

**CALDERDALE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL  
LOCAL PLAN WORKING PARTY**

**WARDS AFFECTED: ALL**

**Date of Meeting: 17<sup>th</sup> August 2016**

**SUBJECT OF REPORT: CALDERDALE LOCAL PLAN: Distribution of Growth**

**Report of the Planning Service Lead**

## **1. PURPOSE OF REPORT**

- 1.1 To provide Members of the Working Party with the latest thoughts on the distribution of growth, which is being informed by work on the transport evidence, Habitats Regulations Assessment and ongoing site assessment.

## **2. RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 That Members discuss the distribution of development and consider its reasonableness as a basis for the ongoing preparation of the Local Plan.

## **3. BACKGROUND**

- 3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF - 2012) requires that : *“Local Plans should meet the objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change, unless:*

- *Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole; or*
- *Specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.”*  
(NPPF: Para 14).

- 3.2 Officers are working on the basis that the Calderdale Local Plan is meeting the Objectively Assessed Needs (OANs) for housing and employment growth within Calderdale’s administrative. This means that Calderdale will accommodate all its development needs and is not exporting any of the requirements to neighbouring authorities. All West Yorkshire authorities are all proceeding on this basis, whilst in Greater Manchester a joint Development Plan Document for the Manchester City Region area, is exploring the potential to seek agreement from neighbouring authorities to accommodate further growth over and above that for which they are they are already planning.

- 3.3 OANs for housing are established through the preparation of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), whilst those for employment are established through an Employment Land Review. Both assessments are compliant with the requirements of the national Planning Practice Guidance (nPPG).

## HOUSING REQUIREMENT

3.4 In 2012, the Council produced its Preferred Options for the Core Strategy (2012).

This distributed growth identified by the previous SHMA (which was published in 2011) and was based on earlier information from the Office of National Statistics, and market factors pertaining at the time.

3.5 The Preferred Options Housing Requirement was 16,800 dwellings or 800 dwellings per year over the plan period between over a 21 year plan period between 2008/09 and 2028/29. Taking account of Planning Permissions at that time, allowances for windfall sites and an assumption that allocations would be made above a threshold of 0.4ha, there was a need for 10,502 dwellings to be allocated.

3.6 The latest SHMA was released in November 2015, and takes forward the data supporting the preparation of the Local Plan. The SHMA 2015 has uplifted the annual housing need to 946 dwellings per annum (dpa) between 2012 and 2032. This 946dpa is therefore a control figure for the early part of the plan period as well, and where completions have not been at a level to meet this need there is a shortfall. The nPPG, requires that the under delivery during the first part of this period has to be added to the overall dwelling need. There are two acknowledged approaches to dealing with this, the Liverpool Method and the Sedgefield Method, The Liverpool Method distributes the shortfall over the full plan period, whilst the Sedgefield Method uplifts the requirements in the first five years of the plan. The consultation on "Potential Sites and Other Aspects of the Local Plan", released in November 2015, applied the Liverpool Method and spread the difference of 92 dwellings per annum across the plan period. As a result the Housing Requirement that the Local Plan is seeking to meet is 17,651 (1,038 dwellings per year).

**TABLE 1 : LOCAL PLAN HOUSING REQUIREMENT 2012 to 2032**

		<b>Number</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>A</b>	Requirement 2012-2015 (946dpa)	2,838	SHMA 20115
<b>B</b>	Net Completions 2012-2015	1,269	
<b>C</b>	Difference 2012-2015 (A-B) (92dpa) <i>(undersupply in early years of plan period)</i>	-1,569	A-B
<b>D</b>	Requirement 2015-2032 (946dpa)	16,082	SHMA 2015 (17 year plan period)
<b>E</b>	<b>Total Requirement (C + D)</b>	<b>17,651</b>	
	Dwellings per annum	<b>1,038</b>	

## WHAT OPTIONS HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE GROWTH ?

3.7 Over the years a number of different but complimentary approaches have been considered for the distribution of growth . The **Issues and Options from 2008** put forward four approaches:

1. **Business as Usual** – a continuation of the same level of growth in all settlement as has occurred over the past;
2. **New Growth Point** - this would provide increased levels of growth generally across the district but with the majority being focusses in Halifax and Brighouse. This was taking advantage of a Government led funding initiative that was available at the time;
3. **Maximising the approach in the Regional Spatial Strategy** – a strong focus of development in Halifax and to a lesser extent in Brighouse;
4. **Go for where the land is** – would take advantage of known opportunities

3.7 For the **Refined Issues and Options from 2011** these were further refined to be :

1. **Focus on Eastern Calderdale;**
2. **Enhance the role of Todmorden;**
3. **Enhance the role of Elland;**
4. **Continuation of current role and function;**

3.8 The Preferred Spatial Option (2012) for Development was

***“Delivering Growth in eastern Calderdale whilst supporting the economy and places in the west :-***

*Halifax (including Sowerby Bridge), Brighouse and Elland are to be the main focus for growth and associated infrastructure. Eastern Calderdale’s proximity to the M62 would be used to encourage business growth. The settlements in western Calderdale receive limited growth with the exception of Todmorden, where development and help to reverse the town’s decline.”*

3.9 Arising from this generalised statement of the Spatial Strategy the Preferred options put forward housing and employment numbers for each of the towns based on defined Local Plan Areas

3.10 The Preferred Options 2012 looked at distributing housing, and employment growth, to a settlement hierarchy. This had 5 Tiers of settlement. The Settlement Hierarchy Approach was required to allow consideration of growth that would be facilitated by site allocations to be brought forward in the Land Allocations and Designations Plan (LADPlan), which would have been produced after the adoption of the Core Strategy.

3.11 The actual proposed growth was distributed to Local Plan Areas, and assumed that there was a housing allocation figure of 10,500 and allocation threshold of 0.4ha (1 acre). For employment land this was stated in floorspace required rather than land area.

**TABLE 2 : PREFERRED OPTIONS HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT LAND DISTRIBUTION (2012)**

LOCAL PLAN AREA	PREFERRED OPTIONS ALLOCATION DISTRIBUTION	PREFERRED OPTIONS EMPLOYMENT DISTRIBUTION (sq.m)	
		Offices	B1 to B8
	Allocated Sites to be over 0.4ha		
BRIGHOUSE	2,100	35,000sq.m	40,000sq.m
ELLAND	1,067	8,000sq.m	50,000sq.m
HALIFAX	5,030	45,000sq.m	85,000sq.m
HEBDEN BRIDGE	252	1,000sq.m	500sq.m
MYTHOLMROYD / LUDDENDEN	158/160	100sq.m	1,000sq.m
NORTHOWRAM / SHELF	368	100sq.m	0
RYBURN VALLEY	46/50/55	200sq.m	1,000sq.m
SOWERBY BRIDGE	840	1,000sq.m	9,000sq.m
TODMORDEN	630	2,000sq.m	3,000sq.m
CALDERDALE	<b>10,502</b> (figures to not add up due to rounding) (NOTE Requirement was 16,800)	<b>98,500sq.m</b>	<b>198,600sq.m</b>

### OPTIONS FOR DISTRIBUTING NEW GROWTH FOR THE LOCAL PLAN 2016

3.12 The latest SHMA (2015) has increased the housing requirements for the district. (See comparative figures in Table 5 below). A new Employment Land Study is exploring the needs for additional employment land, but this has not yet reached a conclusion. As a result this report will focus on the distribution of possible housing requirements.

3.13 The overall requirement for new housing in 17,651 new dwellings between 2012 and 2013. In order to ascertain the requirement for allocations to be identified in the Local Plan, allowances are made for dwellings that have been completed and those that are under construction or with planning permission. This figure is further discounted to reflect the fact that not all permission actually translate into built development. "Windfall" development , and completions in part of the plan period

**TABLE 3 : CALCULATION OF HOUSING ALLOCATIONS NEEDED FOR LOCAL PLAN**

	Total from Table 1	Existing permissions and U/C 31/03/2016 DISCOUNTED	WINDFALLS	Completions 15-16	NEED FOR ALLOCATIONS
CALDERDALE	<b>17,651</b>	<b>2,234</b>	<b>1,247</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>13,834</b>

NOTE : requirements for employment and new retail growth have not been determined at the time of writing.

3.14 It is possible to see how the allowances and effect of Permissions and dwellings under Construction feed through to the need for Allocations in the Table below.

**TABLE 4 : Allowances for Permissions, Completions Windfalls**

Local Plan Area		Existing permissions and U/C 31/03/2016 DISCOUNTED	WINDFALLS	Completions 15-16	Area Allowances	TOTAL FOR ALLOCATION 2016/17
BRIGHOUSE	-	279	168	65	521	-
ELLAND	-	208	189	50	447	-
HALIFAX	-	849	615	112	1,576	-
HEBDEN BRIDGE	-	81	18	46	145	-
MYTHOLMROYD / LUDDENDEN	-	67	20	6	93	-
NORTHOWRAM / SHELF	-	93	19	9	121	-
RYBURN VALLEY	-	101	23	11	135	-
SOWERBY BRIDGE	-	313	27	24	364	-
TODMORDEN	-	245	168	13	426	-
CALDERDALE	<b>17,651</b>	<b>2,234</b>	<b>1,247</b>	<b>336</b>	<b>3,817</b>	<b>13,834</b>

### 3.16 What Ideas for Distribution are being considered ?

These basically follows the same focus on eastern Calderdale distribution from the Preferred Options of 2012, but have been further refined to reflect the increase housing requirement arising from the latest SHMA (2015) and the ongoing transport evidence.

- 3.17 Of particular significance is the potential for additional transport infrastructure and funding through the West Yorkshire+ Transport Fund which will facilitate interventions along the A641 Corridor between Huddersfield and Bradford. Investment in excess of £40million already committed leads to consideration of additional growth within the Brighouse area as an increasingly possible future, which needs to be considered as part of the Local Plan. The Transport Evidence together with that associated with the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) also suggests that northern and western Halifax are less sustainable areas for significant growth.
- 3.18 As site assessment work is also ongoing this has also recognised that some areas have significant environmental constraints which also limit their capacity for significant growth. The final distribution of potential sites will not necessarily follow any of the notional ideas that are set out in Tables 6 and 7. The consideration of

sustainable development is not a matter that will automatically fit a notional distribution.

- 3.19 As an initial consideration of the potential distribution that may come forward within the Local Plan, a starting position that the Preferred Options distribution was appropriate has been made.

**TABLE 5 : Consideration of Growth Distribution**

Local Plan Area	PREFERRED OPTIONS (PO) 2012 : ALLOCATIONS Distribution	SHMA Total 2015 <i>Spread using PO distribution</i>
BRIGHOUSE	2,100	3,530
ELLAND	1,067	1,800
HALIFAX	5,030	8,471
HEBDEN BRIDGE	252	424
MYTHOLMROYD / LUDDENDEN	158/160	282
NORTHOWRAM / SHELF	368	636
RYBURN VALLEY	46/50/55	71
SOWERBY BRIDGE	840	1,412
TODMORDEN	630	1,059
CALDERDALE	<b>10,491</b> (this figure was for allocations) <b>NOTE overall Requirement was 16,800</b>	<b>17,651 Requirement from Table 1</b> (figures do not add up due to rounding)

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

**TABLE 6 : Notional Distribution of Housing Growth for Each Town Area**

	A	B	C	D	E	F
BRIGHOUSE	9,619	6,178	8,048	5,039	5,287	6,397
ELLAND	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,800	1,835	1,354
HALIFAX	5,030	8,471	6,601	8,471	6,601	5,026
HEBDEN BRIDGE	252	252	252	252	252	107
MYTHOLMROYD/LUDDENDEN	160	160	160	282	918	189
NORTHOWRAM/SHELF	368	368	368	636	829	515
RYBURN VALLEY	55	55	55	71	829	-64

<b>SOWERBY BRIDGE</b>	600	600	600	600	600	236
<b>TODMORDEN</b>	500	500	500	500	500	74
<b>CALDERDALE</b>	17,651	17,651	17,651	17,651	17,651	17,651

**TABLE 7 : Potential Need for allocations for Each Town area based on Notional Distributions Above**

	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>
<b>BRIGHOUSE</b>	9,107	5,666	7,536	4,527	4,775	6,397
<b>ELLAND</b>	621	621	621	1,354	1,389	1,354
<b>HALIFAX</b>	3,455	6,896	5,026	6,896	5,026	5,026
<b>HEBDEN BRIDGE</b>	107	107	107	107	107	107
<b>MYTHOLMROYD/LUDDENDEN</b>	67	67	67	189	825	189
<b>NORTHOWRAM/SHELF</b>	247	247	247	515	708	515
<b>RYBURN VALLEY</b>	-80	-80	-80	-64	695	-64
<b>SOWERBY BRIDGE</b>	236	236	236	236	236	236
<b>TODMORDEN</b>	74	74	74	74	74	74
<b>CALDERDALE</b>	13,834	13,834	13,834	13,834	13,834	13,834

**NOTES FOR BOTH TABLES 6 and 7:**

**Description of the notional approaches to distributing the growth :**

- **A** : based on 2012 Preferred Options distribution. Taking into account limitations of land availability in each centre. Remaining requirement to be within Brighouse;
- **B** : based on 2012 Preferred Options distribution. Taking into account limitations of land availability in each town area. Uplifting Halifax 2015 dwelling requirements based on same % from 2012 Preferred Options. Remaining requirement to be within Brighouse;
- **C** : based on 2012 Preferred Options distribution. Taking into account limitations of land availability in each town. Uplifting Halifax inline with distribution by existing dwellings. Remaining requirement to be within Brighouse;
- **D** : Based on Preferred Options uplift;
- **E** : Based on the existing number of dwellings within each settlement;
- **F** : Based on PO uplift except Halifax which is based on size of settlement;

Each of these notional distributions have different impacts on local areas and cannot fully be appraised until the site assessment work has been completed.

- 3.20 It should be noted that these Notional Distributions brings forward notable anomalies. In particular the negative figure for allocations in Ryburn Valley and the very small need for allocations in the Todmorden area.
- 3.21 The individual site assessments will be a very important part of coming to a view on distribution. There is an expectation that where suitable “brownfield” sites area assessed these will have a higher potential for being allocated than similar greenfield sites. The “Brownfield First” principle remains a driving force on site assessment, even though the NPPF (paragraph 17) only requires council’s to

*“encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value”.* As the site assessment process rolls forward and the implications for the use of brownfield and greenfield land and the Green Belt will become much clearer.

- 3.22 How to achieve any of the notional growth depends upon a mixture of smaller readily available smaller sites together with potentially longer time-frame Sustainable Urban Extensions (SUEs). Considerations of SUEs as a way forward of providing for a sustainable future was first raised in the consultation in autumn 2015. A number of towns were identified as having the scope contribute to increased growth and deliver sustainable development through the options to potentially accommodate a SUE. Consideration of the comments made during the autumn consultation together with further work relating to the transport evidence and Habitats Regulations Assessment has raised questions over some of the potential SUEs, particularly those in Eland and Western Halifax. As a result, the opportunities to facilitate the scale of development that is required are increasingly becoming more focussed upon parts of eastern Calderdale including Brighouse and parts of northern Halifax, as previously mentioned in paragraph 3.17. In order to further explore potentiality around Brighouse, further work is in preparation to explore the opportunities and problems associated with enhanced development potential in the Brighouse area.

## **CONCLUSION**

4.1 The Local Plan, will allocate sites to meet the Objectively Assessed Needs (OANs) for new homes and employment. This report has looked at some of the high level notions about how the housing growth could be distributed around the district. These are not options for distributing that growth, as it is important to recognise that the final choices for sites can only be made once the assessments have been finalised, but provides an indication on a broad level of how some of the distribution may come into focus later in the plan-making process.

Richard Seaman, Planning Service Lead

Date: 8 August 2016

---

Author : Phil Ratcliffe, Development Strategy Manager

Contact Details: Tel : 01422 392255; Email : phil.ratcliffe@calderdale.gov.uk



