3, H4 and H9)

Q 10.1 Are the proposed densities in Policy H2 appropriate and will they result in the efficient use of land?

2.1 We are concerned that some of these higher densities may be difficult to achieve in the urban area where the numbers require 'higher level' development which does not sit comfortably with preserving views of the Minster.

Q 10.2 Is the approach to housing mix, and the 'balancing of the housing market', with reference to the SHMA, in Policy H3, based on sound principles?

2.2 While we generally support the aims of the mix policy H3, care needs to be taken in the reference to the 2016 SHMA and how market demands change over time. It is recognised that post covid, many employees are taking the opportunity to work from home either part-time or full time and the benefits that arise from this including a reduction in car use and congestion.

2.3 The fixation of mix policies with bedroom numbers needs to recognise the way in which home space is being consumed and how larger dwellings in the mix (eg 3 and 4 bed) are helping to facilitate home working.

2.4 Ideally, home working needs to be recognised within the Policy wording. Our suggested wording below is.

• 'Proposals for residential development **should seek to** ~~will be required to~~ balance the housing market by including a mix of types of housing which reflects the **local market demand and the diverse mix of need across the city**' for both bedroom numbers **and space for home-working in the dwelling where possible.**

• 'The housing mix proposed should have reference to the SHMA and be informed by:

• Up to date evidence of need including at a local level;

• **Market demand and local aspirations;** and

• 'The nature of the development site and the character of the local surrounding area'.

• 'Applicants ~~will be required to~~ **should** provide ~~sufficient~~ **proportionate** evidence to support their proposals'.



Q 10.3 Does Policy H4 cater adequately for self and custom house building?

- 2.5 While we are supportive of the principle of Self and Custom Build, we are unconvinced these aims are best delivered on Strategic sites and have yet to see any evidence of why those on the Council's Self Build register have expressed a preference to be on a strategic housing site.
- 2.6 There are issues on where within a strategic site such plots could be facilitated and over what timescale they are expected to be delivered. In all likelihood, self build would sit best in its own separate zone.
- 2.7 Guidance on how self build plots would contribute to infrastructure and obligations is missing – presumably the self build plots would make a contribution to affordable housing in a commuted sum payment but this would fall below the 2 dwelling threshold in Policy H10 and Table 5.5.
- 2.8 It is our view that the Plan needs to allocate a series of small sites, up to 20 dwellings at a low density to deliver on self build. In its current form, it looks as though the Council have been unable to find a solution in the Plan and simply handed the problem to the bigger developers.

Q 10.4 Will Policy H9 properly address specialist housing for older people?

- 2.9 We share the HBF response on this matter. Further clarity is required and older persons housing should only be provided on strategic sites where it is proven necessary. Many providers of elderly housing prefer smaller bespoke sites of circa 1 acre for 70 bed dwellings. There is no evidence to suggest they would seek to be on strategic sites.