

Barton Willmore's Further Assessment of Historic Delivery against Requirements since 2001/02 in the NPA

- 1.1 Barton Willmore does not disagree with the Councils 'mathematical calculations' contained in DV21 Appendix 9. However, Barton Willmore disagrees with the annual requirement identified to be met within Appendix 9 at that point in time. The Councils approach tests completions against the 'planned' annual requirements as opposed the 'actual' annual requirement taking into account previous surplus or deficit.
- 1.2 The following tables have been prepared to assess the NPA's delivery of housing since 2001/02 based on the point in time at which the Development Plan was adopted irrespective of the start of the plan period.
- 1.3 At 2001 (i.e. mid way through a plan period), there was a present deficit of 788 dwellings against the then Structure Plan target (1993 – 2011) of 1,194 dwellings per annum (see footnote 1 below and as set out in Appendix 3 of DV32). The Councils have not taken this deficit into account within its DV21 Appendix 9.
- 1.4 Tables 1.1 and 1.2 follow the approach whereby the 'adoption' date of the Development Plan is taken as the point in time in which the housing figure is updated, but reflects the 'actual' annual requirement to monitor completions against. The relevant Development Plans include:
 - The Norfolk Structure Plan: 2001/02 - 2007/08:
 - The East of England Plan (adopted March 2008): 2008/09 – 2010/11:
 - The Joint Core Strategy (adopted March 2011): 2011/12 – 2012/13.
- 1.5 In addition, table 1.1 provides for the deficit to be rectified over the remainder of the then plan period (i.e. the 'Liverpool' approach) whilst table 1.2 rectifies the then deficit over the next 5 year period (the 'Sedgefield' approach) for the purposes of comparison.
- 1.6 When table 1.1 is compared to existing Barton Willmore table 3.3 (p10/11 DV32), the effect of this further approach demonstrates that only an additional year (2006/07) demonstrates a surplus of housing against that years' annual requirements.
- 1.7 When table 1.2 is compared to existing Barton Willmore table 3.3 (p10/11 DV32), the effect is that only one single year is demonstrated as providing surplus housing for that years' annual requirement.
- 1.8 The approaches only reaffirm that the NPA has persistently underperformed and therefore a 20% NPPF buffer is required.

Table 1.1 The Liverpool Approach Based on Point of Adoption and Actual Annual Requirement.

April/March	Actual Completions	Actual Annual Requirement	Calculation	Annualised (Under)/Over Delivery
2001/02	1,342	1,273 ¹	$12,733^2 - 1,342 = 11,391/9 = 1,266$	69
2002/03	1,265	1,266	$11,391 - 1,265 = 10,126/8 = 1,266$	(1)
2003/04	1,261	1,266	$10,126 - 1,261 = 8,865/7 = 1,266$	(5)
2004/05	1,200	1,266	$8,865 - 1,200 = 7,665/6 = 1,278$	(66)
2005/06	1,122	1,278	$7,665 - 1,122 = 6,543/5 = 1,309$	(156)
2006/07	1,432	1,309	$6,542 - 1,432 = 5,110/4 = 1,278$	123
2007/08	2,059	1,278	$5,110 - 2,059 = 3,051 = n/a$	781
2008/09	1,193	1,650	$33,000 - 1,193 = 31,807/13^2 = 2,447$	(457)
2009/10	923	2,447	$31,807 - 923 = 30,884/12 = 2,574$	(1,524)
2010/11	910	2,574	$30,884 - 910 = 29,974/11 = na$	(1,664)
2011/12	915	1,825	$32,850 - 915 = 31,935/17 = 1,879$	(910)
2012/13	881	1,879	$31,935 - 881 = 31,054/16 = 2,156$	(998)

¹ At 2001, only 8,767 dwellings had been completed in the NPA since 1993 against a requirement of 21,500 (1,194pa) as set out in the Norfolk Structure Plan 1993-2011 (source: Table 1 NCC Housing Report April 2007 - see **Appendix 3**. 15,003 dwgs – 6,236 dwgs = 8,767dwgs) . This represents a deficit of 788 dwellings at 2001 (1,194 dpa x 8yrs = 9,555 requirement from 1993/94 – 2001/02). 12,733 dwellings remain to be delivered in the remaining 10 years of the plan period at 1,273dpa.

² Remainder of Plan Period from point of adoption.

Table 1.2 The Sedgefield Approach Based on Point of Adoption and Actual Annual Requirement.

April/ March	Overall Deficit at that point in time.	Annual Increase on planned requirement	Adopted Plan Requirement	Actual Annual Requirement	Completions	Annual Surplus / (deficit)
2001/02	788	158	1,194	1,352	1,342	(10)
2002/03	798	160	1,194	1,354	1,265	(89)
2003/04	887	177	1,194	1,371	1,261	(110)
2004/05	997	199	1,194	1,394	1,200	(194)
2005/06	1,191	238	1,194	1,432	1,122	(310)
2006/07	1,501	300	1,194	1,494	1,432	(62)
2007/08	1,563	313	1,194	1,876	2,059	183
2008/09	0	0	1,650	1,650	1,193	(457)
2009/10	457	91	1,650	1,741	923	(818)
2010/11	1,257	255	1,650	1,905	910	(995)
2011/12	0	0	1,825	1,825	915	(910)
2012/13	910	182	1825	2,007	881	(1,126)

Notes

- i. The Sedgefield approach requires the overall deficit to be rectified over the next 5-year period.
- ii. Starting in 2001/02, there was a deficit of 788 dwellings. This equates to an additional 158 dwellings to be delivered in the next 5-year period ($788/5 = 158$) on top of the annual planned requirement (1,194 dwellings).
- iii. Any surplus/deficit identified is added/subtracted to the existing shortfall to calculate the overall shortfall for the next year.
- iv. For example, a shortfall in 2001/02 of 10 dwellings, is added onto the original shortfall of 788 dwellings, resulting in a new overall deficit of 798 dwellings for the year 2002/03. This revised figure is divided by 5 ($798/5 = 160$), resulting in a new figure to be added to the planned requirement for the next 5-year period of 160 dwellings. In this instance, it results in the need to add an additional 160 dwellings in 2002/03 onto the planned requirement of 1,194 dwellings to make an actual annual requirement of 1,354 dwellings in 2002/03.

- v. At the adoption of a new Development Plan, such as the JCS in 2011, we have not carried forward the previous plan shortfall, but continued to use the Sedgefield approach on any shortfalls seen thereafter.

Barton Willmore

25 July 2013