

SHEPHERD NEAME LTD

(EIP REF:1005633)

SWALE BC – LOCAL PLAN PART 1 EXAMINATION

(RESUMED HEARINGS – JANUARY / FEBRUARY 2017)

MATTER 9: MONITORING AND DELIVERY OF HOUSING SUPPLY

9.3 – ‘DOES THE MODIFIED PLAN INCLUDE SUFFICIENT SITES TO ENABLE THE COUNCIL TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THERE IS A 5 YEAR SUPPLY OF SITES THAT ARE AVAILABLE AND DELIVERABLE?’

1. INTRODUCTION

1. Main Modification 56 includes a new para 4.3.39 which states that SBC will ensure the provision of a 5 year housing land supply *‘by ensuring that sufficient of the sites it has allocated will deliver completions within the first five years of the plan’* but at the date of the Main Modifications, no up-to-date assessment of the 5 year housing land supply was published and so it was not possible at that stage to make any detailed representations on how SBC had set about showing that it had a 5 year housing land supply. On behalf of Shepherd Neame Ltd (promoters of the A2 London Road / Western Link, Faversham Omission Site SW/433), a detailed review has been carried out of SBC’s Statement of Housing Land Supply 2015/16, November 2016 (SBC/PS/113) in order to determine whether the emergent Local Plan, as proposed to be modified, is ‘sound’ in terms meeting its 5 year housing land supply requirements. For reasons relating to methodology and delivery, it is evident that there is a potential significant shortfall in SBC’s 5 year housing land supply provision which can only be met by allocating additional housing sites which can be shown to be deliverable (by reason of lead in times and viability) within the next 5 years.

2. BACKGROUND

2. SBC's Statement of Housing Land Supply seeks to confirm that there is 5.4 years housing land supply. Clearly, this has only been achieved by adopting a 2014 based date for the Local Plan; applying the Liverpool Method as opposed to the Sedgefield Method in terms of dealing with any shortfall in completions in years 2014/15 & 2015/16; and applying a 5% buffer. In addition, it is apparent that the supply that SBC relies on is not the supply that SBC actually considers '*will deliver completions within the first five years of the plan*' (the test correctly set out in para 4.4.39 of MM56) but is a supply only of what the Council regards as 'deliverable' sites, based on its misinterpretation of the St Modwen High Court decision (SBC/PS/113). This error is addressed below (NB: SBC is also proposing a stepped approach to its land supply in terms of the required number of completions in order to help create a smoother housing trajectory but this defers meeting current needs and the current shortfall to even later in the plan period and is clearly unsound). As such, it is evident that even applying this methodology, SBC is still only able to demonstrate a relatively modest supply over and above its 5 year requirement of 302 dwellings.

3. Rather than seeking to boost significantly the supply of housing (NPPF Para 47), it is evident that the position that SBC has arrived at in terms of its 5 year housing land supply calculations would appear to very vulnerable and subject to challenge in terms of its robustness – this is dealt with below.

3. FIVE YEAR LAND SUPPLY METHODOLOGY

4. The two matters referred to in SBC/PS/113 relating to the Local Plan's soundness concern the extent to which it is appropriate to use the Liverpool Method as opposed to the Sedgefield Method when dealing with any shortfall in housing completions since the start of the Local Plan period and whether it is appropriate to apply only a 5% buffer instead of a 20% buffer in a Borough where there has been persistent under delivery in terms of housing completions.

(i) Liverpool v Sedgefield Method

5. In line with SBC's view that it should be allowed to adopt a 'bespoke' approach to the way in which it meets its 5 year housing land supply requirements, it is evident that SBC's justification for applying the Liverpool Method to the term of the Local Plan relates to the fact that the Sedgefield Method would result in a significant cumulative shortfall in completions; there are persisting viability issues (due to ongoing recessionary influences); long lead in times associated with the delivery of sites; and latent infrastructure issues (albeit KCC has previously confirmed that this would not put a brake on the delivery of 776dpa).

6. Whilst it is noted that it has been previously confirmed in the Planning Inspector's Interim Findings to the EIP that SBC may be justified in applying the Liverpool Method up to the adoption of the Local Plan (which one may assume should be 2017), it is evident that there are no overriding special circumstances in the Borough for allowing SBC to apply the Liverpool Method to the rest of the Plan period when calculating 5 year housing land supply. Indeed, to do so would in this case be contrary to NPPG (Para: 035; Ref: 3-035-20140306). The NPPG advises that shortfalls should be met within 5 years 'where possible'. SBC has not provided any new evidence to show it is not possible to eliminate the total shortfall (337 dwellings) over the next 5 years. SBC's trajectory (Fig 7 of SBC/PS/113) indicates that an increase in completions from the current 597 dwellings (2015/16) to up to 1,699 dwellings is considered to be deliverable out of the presently identified supply, so there is no obvious reason why SBC could not address the shortfall within the next 5 years. Clearly, if additional smaller sites were allocated so that there were more opportunities for house-builders to provide the needed housing, then there is no reason to think that the shortfall could not be addressed more quickly than over the next 15 years.

(ii) 5% or 20% buffer

7. SBC recognises that Figs 2 and 3 of SBC/PS/113 'show indications of persistent under delivery suggestive that Swale could be a 20% authority' (para 28 of SBC/PS/113). It is evident by reference to the KCC Housing Information Audits

(2012/13; 2013/14 and 2014/15 editions) that there has been persistent under delivery in Swale for the last 6 years as set out in the table below. In the 2013 High Court decision ‘Cotswold DC v Secretary of State for the Communities and Local Government [2013] EWHC 3719 (Admin), it was the judge’s view that persistent under delivery is ‘*a reference to a state of affairs, under delivery of housing, which has continued over time*’ (para 47). The judge went on to find that the period of time over which an assessment of delivery should be carried out was a matter of judgement for the decision-maker. Importantly, he accepted the Secretary of State’s use of a five year period for an assessment (which had been adopted on the basis that it mirrored the five year requirement for housing land supply) rather than the Council’s preferred approach of looking at the entire life of the previous Structure Plan (para 48 and 50). The judge was satisfied that in adopting a five year period rather than a longer one the Secretary of State had taken into account the state of the economy and the housing market during that period of time (para 52). A copy of the judgement is included as Appendix C.

Year	Development Plan Target / OAN	Number of Completions	Oversupply / shortfall	Cumulative total
2006/07	540	832	+292	+292
2007/08	540	767	+227	+519
2008/09	540	494	-46	+473
2009/10	540	709	+169	+642
2010/11	540	433	-107	+535
2011/12	540	484	-56	+479
2012/13	776	291	-485	-6
2013/14	776	336	-440	-446
2014/15	776	618	-158	-604
2015/16	776	597	-179	-783

8. In terms of the cumulative position (SBC/PS/113 – Figure 3), it is evident that SBC’s contention that completions have not fallen significantly below its housing target when viewed over a 10 year period, is largely due to the fact its annual housing target (as set out in the adopted 2008 Local Plan) for years 2006 to 2012 was much

lower at only 540 dpa. Given that the OAN for year 2012/13 onwards, based on household projections (and not constrained by environmental considerations) has been assessed to be 776 dpa, there is a strong likelihood that the 2008 Local Plan target of 540 dpa was artificially low. This would indicate that there has been persistent under delivery in Swale over a 10 year period (NB: In the Cotswold DC v SOS High Court decision, the judge approved the SOS decision that the housing targets set out in the old Structure Plan did not reflect the actual housing requirement during the preceding five years (para 47 and 50). He agreed with the Secretary of State that the actual requirement against which delivery should be assessed should be higher than the target in the Structure Plan because the target was based on the 1996 projections and more recent projections identified greater need).

9. SBC’s principal reason for maintaining that a 20% buffer should not be applied in this case relates to recessionary influences – namely; a particularly weak housing market driven by poor demand / lower volume of sales / lower market values. (NB: The UK was technically only in recession from the third quarter of 2008 to the last quarter of 2009). The Government would have been well aware of the recession when it issued the NPPF in March 2012, and that past delivery may have been influenced by recessionary factors in some housing market areas. Nonetheless, the guidance on persistent under delivery was not qualified to allow actual under delivery to be excused or discounted on this ground. Whilst noting that Para 21 and 22 of ID/9c confirms that the projection forward of past performance has no place in terms of NPPF 47 when assessing OAN, it is evident there are no grounds for making SBC a special case given that the shortfall in completions are less a failure of the ‘market’ and more a failure of SBC to properly assess whether sites with planning permission or allocated for housing development were ‘viable’ to develop (NPPF Para 47; Footnote 11). This is reaffirmed in a snap shot of SBC’s housing land supply position in 2014 when the rate of delivery / slippage on its key 2008 Local Plan Allocations / Saved Policies was discussed with SBC Planning Policy Officers as part of Shepherd Neame’s Brogdale Road Planning Appeal preparation of planning evidence / submitted appellant appendices; namely:-

Site	Summary of dialogue with SBC Planning Policy
Queensborough	& <i>This is a major regeneration site which has been on going</i>

<p>Rushenden, Isle of Sheppey (165ha) (Saved Policy AAP6)</p>	<p><i>for over 10 years for a mixed use community of housing, employment and community facilities covering 165ha of land and buildings on both sides of Queensborough Creek. In the light of economic circumstances, past proposals for 2,000 dwellings (which relied on a high density housing and marina complex) has now been scaled back to 889 dwellings. The presence of contamination and existing industrial buildings has meant that timing of development has slowed considerably. In spite of the best efforts of the Housing and Communities Agency, and in the absence of a planning permission for the site, SBC consider that it is unlikely that any houses will be completed on the site until 2017/18. This would result in a reduction in SBC's phased housing land supply over the next 5 years from 370 to 70 dwellings (NB: SBC/PS/113 – Now slipped to 2022/23 onwards)</i></p>
<p>Sittingbourne Town Centre and Milton Creek (Saved Policies APP7 & AA8)</p>	<p><i>This relates to major town centre regeneration proposals north and south of the railway line including new civic facilities, shopping, education, cultural facilities and housing. In the light of economic circumstances, major infrastructure and contaminated land issues, past proposals for 2,984 dwelling has been reduced to 881 dwellings. A slippage of only 1 year in SBC's phased housing land supply over the next 5 years would result in a reduction from 130 dwellings to 24 dwellings (NB: SBC/PS/113 – Phase 2 now slipped to 2027/28)</i></p>
<p>Thistle Hill, Minster, Isle of Sheppey (70ha) (Saved Policy H8)</p>	<p><i>This site received outline planning permission in 1997 and has been through a number of development brief and Local Plan Reviews which led to an increase in the number of dwellings expected to come forward – capacity to accommodate 500 dwellings. SBC has confirmed that the 5 year housing land supply figures for the next 5 years will need adjustment to allow for the fact that the rate of development has slowed up and there are fewer non-reserved housing permissions in the pipeline than previously forecast. Therefore, allow for a possible reduction from 175 to 100 dwellings (as part of 5 year supply). (NB: SBC/PS/113 – Now slipped to 2018/19 onwards)</i></p>
<p>Plover Road, Minster, Isle of Sheppey (5ha) Saved Policy H9)</p>	<p><i>This site is located to the east of Thistle Hill. SBC has confirmed that the current allocation for 130 houses might be switched to the Thistle Hill site in return for developing Plover Road site for retail. There is therefore uncertainty whether the current phased provision of 90 dwellings within the next 5 years will be completed (NB: SBC/PS/113 – Now slipped to 2019/20 onwards)</i></p>
<p>Stones Farm, Sittingbourne (18ha) (Saved Policy H5)</p>	<p><i>This is a sensitive site for 600 dwellings (reduced to 550 dwellings) to the east of Sittingbourne which requires the provision of significant landscape buffer and financial contributions to the Sittingbourne Northern Relief Road. A</i></p>

	<i>development brief was approved for the site in 2010. SBC has confirmed that the landowner is holding back, albeit an application is expected shortly, in which the Council expects to meet its current 5 year supply provision of 55 dwellings (2016/17) (NB: SBC/PS/113 – Now slipped to 2019/20)</i>
East Hall Farm, Sittingbourne (43ha) (Saved Policy H7)	<i>The majority of this site is already committed by planning permissions leaving just 70 dwellings to be developed on a site no longer required for a primary school. Whilst development rates have lagged, there is a reasonable likelihood that this provision can be met within the next 5 years (NB: SBC/PS/113 – Under construction commenced 2016/17 – 51 units)</i>

10. Whilst a number of non site specific reports have been produced by SBC on viability (CBRE; PBA Economic Viability Assessment, 2014) it is evident that SBC has not sought to look at ‘achievability’ in sufficient detail (and informed by the development industry) on a site by site basis in its SHLAA reports / SBC/PS/113 housing land supply statement (NB: Whilst comment is made in the text to deliverability / achievability in Appendices A, B, C schedules relating to housing land supply, there is insufficient detail to determine the viability of a site / implications for phasing). This does not reflect the NPPF advice (para 173) that ‘*Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan making...*’ or the NPPG Methodology – Stage 2: Site / broad location assessment (Para 017) (ID: 3-017-20140306) which states that:

‘The development potential is a significant factor that affects economic viability of a site / broad location and its suitability for a particular use. Therefore assessing achievability (including viability) and suitability can usefully be carried out in parallel with estimating the development potential’

10. NPPG Methodology – Stage 5: Final evidence base (Para 028) (ID: 028-20140306) likewise states that:

‘an assessment of each site or broad location, in terms of its suitability for development, availability and achievability (including whether the site / broad location is viable) to determine whether a site is realistically expected to be developed and when’

10. In support of the above, it is evident from the St Modwen's High Court Case that it is necessary to assess 'the likelihood that housing will be delivered in the five year period on that site' (para 51). Whilst the judge made it clear (also para 51) that 'certainty' was not required, the test of 'deliverability' in footnote 11 of the NPPF is whether there is 'a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years'. The judge did not suggest that this was not the test to be applied, and clearly, it is not the role of the Courts to rewrite the NPPF. In other words, if a site is not 'likely' to be delivered within 5 years, it is not 'deliverable'. In considering whether there is a 'realistic prospect' of delivery (ie 'likelihood'), all relevant factors need to be brought into account, and not just those under the control or influence of the local planning authority. For example, if a site is not 'likely' to be delivered in 5 years because it is in multiple ownerships, then it should be discounted as a 'deliverable site'. It should also be noted that the St Modwen decision is subject to an outstanding appeal to the Court of Appeal.

11. Against this background, it is evident that the high development costs / lack of viability associated with bringing forward large regeneration sites in secondary locations in the Thames Gateway (subject to contaminated land issues; high infrastructure costs; S106 / S278 costs) was (and continues to be) the primary reason for there being persistent under delivery in housing completions within the Borough. In collaboration with the development industry (as per recent LPEG Recommendations, March 2016) it should be a relatively straightforward matter to scrutinise, with more accuracy, the development viability of SBC's key housing development sites crucial to the delivery of its 5 year housing land supply.

12. For this reason, it is considered that with a failure to achieve the required housing provision in each of the last 6 years, and with a cumulative deficit of nearly 800 dwellings, taking the last 10 years as a whole, the performance of housing delivery in SBC's area amounts to 'persistent under delivery' and a 20% buffer should be applied to SBC's housing figures and that any sites brought forward from later on in the Plan period should be critically assessed in terms of their viability. If no sites can be brought forward due to long lead in times, a case does exist for allocating a number of additional sites which can be delivered in the short term – next 1 to 5 years. If a 20% buffer was applied then, using SBC's own figures in Table 2 of SBC/PS/113, the 5

year requirement would rise to 4,790 dwellings (using the Liverpool Method) or to 5,060 dwellings (using the Sedgfield Method). Even if all the SBC claimed supply came forward, this would only amount to 4,492 dwellings and on either basis there would be deficit in the 5year housing land supply. The supply would be either 4.4 years (Sedgfield + 20%) or 4.7 years (Liverpool + 20%).

(iii) Difference between deliverable and delivered

13. In terms of SBC's reference to the St Modwen High Court decision (SBC/PS/113 – Paras 128 to 131), and their contention that Council's are not responsible for the wide range of investment, economic and other judgements in the housing market, it is evident that SBC's has failed to properly understand the judgement in that it is very much the Council's responsibility to properly assess the viability of individual sites and whether there is a *'realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years'* (as per footnote 11) rather than assuming that all sites listed as forming part of its housing trajectory are deemed to be deliverable. Unless a site's viability is first tested and a judgement is made that there is a realistic prospect of delivery, it is not credible for SBC then to go on to assert that a failure of a site to deliver the forecast number of completions relates to market factors such as a lack of skilled labour, finance, materials, mortgages / a house builder not wishing to build at an assumed rate (perhaps due competition from competing sites within the same local area etc).

(iv) Stepped or Staged Approach to the housing target

14. There is no basis for supporting SBC's alternative 'bespoke' approach to meeting its housing land supply requirements. This is directly contrary to NPPF Core Planning Principles (Para 17) which states that *'Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area'* and NPPF (Para 47) *'To boost significantly the supply of housing'*. SBC has not provided evidence to show that the housing needs will arise on a *'stepped'* basis due to some demographic or migratory or economic factors, and so the SBC approach results in current housing needs and the current shortfall being unmet in the short term and being deferred to the back end of the plan period. This is wholly unjustified when

there is an ability to meet those needs now by allocating additional sites that are suitable for delivery in the short term.

4. HOW DELIVERY HAS BEEN ASSESSED (SBC/PS/113 APPENDIX A-C)

15. A critical review has been undertaken of SBC’s phased housing delivery in terms of meeting its 5 year housing land supply requirements (Appendix A-C Extant planning permissions and housing allocations). This is appended to this Statement – Appendix A – Faversham and Appendix B – Thames Gateway plus Rest of Swale. This review shows that a number of SBC’s key spatial development sites are at a high risk of slippage (even when not allowing for issues of viability). Even if timescales for delivery were to slip by 1 year (in which on a number of sites it could be 2 years or more) the shortfall in supply over a 5 year period would be 744 dwellings (of which the shortfall in Faversham is 250 dwellings). This would reduce SBC’s forecast land supply from 4,492 dwellings to 3,748 dwellings – a reduction of 16.6%.

16. From the critical review work undertaken, it is evident that the likelihood of this level of reduction is fairly high given a number of key prevailing factors. The first relates to the fact that SBC’s forecast timescales for delivery in the next 5 years are dependent on a large number of planning applications being submitted or determined by the end of 2016 or by early 2017. Whilst SBC will need to provide an update on the latest state of play for consideration at the EIP it is evident that the key sites where an application / decision are pending can be identified as follows:

Site	Planning Position	Key planning Issues (Summary)
Thames Gateway		
1. NW Sittingbourne	1 full / 1 hybrid expected April 2017	Several landowners / developers / dependent on off-site road works
2. SW Sittingbourne	Outline Planning Application (plus non adopted Master Plan), expected early 2017	Several landowners / developers / occupied sites / need for CPO/ dependent on off-site road works
3. Crown Key, Sittingbourne	Full planning application expected by end of 2016 (plus draft Master Plan)	Several landowners / occupied sites/ need for CPO

4. Cockleshell, Sittingbourne	Resolution to grant planning permission with S106 Agreement 'imminent'	
5. Stones Farm, Sittingbourne	Hybrid planning application + S106 Agreement at advanced stage; site to be sold to a developer in early 2017	
6. Queensborough / Rushenden	Full planning application submitted / to be determined early 2017	Dependent on HCA pump priming / viability
7. Barton Hill, Minster	Outline planning application expected 2016/17. No developer on board	Dependent on off site road improvements (funding) / Viability
Rest of Swale		
8. Preston Fields, Faversham	Outline Planning Application expected end 2016	On site road link / possible land acquisition (visibility splays)
9. Perry Court Farm, Faversham	S106 Agreement to be signed by end 2016	Mixed Use / several developers
10. Oare, Faversham	S106 Agreement plus sale to developer expected early 2017	Mixed Use / several developers / habitat / FRA/ Heritage issues
11. Lady Dale Farm, Faversham	Developer confirmed, November 2016	Mixed use / several developers/ future alternative access / land acquisition
12. Weston Link, Faversham	Reserved Matters Application 'imminent'	
13. Graveney Road, Faversham	Full Planning Application expected early 2017	
14. Weston Works, Faversham	Outline Planning Application expected early 2017	
15. East of Station Road, Teynham	Outline Planning Application expected early 2017	Land acquisition (access visibility splays)
16. Newington	Hybrid Planning Application expected December 2016	Dependent on off site road improvements
17. North of Iwade	Outline Planning Application expected early 2017	Dependent on off site road improvements

17. In addition to the uncertainty surrounding the current state of play on the submission / determination dates, it is evident that a large number of SBC's spatial development sites (housing / mixed uses) are subject to other uncertainties concerning multiple land ownerships /several developers; the need to acquire additional land / relocate existing uses; on site and off site infrastructure works (requiring KCC and

Highway Agency approvals); and ongoing viability issues. As can be seen for a number of key sites in Faversham, this has led to protracted outline planning application determination periods.

Site	Determination Period
1. Lady Dane Farm, East of Love Lane (SW/14/0045)	Outline Planning Application submission – 15.1.14 Validation – 6.2.14 Resolution to Grant – 17.2.16 S106 Agreement – Not known
2. Perry Court Farm (SW/14/0015) + (SW/15/504264)	Outline Planning Application submission – 10.1.14 Decision – Refused 9.6.14 Resubmission – 4.6.15 Resolution to Grant – 4.6.16 S106 Agreement - Pending
3. Oare Gravel Works (SW/14/0257)	Outline Planning Application submission – 3.3.14 Validation – 15.4.14 Resolution to Grant – 24.9.15 S106 Agreement - Pending
4. Weston Link (SW/14/502729)	Outline Planning Application submission – 15.8.14 Resolution to Grant – 23.12.15 S106 Agreement - Pending

18. It is also evident that in focusing on a large number of key spatial development sites (including mixed use opportunities) the timescale involved in the transaction of these sites to one or a number of developers is often an extremely protracted process, necessitating the need for complex legal / cooperation agreements relating to the future phasing of development and the funding of up front development costs. Likewise, the preparation of complex reserved matters applications (usually involving urban design issues) / coupled with the preparation of an overarching master plan / technical planning brief and the discharge of pre-commencement planning conditions is often a drawn out affair. Clearly, this process is not helped by the extreme inertia within the planning system due to a lack of staff resources (Planning / Open Space; Highways (KCC & HE) / drainage / legal; Environment Agency; and Utilities). Indeed, SBC was forced to abandon its pre-application service for a large part of 2016.

19. Whilst SBC state within SBC/PS/113 that it is possible to run various phases of the development process in parallel, this does not generally happen in practice in SBC

or elsewhere in England. As such, a large part of the work involved in agreeing the S106 Agreement will take place post a resolution to grant planning permission. A site generally will not come to the market until an S106 Agreement is in place. A reserved matters application / discharge of planning conditions can not proceed until a site has been sold to a developer. No works can take place on site until a reserve matters application has been approved / pre commence conditions discharged. Whilst any proposals to speed up the S106 Process is welcome, SBC is clearly dependent on KCC legal on helping it to expedite this part of process which is unlikely to happen in the present financial climate.

20. With the above in mind, it is evident that SBC stands a much better prospect of meeting its 5 year housing land supply requirements if a larger number of medium sized sites are identified as part of its housing allocation process. As with Shepherd Neame's Brogdale Road site, it is evident that a significant number of houses can be delivered on a relatively small site area – in this case 63 houses on a developable area of 1.5 ha (3ha including open space). Similarly, it is evident that Shepherd Neame's A2 / Western Link site, Faversham (Housing Omission site SW/433) is capable of delivering a relatively large number of houses for little land take – in this case 54 houses on 2 ha (3ha including open space provision). This compares extremely favourably with the spatial development sites which in reality deliver relatively few houses on a large area of land involving expensive infrastructure works (Preston Fields, Perry Court Farm; Lady Dale Farm; Oare Gravel works).

5. CONCLUSIONS

21. This statement serves to show the fragility of SBC's housing land supply. The past record of housing under delivery shows that SBC should be regarded as a 20% authority, and if so, it is clear that no 5 year housing land supply exists, even if the Liverpool Method is used (4.7 years), and the deficit is even bigger (4.4 years) if the Sedgfield Method is used (as it should be in this case). This is the case if all of the SBC supply is realised in accordance with the trajectory. However, there are good reasons to be concerned about the realism of the claimed supply. The following 'years' supply would apply if there is a shortfall of 744 dwellings in the delivery of SBC housing land supply over the next 5 years (2016/17 – 2020-21).

1. Liverpool + 5% @ a total deliverable supply of 3,748 dwellings = 4.5 years
2. Liverpool + 20% @ a total deliverable supply of 3,748 dwellings = 3.9 years
3. Sedgefield + 20% @ total deliverable supply of 3,748 dwellings = 3.7 years.

22. Even if the risk of slippage is only 50% (372 dwellings) of that forecast in this Statement, the following shortfalls in 'years' supply would still apply.

1. Liverpool + 5% @ a total deliverable supply of 4,120 dwellings = 4.9 years
2. Liverpool + 20% @ a total deliverable supply of 4,120 dwellings = 4.3 years
3. Sedgefield + 20% @ a total deliverable supply of 4,120 dwellings = 4.1 years.

23. Under all scenarios SBC would fail to deliver its 5 year housing land supply. On the basis that SBC has confirmed that it is unable to bring forward any future phasing from later on in the Plan period, it needs to allocate a number of additional smaller sites to ensure it can meet its 5 year housing land supply requirements (providing additional housing flexibility and choice). Not to do so would mean that the emergent Local Plan can not be found to be 'sound' in terms of prevailing national planning policy guidance to boost housing land supply. Shepherd Neame's A2 / Western Link site (Housing Omission site SW/433) would go some way to meeting this shortfall in Faversham (Additional material evidence in support of SW/433 / critique of SBC's ranking of non allocated sites (SBC/PS/116) is set out in Appendix D; Sub Appendix 1: Landscape; Sub-Appendix 2: Heritage; Sub Appendix 3: Agents Letters).

SM/1

JANUARY 2017