Matter 4: Supply of housing.

As set out above, subject to being able to conclude that the Plan is capable of being found legally compliant and sound, I am intending to move to a second phase of hearing sessions at which I would consider matters in detail, such as the supply of housing. However, the following issue would be usefully considered at this stage of the examination.

**Issue 1: Is the Council’s approach to its housing supply, justified, effective and consistent with national policy?**

**Question 58.** Is reliance on the scale of windfall housing predicated within the LP being delivered, realistic, justified and consistent with national policy? In particular, how have the Core Areas been determined? How does the projected contribution from windfall housing compare with recent housing delivery? Is it appropriate to rely to such an extent on windfall housing rather than the allocation of housing sites within a plan led system?

We consider that the proposed scale of windfall housing is realistic given the history of windfall development in the District. Over the last 20 years, 4,483 windfalls have been delivered out of a total housing delivery of 8,327 units, representing 54% of the total, which compares favourably with the proposed 39% in the Plan. In addition, 20 of the proposed 34 Core Areas where windfalls are to be permitted were previously in the countryside where development was restricted. Thus, the opportunity for windfalls will be improved.

We also consider that it is appropriate to rely on windfalls in a plan led system, especially as this Plan allocates windfalls to settlements.

Windfalls open the house building market to smaller developers and builders who cannot compete on the larger allocations. There is a chance that these small developments can moderate the new house sales price and chip away at the stranglehold on the industry exerted by the major players.