

PLANNING COMMITTEE – 17 NOVEMBER 2022

PART I - DELEGATED

6. 22/1226/OUT - Outline application: Erection of two detached dwellings (All matters reserved) at LAND WEST OF BEDMOND ROAD, BEDMOND, HERTFORDSHIRE

Parish: Abbots Langley Parish Council

Ward: Abbots Langley and Bedmond

Expiry of Statutory Period: 21.11.2022 (Agreed Extension) Case Officer: Lauren Edwards

Recommendation: That Planning Permission be refused.

Reason for consideration by the Committee: The application was called in by three members of the planning committee to consider the impact on the Green Belt.

1 Relevant Planning History

1.1 No relevant planning history.

2 Description of Application Site

2.1 The application site has an area of approximately 0.32Ha and is located on the western side of Bedmond Road. The site is rectangular in shape and comprises of an open parcel of land bounded by hedging and trees. The south eastern boundary of the application site is stepped where it adjoins an electricity substation to the south. The site currently has two access points, one adjacent to the substation and one to the north.

2.2 To the west of the application site are open fields.

2.3 To the south are Badgers End and Knoll Cottage. These dwellings are a pair of two storey semi-detached residential properties. They are orientated such that their rear elevations face towards the application site.

2.4 To the north west of the application site is Homewood Farm which includes a collection of agricultural style buildings and a chalet style bungalow which faces the highway.

2.5 There are 7 individual tree preservation orders (TPOs) on or adjacent to the application site (TPO 270).

3 Description of Proposed Development

3.1 This application seeks Outline planning permission for the erection of two detached dwellings. All matters are reserved for this application.

3.2 Whilst Appearance, Access, Landscaping, Layout and Scale are all Reserved Matters, an illustrative block plan provided indicates that each dwelling would have a footprint of approx. 288sqm. The dwelling to the north hereafter referred to as Plot 1 would be set back 15m from the front boundary and 10m from the northern flank boundary. The dwelling to the south hereafter referred to as Plot 2 would be set back 13m from the front boundary and a minimum of 9.5m from the south eastern boundary.

3.3 A secondary indicative block plan has been submitted which includes the location of two access points either end of the application site and which utilise the two existing accesses.

4 Consultation

4.1 Statutory Consultation

4.1.1 Abbots Langley Parish Council: [Guidance requested]

Members appreciate the information provided on the outline application and note the appeal decision on #1 Cecile Lodge Cottage. While this type of defined development is permitted within the residential boundary of Abbots Langley, members request guidance on how far beyond Bedmond this type of development would be permitted.

4.1.2 Hertfordshire County Council – Highway Authority: [No objection subject to conditions]

Notice is given under article 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following condition:

1) No development shall commence until full details (in the form of scaled plans and / or written specifications) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to illustrate the following:

i) Visibility splays

ii) Access arrangements - amended / reconstructed vehicle crossover accesses with widths of no greater than 5.4m (made up of four flat kerbs and two ramped kerbs). The approved amended access shall be completed prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted.

iii) Parking provision in accordance with adopted standard.

iv) Turning spaces - designed to cater for the largest anticipated vehicle to access the site

Reason: To ensure suitable, safe and satisfactory planning and development of the site in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

HCC as Highway Authority recommends inclusion of the following Advisory Note (AN) / highway informative to ensure that any works within the highway are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highway Act 1980:

AN1) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence.

Further information is available via the County Council website at:

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

AN2) Obstruction of highway: It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence.

Further information is available via the County Council website at:

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

AN3) Debris and deposits on the highway: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit compost, dung or other material for dressing land, or any rubbish on a made up carriageway, or any or other debris on a highway to the interruption of any highway user. Section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development and use thereafter are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway. Further information is available by telephoning 0300 1234047.

AN4) Works within the highway (section 278): The applicant is advised that in order to comply with this permission it will be necessary for the developer of the site to enter into an agreement with Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 to ensure the satisfactory completion of the access and associated road improvements. The construction of such works must be undertaken to the satisfaction and specification of the Highway Authority, and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements. Further information is available via the County Council website at: <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/development-anagement/highways-development-management.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

Comments/Analysis

Description of Proposal

Erection of two detached dwellings (All matters reserved)

Site and Surroundings

Bedmond Road is a classified C secondary distributor road subject to a 40mph speed limit which is highway maintainable at public expense. The site is located approximately 500m to the north of Bedmond where a pub and small convenience store are located. The closest bus stop to the site is approximately 105m away and is a stop for the 20 bus towards Boxmoor and Holywell. The nearest train station to the site is Kings Langley which is approximately 3.8km away. There is a footway fronting the site and Bedmond Road is part of the Rivers Gade & Bulbourne cycle way, although there is not a defined cycle path. The Highway Authority are satisfied the site is in a sustainable enough location for the size of the development, which is in line with the principles set out in HCC's Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4).

Access and Parking

Access is presently a reserved matter, however drawing number 12686/201 gives an indication of where the accesses would be located. The drawing states that these accesses shall make use of the existing access points into the site. These two accesses consist of existing dropped kerbs, one to the north of the site and another to the south. At present the accesses are unused and would require some works to ensure they would be suitable for use. The maximum size a dropped kerb can be to serve a dwelling is 5.4m, made up of 4 dropped kerbs and 2 ramped kerbs, according to Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition Section 4 – Design Standards and Advice and Hertfordshire County Council Residential Dropped Kerbs Terms and Conditions. Therefore, the existing accesses at the site would have to be amended to be this suitable size to ensure that they are not oversized, which would infringe upon Policies 1 and 5 of LTP4. Due to the speed of the road, the visibility splays from the accesses would have to be clear from 2.4m x 101m according to DMRB standards, and not be interrupted from a height of 0.6m to 2m. The

speed and classification of the road also means that vehicles must be able to turnaround within the site and egress onto the highway in a forward gear to ensure optimum visibility. Therefore, a turning area which is suitable for the largest anticipated vehicle to enter the site should be provided. There have not been any collisions on the stretch of Bedmond Road which fronts the site within the last 5 years.

Ultimately the LPA will have to be satisfied with the parking provision, but HCC would like to comment that parking spaces must measure a minimum of 2.4m x 4.8m and garages, if proposed, must be a minimum of 3m x 6m to be considered a parking space according to Manual for Streets. Overall parking provision should be in accordance with to TRDC standards, this includes vehicle and cycle parking. Any electric vehicle charging provision is to be in line with new building regulations and TRDC emerging standards.

Refuse and Waste Collection

Manual for Streets Paragraph 6.8.9 states that waste collection vehicles must be able to get within 25m of the bin collection location and residents must not have to carry waste more than 30m to a bin collection point.

Emergency Vehicle Access

In accordance with Manual for Streets Paragraph 6.7, the entire footprint of a dwelling must be within 45m from the edge of the highway in order for an emergency vehicle can gain access if required.

Conclusion

HCC as Highway Authority has considered the application and are satisfied that the proposal would not have an unreasonable impact on the safety and operation of the adjoining highway and therefore, has no objections on highway grounds to this application.

4.1.3 Herts Ecology: No response to date. Any response received following the publication of this report but prior to the committee meeting will be provided as a verbal Officer update.

4.1.4 Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust: [Objection]

Objection: No ecological survey submitted, no protected species survey submitted, biodiversity net gain not demonstrated. Insufficient information to determine the application. Aerial imagery indicates that this site is wooded. This means an elevated ecological value and higher likelihood that protected species may be present.

The NPPF states:

174. Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity

180. When determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply the following principles:

a) if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided...., adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused;

This application will require an ecological report which should state, what is there, how it will be affected by the proposal and how any negative impacts can be avoided, mitigated or compensated in order to achieve measurable net gains to biodiversity. The NE biodiversity

metric must be used to demonstrate net gain. A net gain is an increase in habitat units of 10%.

BS 42020 states:

'8.1 Making decisions based on adequate information

The decision-maker should undertake a thorough analysis of the applicant's ecological report as part of its wider determination of the application. In reaching a decision, the decision-maker should take the take the following into account:

h) Whether there is a clear indication of likely significant losses and gains for biodiversity.' There is also a reasonable likelihood of protected species. ODPM circular 06/05 para 99 states that all protected species surveys must be completed before a decision can be made. In accordance with the Environment Act, Schedule 14 para 6, if changes to the habitats present have occurred since Jan 30 2020, the baseline must be taken from before the site was cleared.

4.2 Public/Neighbour Consultation

4.2.1 Number consulted: 6

4.2.2 No of responses received: 7 (objections)

4.2.3 Site Notice: Expired 21.09.2022 Press notice: Not required

4.2.4 Summary of Responses:

- Impact on wildlife
- No surveys undertaken
- Reports of badger presence
- Climate emergency/building on Green Belt land
- Impact on trees
- Traffic impacts
- Lack of existing bus routes
- All development should be on brownfield sites
- Loss of Green belt land
- Luxury detached houses do not help with local council demands
- Urban sprawl
- Erosion of 'village' feel
- Additional site to those already in draft local plan
- Woodlands site rejected in local plan
- Shortage of affordable homes not addresses
- Not located in the village of Bedmond (or Pimlico)
- Precedent for development in Green Belt
- Located in Chiltern Beechwood Special Area of Conservation - no attempt demonstrated to show compliance with moratorium.

5 Reason for Delay

5.1 Committee cycle.

6 Relevant Planning Policy, Guidance and Legislation

6.1 Planning applications are required to be determined in accordance with the statutory development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise as set out within S38 (6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and S70 of Town and Country Planning Act 1990).

6.2 National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance

In July 2021 the new National Planning Policy Framework was published. This is read alongside the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The determination of planning applications is made mindful of Central Government advice and the Local Plan for the area. It is recognised that Local Planning Authorities must determine applications in accordance with the statutory Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise, and that the planning system does not exist to protect the private interests of one person against another. The NPPF is clear that “existing policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted or made prior to the publication of this Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with this Framework”.

The NPPF states that ‘good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities’. The NPPF retains a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This applies unless any adverse impacts of a development would ‘significantly and demonstrably’ outweigh the benefits.

6.3 The Three Rivers Local Development Plan

The application has been considered against the policies of the Local Plan, including the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), the Development Management Policies Local Development Document (adopted July 2013) and the Site Allocations Local Development Document (adopted November 2014) as well as government guidance. The policies of Three Rivers District Council reflect the content of the NPPF.

The Core Strategy was adopted on 17 October 2011 having been through a full public participation process and Examination in Public. Relevant policies include Policies PSP4, CP1, CP3, CP4, CP9, CP10, CP11 and CP12.

The Development Management Policies Local Development Document (DMLDD) was adopted on 26 July 2013 after the Inspector concluded that it was sound following Examination in Public which took place in March 2013. Relevant policies include DM1, DM2, DM4, DM6, DM13 and Appendices 2 and 5.

6.4 Other

Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (adopted June 2011).

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (adopted February 2015).

The Localism Act received Royal Assent on 15 November 2011. The growth and Infrastructure Act achieved Royal Assent on 25 April 2013.

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 and the Habitat Regulations 1994 may also be relevant.

7 Planning Analysis

7.1 Outline Nature of Development

7.1.1 The application has been submitted in Outline with the Planning Statement specifying that all matters (Appearance, Access, Landscaping, Layout and Scale) are reserved. Therefore if planning permission were to be granted, the reserved matters would all need to be the subject of another application or applications. Consequently, this application only seeks a decision on the principle of development.

7.1.2 The application may acknowledge the reserved matters but may not give these matters significant weight as they would be assessed and agreed at a subsequent stage, if the current outline approval were to be approved.

7.2 Principle of residential development

7.2.1 The proposed development would result in a net gain of 2 dwellings. The site is not identified as a housing site in the Site Allocations document and would be considered as a windfall site. However, as advised in this document, where a site is not identified for development, it may still come forward through the planning application process where it will be tested in accordance with relevant national and local policies.

7.2.2 Core Strategy Policy CP2 advises that in assessing applications for development not identified as part of the District's housing land supply including windfall sites, applications will be considered on a case by case basis having regard to:

- i. The location of the proposed development, taking into account the Spatial Strategy,
- ii. The sustainability of the development and its contribution to meeting local housing needs,
- iii. Infrastructure requirements and the impact on the delivery of allocated housing sites, and
- iv. Monitoring information relating to housing supply and the Three Rivers housing targets.

7.2.3 The application site is located within the settlement hierarchy, as set out within the Core Strategy, as being within Bedmond which is defined as a Village within the Core Strategy. PSP4 sets out that development within villages should protect their character and the openness of the Green Belt and that small scale development to meet local needs may be allowed. Given that the application site is located amongst existing residential dwellings to the north and south it is not considered that the principle of new dwellings in this location would be unacceptable subject to all other material considerations below.

7.3 Principle of development: Green Belt

7.3.1 The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the most important attribute of Green Belts is their openness. Green Belts can shape patterns of urban development at sub-regional and regional scale, and help to ensure that development occurs in locations allocated in development plans. They help to protect the countryside, be it in agricultural, forestry or other use.

7.3.2 Paragraph 149 of the NPPF states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;

e) limited infilling in villages;

f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and

g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land, whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would:

- not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development; or
- not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt, where the development would re-use previously developed land and contribute to meeting an identified affordable housing need within the area of the local planning authority

7.3.3 Policy CP11 of the Core Strategy and Policy DM2 of the DMP LDD relate to development within the Green Belt and reflect the guidance as set out in the NPPF.

7.3.4 The NPPF identifies that limited infilling in villages, and limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the Local Plan may not be inappropriate.

7.3.5 Expanding on the points outlined above when ascertaining whether the proposed development would fall within one of the exceptions to inappropriate development within the Green Belt it is necessary to firstly consider a) whether the application site falls within a village and b) if the extent of housing proposed is considered 'limited'. In *Wood v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (2014)* it was held that whether or not a proposed development constitutes limited infilling in a village is a question of planning judgement, and that this would depend upon their assessment of the position on the ground.

7.3.6 The Oxford Dictionary defines a village as a group of houses and associated buildings, larger than a hamlet and smaller than a town, situated in a rural area. It defines a hamlet as a small settlement, generally one smaller than a village, and strictly (in Britain) one without a Church. It is recognised that in the appeal at Land off Tongue Lane, Brown Edge (APP/B3438/W/18/3211000) the Inspector noted that..."While a Church may have once existed in Ridgeway, there is no Church there now as it has been replaced by a dwelling known as Chapel House. There are also no other associated buildings in Ridgeway that would, in my judgement, mean that Ridgeway is anything more than a hamlet". While the Inspector's comments are noted, it is considered that the existence of a Church is not a conclusive factor as to whether a settlement is a village and thus a greater view is required based on facts on the ground.

7.3.7 The NPPF does not specify what the limits of a village should be, this is a matter of planning judgement. The application site does fall within the boundary of Bedmond Village as set out within PSP4 the Core Strategy which sets out settlement hierarchies. Having regard to appeal decisions, it is accepted that the definition of a village is a matter of planning judgement and even if a site falls within a designated settlement boundary, this is not definitive as to whether a site falls within a village or not.

7.3.8 The application site sits immediately adjacent to residential development to the south and north. Whilst the application site is situated within a part of Bedmond Road where development is sporadic, within the immediate context, on the ground the site is closely associated with Bedmond Village. The main facilities of Bedmond are within a 0.3 mile (8 minute) walk of the application site where a number of amenities can be found including a post office, convenience store, church and village hall. The route is also well lit by street lighting and has a pavement the whole way and as such it is considered to be within an easy walking route of the site. It is considered the services within Bedmond are generally those expected to be found in villages and the application site is within easy access of these

services. Having regard to the above, it is considered that the application site does, by virtue of the surrounding site circumstances, fall within a village.

- 7.3.9 The next test of paragraph 149 (e) is to ascertain whether the proposal constitutes “limited infilling”. As with the village factor of this exception the NPPF does not define limited infilling and therefore this is also a matter of planning judgement. It is generally considered to be a “small gap” having regard to both the scale and form of the development, interpreted in the context of the overall aims of the Green Belt. Having regard to the size of the application site it is considered that two units would be ‘limited’ and would sit comfortably with the scale of the site. Whilst the block plan submitted does indicate two large dwellings this cannot be taken into account at this stage. The site is bound on three sides by residential dwellings (north, south and east). It is acknowledged that to the west there is open field land however when having regard to the overall position of the application site and its setting adjacent to the road and surrounded on three sides by residential properties and their gardens together with the siting of the proposed dwellings following the prevailing building line along this part of Bedmond Road it is considered that the development would comprise limited infilling.
- 7.3.10 Given that the proposed development would be considered appropriate development by virtue of its full compliance with exception (e) of paragraph 149 of the NPPF the proposal would not require an assessment of impact on openness.
- 7.3.11 In light of the above the development would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt and would be consistent with the aims and objectives of the Framework and Policy CP11 of the Three Rivers Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2011), Policy DM2 of the Three Rivers Local Plan Development Management Policies Local Development Document (2013) and the NPPF (2021).

7.4 Principle of development: Character and Street Scene

- 7.4.1 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) seeks to promote buildings of a high enduring design quality that respect local distinctiveness and Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) relates to design and states that in seeking a high standard of design the Council will expect development proposals to 'have regard to the local context and conserve or enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area'. Development should make efficient use of land but should also respect the 'distinctiveness of the surrounding area in terms of density, character, layout and spacing, amenity, scale, height, massing and use of materials'; 'have regard to the local context and conserve or enhance the character, amenities and quality of an area' and 'incorporate visually attractive frontages to adjoining streets and public spaces'.
- 7.4.2 In terms of new residential development, Policy DM1 of the DMLDD advises that the Council will protect the character and residential amenity of existing areas of housing from forms of ‘backland’, ‘infill’ or other forms of new residential development which are inappropriate for the area. Development will be only be supported where it can be demonstrated that the proposal will not result in:
- i. Tandem development;
 - ii. Servicing by an awkward access drive which cannot easily be used by service vehicles;
 - iii. The generation of excessive levels of traffic;
 - iv. Loss of residential amenity;
 - v. Layouts unable to maintain the particular character of the area in the vicinity of the application site in terms of plot size, plot depth, building footprint, plot frontage width, frontage building line, height, gaps between buildings and streetscape features (e.g. hedges, walls, grass verges etc.)
- 7.4.3 Elevations and floor plans have not been submitted and as such a full assessment of impact would be made at reserved matters scale. However the illustrative plans submitted indicate

that the site is capable of comfortably accommodating two residential dwellings. Ample space would be retained to the boundaries and between the dwellings. The proposed development would also follow the rough building line of development on this side of Bedmon Road. However a full assessment of impact cannot be made at this stage.

7.5 Principle of development: Impact on amenity of neighbours

7.5.1 Policy CP12 of the Core Strategy advises that development will be expected to protect residential amenity. Policy DM1 and Appendix 2 of the Development Management Properties LDD provides further guidance and states that residential development should not result in a loss of light or loss of privacy to neighbouring dwellings.

7.5.2 Elevations and floor plans have not been submitted with this application and as such a full assessment of impact would be made at reserved matters scale. However the indicative block plan submitted indicates that there is potential for sufficient spacing to be achieved between the proposed dwellings and the neighbouring properties to both sides of the site.

7.6 Principle of development: Quality of accommodation for future occupants

7.6.1 With regard to overlooking, Appendix 2 of the Development Management Policies LDD sets out that where garden length alone is relied upon for privacy a minimum of 14m should be retained and a back to back distance of 28m should be maintained.

7.6.2 There are no residential neighbours to the west of the site. It is unclear how the proposed dwelling would be orientated. Assuming they are located such that the inner elevations are flank to flank with the front elevations facing Bedmond Road and the rear elevations facing towards the field land this would not be an unusual relationship within a residential setting. However a full assessment would be made at the reserved matters stage.

7.7 Principle of development: Amenity Space Provision for future occupants

7.7.1 Appendix 2 of the DMP LDD outlines the following standards for amenity space:

1 bed dwelling -- 42 square metres

2 bed dwelling -- 63 square metres

3 bed dwelling -- 84 square metres

4 bed dwelling -- 105 square metres

additional bedrooms: - 21 square metres each

7.7.2 Floor plans have not been provided nor has it been indicated on the illustrative block plan how the plots would be subdivided and as such would be required at reserved matters stage to make an assessment in this respect. However the illustrative block plan submitted does indicate that sufficient amenity space for two dwellings could be provided owing to the overall size of the site.

7.8 Wildlife and Biodiversity

7.8.1 Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 requires Local Planning Authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. This is further emphasised by regulation 3(4) of the Habitat Regulations 1994 which state that Councils must have regard to the strict protection for certain species required by the EC Habitats Directive.

7.8.2 The protection of biodiversity and protected species is a material planning consideration in the assessment of applications in accordance with Policy CP9 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and Policy DM6 of the DMP LDD. National Planning Policy requires Local Authorities to ensure that a protected species survey is undertaken for applications that may be affected prior to determination of a planning application.

- 7.8.3 Paragraph 180 of the NPPF advises that when determining planning applications, local planning authorities should apply principles including if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.
- 7.8.4 The application site is located within the Zone of Influence (ZOI) for the Chilterns Beechwoods Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The location of the site within the ZOI is a material consideration, however it is acknowledged that the site, and Three Rivers District is at the outer edge of the ZOI, and the District has been identified as generating less than 2% of the visits to the SAC. Taking this into account, it is considered that material harm would be unlikely to be caused to the SAC as a result of this development, and no compensatory measures are required in respect of this matter.
- 7.8.5 Notwithstanding this there have been no ecological surveys undertaken to confirm the absence of protected species. As such it cannot be determined whether mitigation is required or can be achieved. The application site comprises open land adjacent to wider open field land and therefore has a high potential for the evidence of protected species. In the absence of any supporting information it cannot be concluded that the proposed development would not result in harm in this respect.
- 7.8.6 Therefore necessary consideration and appropriate mitigation cannot be given to the impact of the development on biodiversity and protected species which is contrary to Policies CP1, CP9 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the NPPF (2021).

7.9 Trees and Landscaping

- 7.9.1 Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) states that development proposals on sites which contain existing trees and hedgerows will be expected to retain as many trees and hedgerows as possible, particularly those of local amenity or nature conservation value. Policy DM6 further states that development proposals should demonstrate that existing trees, hedgerows and woodlands will be safeguarded and managed during and after development.
- 7.9.2 Paragraph 131 of the NPPF outlines that trees make an important contribution to the character and quality of urban environments. Paragraph 174 further adds that planning decisions should contribute to the natural and local environments and should recognise the benefits of trees and woodland.
- 7.9.3 There are 7 TPOs on or immediately adjacent to the application site these trees are covered by TPO 270. They are mature Ash, Oak and Beech trees. The trees are sited around the perimeter of the application site. By virtue of their siting and maturity, readily visible from the streetscene, these trees make a positive contribution to the visual amenity of the area and respond to the verdant character of the surrounding field land.
- 7.9.4 It is not clear from the information submitted whether the proposed new dwellings would be within the RPAs of any of the 7 TPOs. However given that all matters are reserved it would be at the approval of details application whereby it would need to demonstrate that the proposed development can be accommodated on site without result in direct or indirect harm to the on-site protected trees.

7.10 Sustainability

- 7.10.1 Policy CP1 of the Core Strategy sets out that all applications for all new commercial development of one unit or more will be required to submit an Energy Statement demonstrating the extent to which sustainability principles have been incorporated into the location, design and construction. Policy DM4 of the Development Management Policies

Document states that development should provide 5% less Carbon Dioxide than Building Regulations Part L (2013) having regard to feasibility and viability. The policy states that from 2016, applicants will be required to demonstrate that new residential development will be zero carbon. However, the Government has announced that it is not pursuing zero carbon and the standard remains that development should produce 5% less carbon dioxide emissions than Building Regulations Part L (2013) requirements having regard to feasibility and viability.

7.10.2 This application has not been accompanied by an Energy Statement. This would be required at reserved matters stage and should demonstrate that the development is in accordance with the above standards.

7.11 Highways, Access and Parking

7.11.1 Core Strategy Policy CP10 requires development to provide a safe and adequate means of access to make adequate provision for all users, including car parking. Appendix 5 of the Development Management Policies document sets out parking standards for developments within the District.

7.11.2 No plans have submitted which set out the proposed bedroom number of the dwellings. Appendix 5 of the DMP LDD sets out the parking standards for residential dwellings this is outlined below:

1 bedroom dwellings: 1.75 spaces (1 assigned)

2 bedroom dwellings: 2 spaces (1 assigned)

3 bedroom dwellings: 2.25 spaces (2 assigned)

4 or more bedrooms: 3 spaces (3 assigned)

7.11.3 Given the limited detail submitted on the proposed indicative block plan an assessment of parking provision cannot be made at this stage. However from the block plan submitted it does appear that the site is of a sufficient size to accommodate on-site parking.

7.11.4 Notwithstanding this in relation to the proposed accesses the Highways Officer considers that whilst some works would be proposed to bring them back into use the in principle nature of the development would be acceptable.

7.12 Affordable Housing

7.12.1 **Appendix A** of this report sets out the position of the Council and evidence relating to the application of the affordable housing threshold in Core Strategy Policy CP4: Affordable Housing.

7.12.2 The proposed development would necessitate the requirement for the LPA to seek the payment of a commuted sum in lieu of the provision of on-site affordable housing.

7.12.3 Floor plans have not been submitted and as such it is not possible to calculate the required commuted sum amount which is based on a payment per square meeting based on the market area set out in the Affordable Housing SPD. In this case the required amount would be £750 per sqm of habitable floor space.

7.12.4 Whilst an accurate amount cannot be calculated the application has been submitted with a draft Section 106 which commits to an estimate of the payment. Should this outline application be recommended for approval a Section 106 could be progressed to include a formula based mechanism to secure the required full commuted sum payment at reserved matters stage. However owing to the Officers recommendation for refusal no further progression has been made in the negotiation of completing the deed to secure the funds.

7.12.5 In summary the Council has not reached a situation where the mechanism to secure the payment of the AHC by Section 106 has been completed. As such the proposal fails to provide adequate contribution towards affordable housing, contrary to Policy CP4 of the Core Strategy (adopted October).

7.13 Refuse and Recycling

7.13.1 Policy DM10 (Waste Management) of the DMLDD advises that the Council will ensure that there is adequate provision for the storage and recycling of waste and that these facilities are fully integrated into design proposals. New developments will only be supported where:

- i) The siting or design of waste/recycling areas would not result in any adverse impact to residential or work place amenity
- ii) Waste/recycling areas can be easily accessed (and moved) by occupiers and by local authority/private waste providers
- iii) There would be no obstruction of pedestrian, cyclists or driver site lines

7.13.2 Further details of refuse/recycling provision would be required at reserved matters stage also taking into account the comments of the Highways Officer in respect of the access.

7.14 Tilted Balance

7.14.1 The LPA cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, and therefore paragraph 11 of the NPPF is engaged. Paragraph 11 and footnote 7 clarifies that in the context of decision-taking "the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date when the LPA cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites". The most important policies for determining a housing application are considered to be Policies CP2 (Housing Supply) and Policy CP3 (Housing Mix and Density). Paragraph 11 continues, "Plans and decisions should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development...where there are no relevant development plan policies, or the policies which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date, granting permission unless: a) the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed; or b) 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.". It is considered that the lack of a 5 year housing land supply should be afforded significant weight in the planning balance.

7.14.2 The NPPF identifies that there are 3 dimensions to sustainable development: social, economic and environmental. In terms of economic benefits, there would be very limited short term benefits weighing in favour of the scheme as a result of construction activities, and benefits resulting from the expenditure of new residents locally. However any benefits would be limited given the development is only proposing an uplift of one dwelling. The wider public benefits would also be limited owing to the self-build nature of the development. Therefore limiting wider economic benefits of construction.

7.14.3 However, for the reasons stated, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not result in an adverse impact to the on-site and adjacent TPOs nor has it been demonstrated that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact to protected species.

7.14.4 A Section 106 agreement has also not been completed during the course of the application and as such the proposed development does not provide a contribution towards Affordable Housing. Nor has it been confirmed that the development would not be viable to do so. Owing to the pressing need for affordable housing within the District which has been identified in a number of recent appeal decisions, the limited economic benefits of the scheme, as outlined above, do not outweigh the negatives in relation to the lack of any contribution towards affordable housing.

7.14.5 Whilst the uplift of two residential dwelling is noted in relation to its contribution to the District's Housing supply the short term and long term social and economic benefits of the scheme do not outweigh the harm resulting from the lack of sufficient information to demonstrate that unacceptable adverse impacts would not result to protected trees or protected species.

7.14.6 On this basis, it is not considered that the proposal would constitute sustainable development in the context of paragraph 11 of the NPPF and the adverse impacts of granting planning permission are not considered to be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the benefits.

8 Recommendation

8.1 That OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

R1 In the absence of sufficient information it has not been demonstrated that the development would not have a detrimental impact on biodiversity and protected species on the site. Therefore necessary consideration and appropriate mitigation cannot be given to the impact of the development on biodiversity and protected species which is contrary to Policies CP1, CP9 and CP12 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011), Policy DM6 of the Development Management Policies LDD (adopted July 2013) and the NPPF (2021).

R2 In the absence of an agreement under the provisions of Section 106 of Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the development would not contribute to the provision of affordable housing. The proposed development therefore fails to meet the requirements of Policy CP4 of the Core Strategy (adopted October 2011) and the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (approved June 2011).

8.2 **Informatives:**

I1 The Local Planning Authority has been positive and proactive in considering this planning application in line with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority encourages applicants to have pre-application discussions as advocated in the NPPF. The applicant and/or their agent did not have formal pre-application discussions with the Local Planning Authority and the proposed development fails to comply with the requirements of the Development Plan and does not maintain/improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the District.

APPENDIX A: Evidence Relating to the Application of the Affordable Housing Threshold in Core Strategy Policy CP4: Affordable Housing

Evidence Relating to the Application of the Affordable Housing Threshold in Core Strategy Policy CP4: Affordable Housing

Background

- 1.1 In November 2014, the Minister of State for Housing and Planning issued a Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) setting out changes to national planning policy. The WMS stated that financial contributions towards affordable housing should no longer be sought on sites of 10 units or less and which have a maximum combined gross floor area of 1,000sqm. National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) was amended to reflect this. However on 31st July 2015 the High Court held (*West Berkshire Council v SSCLG* [2015]) that the policy expressed through the WMS was unlawful and the NPPG was changed to reflect this. On 11th May 2016 the Court of Appeal reversed the High Court decision. The NPPG was subsequently amended to reflect the WMS on 19th May 2016.
- 1.2 In light of the above developments, between November 2014 and August 2015 and May 2016 and 1st September 2017 the Council gave greater weight to the WMS policy and associated NPPG guidance in it than to adopted Policy CP4 of its Core Strategy in respect of development proposals for 10 dwellings or less and which had a maximum combined gross floor area of 1000 sq metres. However, having undertaken an analysis of up to date evidence of housing needs (**The Needs Analysis**), officers advised in 2017 that when considering the weight to be given to the WMS in the context of breaches of the adopted development plan policy, the local evidence of housing need contained in the Needs Analysis should generally be given greater weight. On 1st September 2017 the Council resolved to have regard to the Needs Analysis as a consideration of significant weight when considering the relationship between Policy CP4 and the WMS for the purposes of Section 70(2) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 in respect of development proposals of 10 dwellings or less.
- 1.3 On 24th July 2018 a new version of the National Planning Policy Framework¹ (the Framework) was published with immediate effect for development management purposes. Paragraph 63 of the Framework advises that *“Provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer).”* Annex 2 of the NPPF defines *“major development”* as *“for housing, development where 10 or more homes will be provided, or the site has an area of 0.5 hectares or more.”*

¹ The revised National Planning Policy Framework was updated in February 2019 and July 2021 and retains the policies as stated in Paragraph 1.3 of this document.

- 1.4 The Council's current affordable housing policy is set out in Policy CP4 of the Core Strategy (adopted in October 2011) and establishes that :
- a) "...All new development resulting in a net gain of one or more dwellings will be expected to contribute to the provision of affordable housing."
 - e) "In most cases require affordable housing provision to be made on site, but in relation to small sites delivering between one and nine dwellings, consider the use of commuted payments towards provision off site. Such payments will be broadly equivalent in value to on-site provision but may vary depending on site circumstances and viability."
- 1.5 The supporting text to Policy CP4 summarises the justification for it:
- Average house prices in Three Rivers are some of the highest in the country outside of London. As a result, many local people have difficulty accessing housing on the open market.
 - A Housing Needs Study estimated that 429 affordable dwellings would be needed each year to satisfy need. Such provision would exceed the total number of all housing types provided in the District in any year.
 - The 2010 Strategic Market Housing Assessment (SMHA) found that the requirement for affordable housing in and around the Three Rivers area remains exceptionally high.
 - In order to completely satisfy affordable housing requirements, **all** future housing in the district to 2021 would need to be affordable.
- 1.6 This policy remains the legal starting point for the consideration of planning applications under Section 38(6) PCPA 2004, which requires that the Council determines applications in accordance with the adopted development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Revised NPPF 63 is a material consideration. The weight to be given to it is a matter for the decision maker when determining each planning application. This note explains the advice from the Head of Planning Policy & Projects and Head of Regulatory Services on the weight that they recommend should be given to NPPF 63 for these purposes in light of the Needs Analysis.
- 1.7 Since the adoption of its Core Strategy in 2011 and as of 31 December 2021, Three Rivers has received small site affordable housing contributions amounting to over **£2.4 million**. Utilising those monies, development is has funded the delivery of 21 units of affordable housing, with the remaining monies utilised as a contribution towards the delivery of a further 17 affordable dwellings. It is clear that Three Rivers' policy has already delivered a significant contribution towards the delivery of much needed affordable housing in the district.
- 1.8 In addition to the £2.4 million already received, small scale (1-9 unit) schemes have secured to date a further **£2.7million to £4.0million²** of affordable housing contributions in respect of unimplemented but current planning permissions. All of those schemes were agreed to be viable with those sums secured. The Council has several large scale future residential developments planned which will aim to deliver substantial quantities of further affordable

² The sums payable secured by Sec 106 will be subject to indexation, in most cases from June 2011 which will not be calculable until the date of payment. The quoted upper limit includes a policy compliant contribution of £1,341,250.00 which relates to a minor development PP subject to a late stage viability review mechanism. The AHC, whilst capped at this figure, will only be known once viability is re-run at occupation when actual build costs and realised sales values are understood. The contribution paid could therefore be substantially less than the policy compliant sum referred to above, hence the range specified. Data is as of February 2022

housing in the District in the medium term future, utilising those additional affordable housing contributions as and when they are received.

- 1.9 Policy CP4 makes it clear that a requirement for a scheme to contribute towards the provision of affordable housing is subject to viability considerations and is therefore consistent with paragraph 122 of the Framework. The application of CP4, which includes this in built viability allowance, cannot properly be said to be a barrier to delivery. Indeed between 1 October 2011 and 31 March 2021, 250 planning permissions were granted for minor residential developments which contribute a net dwelling gain. Of those only 13 have been permitted to lapse which is only 5.2% of all such schemes³.
- 1.10 Current evidence of housing need in the District is noted below at 2.4 to 2.11. It confirms that the needs underlying the adopted development plan policy remain pressing.

Importance of Small Sites to Three Rivers

- 1.11 It is important to acknowledge the percentage of residential development schemes which tend to come forward in the District which propose the delivery of less than 10 dwellings: from 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2021, 215 planning applications for residential development involving a net gain of dwellings were determined⁴ by the Council. Of these, 191 applications (89%) were for schemes which proposed a net gain of 1-9 units. Having a large number of small sites is an inevitable consequence of the District being contained within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The contribution to both market housing supply and affordable housing supply are therefore both material to overall identified needs and adopted development plan objectives. This is dealt with in more detail below.
- 1.12 If the weight to be given to the Framework is greater than the adopted development plan, this large proportion of Three Rivers' expected new housing delivery will contribute nothing towards affordable housing. This would compromise Three Rivers' ability to deliver its objectively assessed need for affordable housing.

2 Development Plan Policies and the WMS

- 2.1 The content of the Framework is a material consideration in any planning decision, and one which the decision making authority must weigh against the development plan as the starting point under section 38(6) of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. The correct approach is to:
- Consider the starting point under the development plan policies
 - Have regard to the Framework and its objectives if those development plan policies would be breached – it is officers' view that the Framework should be given considerable weight as a statement of national policy post-dating the Core Strategy
 - Consider up to date evidence on housing needs

³ The Needs Analyses (December 2019 and December 2020) referred to a lapse rate of 9% for minor developments; manual analysis has since demonstrated that a number of sites included in the 9% lapse figure have been subject to subsequent planning applications which were granted approval. Such sites have therefore still come forward for development despite earlier permissions lapsing. The lapse percentage in this Needs Analysis (January 2022) has therefore been revised to exclude application sites which are subject to later approvals which are either outstanding, under construction or complete.

⁴ Includes refused and approved applications. Excludes prior approval developments.

- Consider whether the Framework should outweigh the weight to be given to the local evidence of affordable housing need and the breach of the adopted development plan policy.

2.2 This approach reflects the Court of Appeal's judgment in *West Berkshire*, which held that whilst the government, whether central or local, could state policy “rules” absolutely, decision makers must consider them without treating them as absolute: their discretion to weigh material considerations in the balance and do something different cannot be fettered by policy:

“the exercise of public discretionary power requires the decision maker to bring his mind to bear on every case; they cannot blindly follow a pre-existing policy without considering anything said to persuade him that the case in hand is an exception”

2.3 At paragraph 26 of the judgment, the court cited statements made to the High Court on behalf of the Secretary of State, describing those as being “no more than a conventional description of the law’s treatment of the Secretary of State’s policy in the decision making process”:

“As a matter of law the new national policy is only one of the matters which has to be considered under sec 70(2) and sec 38(6) when determining planning applications... in the determination of planning applications the effect of the new national policy is that although it would normally be inappropriate to require any affordable housing or social infrastructure contributions on sites below the threshold stated, local circumstances may justify lower (or no) thresholds as an exception to the national policy. It would then be a matter for the decision maker to decide how much weight to give to lower thresholds justified by local circumstances as compared with the new national policy”

As confirmed by the Court of Appeal decision in the *West Berkshire* case, whilst the WMS, and now the Framework, is clear with regard to the Government’s intentions on planning obligations in relation to small sites, the weight to attach to a development plan policy is a matter of discretion for the decision taker. Policies should not be applied rigidly or exclusively when material considerations may indicate an exception may be necessary.

In determining an appeal in *Elmbridge, Surrey* in August 2016 (appeal reference: APP/K3605/W/16/3146699) the Inspector found that *“whilst the WMS carries considerable weight, I do not consider it outweighs the development plan in this instance given the acute and substantial need for affordable housing in the Borough and the importance of delivering through small sites towards this.”* The existence of evidence of housing need is important in this context. That general principle has not been changed by the Revised NPPF.

2.4 Officers advise that whilst the Framework is a material consideration, breaches of Policy CP4 should not, in light of ongoing evidence of housing need in the Needs Analysis, be treated as outweighed by the Framework. This conclusion has been reached having had regard to the following relevant factors:

- **General House Price Affordability in Three Rivers**
- **Affordable Housing Supply Requirements in Three Rivers**
- **Affordable Housing Provision in Three Rivers**
- **Extent of residential development schemes proposed which are for sites delivering net gain of less than 10 dwellings**
- **The contribution towards the provision of affordable housing Policy CP4(e) has historically made in respect of small sites**
- **Relevant Appeal Decisions**
- **The fact that the adopted development plan policy does not impose burdens where they would render schemes unviable.**

General House Price Affordability in Three Rivers

2.5 Due to the District's close proximity to London, Three Rivers has traditionally been situated within a high house price area. According to data published by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) in the third quarter of 2016⁵, the lowest quartile house price in Three Rivers in 2016, representing the cheapest properties in the District was £325,000.00, making it the **fifth**⁶ most expensive local authority area in England and Wales (excluding London), out of a total of three hundred and three local authority areas (see table 1 below).

Number	Local Authority Name	Lowest Quartile House Prices (2016)
1	Elmbridge	£375,000.00
2	St Albans	£355,000.00
3	Windsor and Maidenhead	£340,000.00
4	Hertsmere	£330,000.00
5	Three Rivers	£325,000.00

Table 1.

Since the publication of the above ONS data in 2016, the general house price affordability position has grown worse. According to data published by the Office of National Statistics (ONS), the lowest quartile house price in Three Rivers in September 2020 was £365,000⁷. The lowest quartile house price of £365,000 places Three Rivers as the **fourth** most expensive local authority area in England and Wales (excluding London), out of a total of three hundred and three local authority areas (see table 2 below). The lowest quartile house price has risen by £40,000 from 2016 to 2020, demonstrating a worsening affordability position.

Number	Local Authority Name	Lowest Quartile House Prices (2020)
1	Elmbridge	£411,250
2	St Albans	£400,000
3	Windsor and Maidenhead	£375,000
4	Three Rivers	£365,000

Table 2.

Lowest quartile earnings in Three Rivers in 2016 were £24,518.00 and £26,983.00 in 2020, 13.3 times worsening to 13.5 below the lowest quartile house prices (ratio of lower quartile house prices to lower quartile gross annual, residence based earnings⁸). In a mortgage market where lenders are traditionally willing to lend 3.5 times a person's income, clearly a lending requirement at over 13 times such an income means that most first time buyers are simply unable to purchase a dwelling in the District. Such a lending ratio would have required a first time buyer in 2020 to have a deposit of £270,560.00, or (without such a deposit) to earn £94,440.00 per annum to get onto the lowest/cheapest rung of the property ladder. An

⁵ ONS (2021) *Dataset: House price to residence-based earnings ratio Table 6a*

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/ratioofhousepricetoresidencebasedearningslowerquartileandmedian>

⁶ Note that prior to the formation of the Buckinghamshire Council (now a unitary authority), Three Rivers was the seventh most expensive local authority area as two local authorities in Buckinghamshire ranked higher in lower quartile house price than Three Rivers in 2016 (South Bucks - £370,000.00; Chiltern - £335,000.00).

⁷ Office for National Statistics (2021) *Dataset: House price to residence-based earnings ratio Table 6a*

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/ratioofhousepricetoresidencebasedearningslowerquartileandmedian>

⁸ Office for National Statistics (2020) *Dataset: House price to residence-based earnings ratio Table 6b*

<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/ratioofhousepricetoresidencebasedearningslowerquartileandmedian>

additional Stamp Duty payment would also have been due (subject to COVID related temporary relaxation).

When one considers the median affordability ratio⁹ for Three Rivers compared to the rest of England and Wales, the position is even more serious: in 2016, the median quartile income to median quartile house price affordability ratio was 13.77, the fourth¹⁰ worst affordability ratio in England and Wales (excluding London), as set out in table 3 below, again when compared against three hundred and three local authorities.

Number	Local Authority Name	Median quartile house price affordability ratio ⁸ (2016)
1	Hertsmere	14.23
2	Mole Valley	14.18
3	Elmbridge	13.86
4	Three Rivers	13.77

Table 3.

Over the period 2016 to 2020, the median quartile house affordability ratio in Three Rivers has improved with a decrease from 13.77 in 2016 to 12.92 in 2020 (see table 4 below). Whilst the median affordability ratio has slightly improved (by 0.85), Three Rivers has maintained its position with the fourth worst affordability ratio in England and Wales (excluding London), demonstrating a lack of improvement in Three Rivers' affordability position nationally.

Number	Local Authority Name	Median quartile house price affordability ratio ¹ (2020)
1	Mole Valley	16.84
2	Elmbridge	14.17
3	Epsom and Ewell	13.26
4	Three Rivers	12.92

Table 4.

Looking at the ratio of lower quartile house prices to lower quartile to gross annual, residence based earnings, in 2016 the ratio was 13.26. By September 2020 that had risen to 13.53, showing a worsening ratio over the period from 2016 to 2020.

It is clear from the above that the affordability of housing in Three Rivers is getting worse with time.

Affordable Housing Requirements in Three Rivers

- 2.6 The Local Housing Needs Assessment (LNHA) (August 2020) is the most recent update to the South West Hertfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment January 2016 (SHMA) and estimates the need for affordable housing over the 2020-2036 period. The LNHA splits its analysis between affordable housing to rent and affordable housing to buy.

Affordable Housing Need - To Rent

- 2.7 The South West Hertfordshire Local Housing Needs Assessment (LHNA) (August 2020) found that at that time there were approximately 1,276 households within Three Rivers that were situated in unsuitable housing. Unsuitability is based on the numbers of homeless households and in temporary accommodation, households in overcrowded housing,

⁹ Affordability ratio statistics are revised annually by the ONS to reflect revisions to the house price statistics and earnings data.

¹⁰ Note that prior to the formation of the Buckinghamshire Council (now a unitary authority), Three Rivers had the fifth worst affordability ratio most expensive local authority area as a local authority in Buckinghamshire ranked higher in median affordability ratio than Three Rivers in 2016 (Chiltern – 14.49).

concealed households and existing affordable housing tenants in need. 57% of these households are estimated to be unable to afford market housing without subsidy, which means the revised gross need is reduced to 727 households¹¹.

- 2.8 In addition to needs arising from those in unsuitable housing, the LNHA also analyses affordable need to rent arising from newly-forming households within the District. The LNHA estimates 800 new households forming per annum in Three Rivers over the period 2020 to 2036. 45% of these newly-forming households are estimated to be unable to afford market housing (to rent) resulting in 360 new households with a need for affordable housing to rent each year over the period 2020 to 2036¹².
- 2.9 The LNHA also considers newly arising need for affordable rent from existing households (i.e. households residing in market accommodation now requiring affordable housing). The LNHA estimates an additional 77 existing households falling into need for affordable rent per year over the period 2020 to 2036¹³.
- 2.10 Taking into account the figures of need noted above and the supply of affordable housing to rent through re-lets, the LNHA calculates the annual affordable housing need to rent over the period 2020 to 2036 as 350 in Three Rivers¹⁴. This need involves households who cannot afford anything in the market without subsidy and is equivalent to 55% of the District's total local housing need requirement calculated by the standard methodology. This indicates the substantial scale of need for this type of affordable housing.

Affordable Housing Need - To Buy

- 2.11 In addition, the LNHA estimates a need of 162 units for affordable home ownership per annum¹⁵ over the period 2020 to 2036, although this is a need which is formed by households identified as being able to afford to rent privately without subsidy.

Total Affordable Housing Need

- 2.12 Combining the need for affordable housing to rent and affordable housing to buy results in the calculation of 512 affordable units per year, equating to approximately 80% of Three Rivers' total local housing need requirement (as calculated by the standard method).

Affordable Housing Provision in Three Rivers

- 2.13 Core Strategy CP4 requires around 45% of all new housing in the District to be affordable. As stated previously, prior to the WMS, all new developments that had a net gain of one or more dwellings would, subject to viability, be expected to contribute towards this.

¹¹ Table 33: Estimated Current Rented Affordable Housing Need, South West Hertfordshire Local Housing Needs Assessment (August 2020)

¹² Table 34: Estimated Level of Rented Affordable Housing Need from Newly Forming Households (per annum 2020-2036), South West Hertfordshire Local Housing Needs Assessment (August 2020)

¹³ Table 35: Estimated level of Housing Need from Existing Households (per annum 2020-2036), South West Hertfordshire Local Housing Needs Assessment (August 2020)

¹⁴ Table 37: Estimated Annual Level of Affordable/Social Rented Housing Need (2020-2036), South West Hertfordshire Local Housing Needs Assessment (August 2020)

¹⁵ Table 42: Estimated Annual Need for Affordable Home Ownership (2020-2036), South West Hertfordshire Local Housing Needs Assessment (August 2020)

2.14 Since the start of the plan period from 1 April 2001 to 31st March 2021 (the latest date where the most recent completion figures are available), 4,965 gross dwellings were completed. From this, 1,128 were secured as affordable housing, a total of 22.7%. This percentage is significantly below the Core Strategy target of 45% which means there was a shortfall of 1,107 or 22.3% in order to fulfil the 45% affordable housing requirement up to 31 March 2021. This shortfall only exacerbates the already pressing need for small sites to contribute towards the provision of affordable housing.

2.15 In the latest monitoring period of 2020/21 (financial year), 26 sites¹⁶ delivered a net gain of one or more dwellings and would therefore be required to contribute to affordable housing under Policy CP4 (either through an on-site or off-site contribution). These were made up of four major developments (15%) and 22 minor developments (86%). 17 of the 26 schemes contributed to affordable housing provision whilst nine of the 26 schemes did not contribute:

- Four out of the 26 sites provided viability justification, in line with CP4 policy, for the absence of affordable housing provision.
- Four of the applications were determined during the 2014/15 and 2016/17 periods noted at 1.2 above (when the Council was dealing with applications on the basis that the WMS should be given overriding effect regardless of the viability position on specific schemes). Affordable housing provision was forgone on them on this basis, which is now reflected in the low affordable provision as they are built out.
- Of the 17 schemes which did contribute, nine made contributions via commuted sums towards off-site provision; all nine schemes were minor developments, demonstrating the important role of small sites in collecting financial payments to be spent on affordable housing provision. Of the remaining eight schemes which contributed via on-site provision in 2020/21, three were major developments and five were minor developments, with four of the five minor developments delivered by Registered Providers (17/2077/FUL, 17/2606/FUL – Three Rivers District Council; 17/0883/FUL – Thrive Homes; 14/1168/FUL – Watford Community Housing Trust). This reflects the pattern of on-site delivery from large schemes, with commuted sums from minor developments, unless delivered by Registered Providers.

Extent of residential development schemes proposed which are for sites delivering a net gain of less than 10 dwellings

2.16 In 2017/2018 (financial year), there were 67 planning applications determined¹⁷ for net gain residential schemes, of which 57 were small site schemes (85%). In 2018/19 (financial year), there were 50 planning applications determined for net gain residential schemes, of which 46 were small site schemes (92%). In 2019/20 (financial year), there were 60 planning applications for net gain residential schemes determined, of which 55 were small sites schemes (92%). In 2020/21 (financial year), there were 38 planning applications for net gain residential schemes determined, of which 33 were small site schemes (87%). It is therefore clear that a high proportion of small site schemes have been proposed in the District, equating to 89% of applications over the past four financial years.

¹⁶ Sites with completions in 2020/21

¹⁷ Includes refused and approved applications. Excludes prior approval developments.

2.17 In terms of numbers of completed dwellings proposed by those small site schemes, between 2011-2021 (financial years) some 384 net dwellings were completed which equates to 38 net dwellings per annum and to 22.2% over the 2011-2021 period. 22.2% is a significant proportion of the overall supply. Whilst such numbers are significant, it is acknowledged that major developments, whilst far less frequent, provided significantly greater quantities of housing. However CP4(e) does not generally require small site schemes to provide on-site affordable housing (small-scale piecemeal development is unattractive to RP's). Instead commuted sums in lieu of on-site provision are required and thus it is the sums of money secured and the contribution those make towards the provision of additional much needed affordable housing in the District which the policy should be tested against. This has been acknowledged by Planning Inspectors on appeal, as referred to at paragraph 2.21 below: APP/P1940/W/19/3230999, 27 Gable Close, Abbots Langley: *"It also identifies the importance of small sites in providing affordable housing with contributions from small sites amounting to over £2.1 million since 2011 being spent towards the delivery of 38 affordable dwellings."*

Contributions towards the provision of affordable housing Policy CP4(e) has made in respect of small sites

2.18 As set out at paragraphs 1.7 and 1.8 above, the commuted payments (£2.4 million) spent on the provision of affordable housing which have been collected by the Council to date have made a direct contribution towards the identified affordable housing shortfall in the district: providing some 21 units with some of the monies being utilised to assist in the delivery of a further 17 units (38 in total). Furthermore, as set out at paragraph 1.8 above, small scale (1-9 unit) schemes have (as at February 2022) secured a further **£2.7million - £4.0million** (see footnote 2) in respect of unimplemented but current planning permissions. The Council has several large scale future residential developments planned which will aim to deliver substantial quantities of further affordable housing in the District in the medium term future, utilising those additional affordable housing contributions as and when they are received. It is clear therefore that CP4(e) has made and will continue to make a significant contribution towards the provision of much needed affordable housing in the District in the future.

Adopted development plan policy does not impose burdens where they would render schemes unviable

2.19 As set out at paragraph 1.9 above, Policy CP4 makes it clear that a requirement for a scheme to contribute towards the provision of affordable housing is subject to viability considerations and is therefore consistent with paragraph 122 of the Framework. The application of CP4, which includes this in built viability allowance, cannot properly be said to be a barrier to delivery. The Council accepts that if, properly tested, viability cannot be established on current day costs and values then a scheme should not currently be required to provide or contribute to affordable housing delivery. Between 1 October 2011 and 31 March 2021 there were 250 planning permissions granted for minor (net gain) residential developments in the District. Of those only 13 have lapsed (5.2%)¹⁸. This demonstrates that the application of CP4 has not acted as a brake on small scale residential developments.

Relevant Appeal Decisions

2.20 There have been a number of appeal decisions since the WMS was upheld by the High Court in May 2016. As an example, the Planning Inspectorate has dismissed appeals that were

¹⁸ See footnote 3.

submitted against the decisions made by Elmbridge Borough Council (appeal no: 3146699), Reading Borough Council (appeal ref: 315661), South Cambridgeshire District Council (appeal ref: 3142834) and Islington Borough Council (3154751, 3164313, 3174582, 3177927 and 3182729). These were for small scale housing schemes where those Councils had attached greater weight to their affordable housing policy than to the WMS as a consequence of local evidence of substantial affordable housing need. Copies of these three appeals are attached to Appendix 1. The Council considers these appeal decisions to be of continuing relevance post the new Framework.

- 2.21 The Inspectors appointed to determine these appeals stated that the WMS needed to be addressed alongside existing Local Plan policy. Within each case, the Inspectors found that there was substantial evidence of a pressing need for affordable housing within these three local authority areas. On this basis, it was considered that local policy had significant weight and there was strong evidence to suggest that these issues would outweigh the WMS within these three cases.
- 2.22 In March 2017 the Planning Inspectorate issued a response to a letter from Richmond and Wandsworth Councils regarding the perceived inconsistency of approach by the inspectorate in relation to a further five appeal decisions made in 2016, regarding the weight that was made to the WMS. A copy of this letter is attached to Appendix 2.
- 2.23 Out of these five decisions, the Planning Inspectorate considered that three appeal decisions were reasonable, and fairly reflected the Court of Appeal's decision that although great weight should be attached to the WMS as a material circumstance; planning applications must be decided in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 2.24 However, the Planning Inspectorate considered that the decision taken on the two remaining appeals which stated that lesser weight was afforded to local policies because they were now, in part, inconsistent with national policy, was not appropriate. The seventh paragraph in the response from the Inspectorate, summarised the approach that the Inspectorate acknowledges should be taken:

*"...an Inspector to start with the development plan and any evidence presented by the LPA supporting the need for an affordable housing contribution, establish whether the proposal is in conflict with those policies if no contribution is provided for, and, if there is conflict, only then go on to address the weight to be attached to the WMS as a national policy that post-dates the development plan policies."*¹⁹

- 2.25 It is clear therefore that the Planning Inspectorate considered that although the WMS (and now the Framework) was a material consideration, this should be balanced against the policies within a plan along with any further evidence that supports a Local Planning Authority's application of the policy.
- 2.26 The Council's stance has been tested on appeal on numerous occasions (26 decisions as at the date of this document) and the Planning Inspectorate have repeatedly concluded (that whilst the NPPF carries considerable weight, it does not outweigh CP4 of the Councils development plan given the acute and substantial need for affordable housing in the District and the important contribution small sites make towards addressing this shortfall. Below are extracts from a few of those decisions:

¹⁹ Paragraph 7, Planning Inspectorate Letter, March 2017.

- APP/P1940/W/19/3222318, Eastbury Corner, 13 Eastbury Avenue, Northwood, Decision date: 21st June 2019:**

“The Council has however provided robust evidence to demonstrate high affordable housing need locally and that affordability in the District continues to deteriorate. Indeed, needs analysis carried out by the Council highlights the importance of small sites in addressing shortfall and the lack of affordability that exists in the District. I apply substantial weight to this local evidence due to its recentness and the clear conclusions that can be drawn from it. Policy CP4 makes it clear that site circumstances and financial viability will be taken into account when seeking affordable housing provision.”
- APP/P1940/W/19/3221363, The Swallows, Shirley Road, Abbots Langley Decision date: 27th June 2019:**

“The Council has however provided robust evidence to demonstrate high affordable housing need locally and that affordability in the District continues to deteriorate. Indeed, needs analysis carried out by the Council highlights the importance of small sites in addressing shortfall and the lack of affordability that exists in the District. I apply substantial weight to this local evidence due to its recentness and the clear conclusions that can be drawn from it.”
- APP/P1940/W/19/3225445, 6 Berkely Close, Abbots Langley Decision date 5th August 2019:**

“The Council has provided robust evidence of high affordable housing need in the District, and in line with the findings of other appeal decisions cited by the Council, I attribute substantial weight to that need as a consequence and consider that a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing is necessary.”
- APP/P1940/W/19/3230999, 27 Gable Close, Abbots Langley Decision Date: 1st November 2019:**

“The Council has provided detailed evidence of acute affordable housing need locally: a Needs Analysis was undertaken in May 2016 after the publication of the Written Ministerial Statement which introduced the affordable housing thresholds now included in the Framework. Based on the Needs Analysis, the Council’s evidence highlights the issue of general house price affordability in the District, plus an exceptionally high need for affordable housing exacerbated by a significant shortfall in supply. It also identifies the importance of small sites in providing affordable housing with contributions from small sites amounting to over £2.1 million since 2011 being spent towards the delivery of 38 affordable dwellings. A further Needs Analysis following publication of the revised Framework in July 2018 demonstrated that housing stress had increased since 2016. The Council has therefore revisited its position following the update to national policy. There is no evidence before me that affordable housing contributions are acting as a brake on development. Rather, the evidence is that contributions from small sites collected since the policy was adopted in 2011 are delivering affordable housing on the ground. Due to its recentness and the clear conclusions that can be drawn from it, I give this local evidence substantial weight. It underpins the approach in Policy CP4 as an exception to national policy.”
- APP/P1940/W/19/3230911, 67 & 69 St Georges Drive, Carpenders Park, Decision date 22nd October 2019:**

“The Council has undertaken several needs analyses, the latest being July 2018, to demonstrate the acute shortage of affordable housing in the District, especially in light of high house prices and that much of the District is also constrained by the Metropolitan Green Belt. It further highlights the importance small sites make to the contribution to the overall provision of affordable housing. Up until the end of March 2017 there has only been 22.6% of affordable housing provision which falls short of the policy requirement of 45% The shortfall demonstrates that the provision of affordable housing is still very much needed, such that Policy CP4 should continue to apply to small sites, despite the Framework and the WMS. In light of the Council’s

body of evidence that demonstrates the particular housing circumstances and needs of the District, I attach substantial weight to this local evidence and consider that the national policy position does not outweigh the development plan and Policy CP4 in this instance.”

- **APP/P1940/W/19/3230458, 19 Lynwood Heights, Rickmansworth,**

Decision date 11th October 2019:

“The Council states that its Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2010) has demonstrated that there is a significant affordable housing need locally due to very high house prices and rents and a constricted supply of suitable housing sites. Further, the South West Hertfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2016) estimated a net affordable housing need of 14,191 in the District between 2013-36 and there is also a worsening situation with regards to affordability. Based on the Councils evidence the District is the 7th most expensive local authority area in England and Wales in 2016 and demonstrates that its application of Policy CP4 has delivered a significant contribution of over £2.1 million towards the delivery of affordable housing without disrupting the supply of small residential sites. Decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The robust evidence referred to in footnote 1 and the clear need to deliver affordable housing in the District underpins the Council’s approach in Policy CP4 as an exception to national policy and therefore in this case, the Framework’s threshold would not outweigh the conflict with the development plan. I therefore attach considerable weight to Policy CP4. I am also referred to a number of recent appeal decisions in the District which support this approach and are therefore relevant to the scheme before me and as such carry considerable weight.”

- **APP/P1940/W/18/3213370: No.9 Lapwing Way, Abbots Langley.**

Decision Date 22nd May 2019:

“In considering whether provision should be made for affordable housing, there are two matters that need to be addressed. Firstly, whether in principle the provisions of Policy CP4 are outweighed by more recent Government policy. Secondly, if not, whether for reasons of financial viability a contribution is not required... There is no evidence before me that the application of Policy CP4 has put a brake on small windfall sites coming forward. Indeed, such sites have contributed over £2m to the affordable housing pot since 2011... Decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. There are very important factors in support of the continued application of Policy CP4. These factors are not unique to Three Rivers. Government policy does not suggest that areas where affordability is a particular issue should be treated differently. Nonetheless, although a weighty matter, the national policy threshold is not a material consideration which outweighs the conflict with the development plan in this case. In making this policy judgment I have given considerable but not full weight to Policy CP4. I have also had regard to the other appeal decisions in the south-east referred to by the Council where Inspectors considered development plan policies seeking affordable housing against national policy. My approach is consistent with these decisions.”

- **APP/P1940/W/19/3219890: 4 Scots Hill, Croxley Green**

Decision Date 5th May 2019:

Whilst the appeal was allowed the Inspector considered that when “having regard to TRDCS Policy CP4 and the Council’s Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2011, I consider that a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing is necessary. A draft unilateral undertaking was submitted at appeal stage and was agreed by the Council.”

- **APP/1940/W/19/3229274: 101 Durrants Drive, Croxley Green**

Decision Date 16th August 2019:

“Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise... Therefore, I find that the proposal would fail to make appropriate

provision for affordable housing and as such, would be contrary to policy CP4 of the CS which seeks to secure such provision, which although does not attract full weight, in light of the evidence provided, attracts significant weight sufficient to outweigh paragraph 63 of the Framework.”

- **APP/P1940/W/19/3229038: 124 Greenfield Avenue**

Decision Date 10th December 2019

“Furthermore, windfall sites make up the majority of the proposals in a District which is constrained by the Green Belt and so delivery of affordable housing from these sites is crucial. The submitted evidence supports the proportion of housing proposals which have been on small sites in the last few years. There is no evidence before me that seeking affordable housing on small sites has precluded small windfall sites coming forward – indeed such sites have contributed a significant amount to the affordable housing pot since 2011... Overall, there is substantial evidence of considerable affordable housing need in the District and it has been demonstrated that small sites make an important contribution to affordable housing delivery in the Borough. I attach very significant weight to this consideration. Whilst the Framework is a material consideration of very considerable weight, based on the local circumstances of this case, in this instance the Framework does not outweigh the relevant development plan policy.”

- **APP/P1940/W/19/3238285: Bell Public House, 117 Primrose Hill, Kings Langley**
Decision Date 9th March 2020

“Even taking the appellants figures that 22.8% of affordable units have arisen from non major sites, I consider this to be an important and meaningful contribution...even taking the appellant’s figures my conclusion remains unaltered.”

- **APP/P1940/W/19/3229189: Glenwood, Harthall Lane, Kings Langley**
Decision Date 7th May 2020

“The Council’s evidence sets out the acute need for affordable housing in the area and the importance of small sites in contributing to the provision of such housing. They also highlighted a large number of recent appeal decisions for small residential schemes where it has been considered that the exceptional local need should outweigh government policy, as set out in the Framework... Despite the appellant’s evidence, which included reference to a Local Plan Consultation Document (October 2018) and an analysis undertaken by them based on the Council’s Housing Land Supply Update (December 2018), it was clear to me, in the light of all the evidence before me, that a pressing need for affordable housing in the area remains. It was also clear that small sites play a key role in ensuring this provision. As such, in this case, I am satisfied that although considerable weight should be given to the Framework, it does not outweigh the development plan policy.”

- **APP/P1940/W/20/3249107: 2 Church Cottages, Old Uxbridge Road, West Hyde**
Decision Date: 21st October 2020

“The Framework at paragraph 63 sets out that the provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments other than in designated rural areas where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer. That said, there is clear evidence to suggest that there is an acute need for affordable housing in the Three Rivers District and there have been several appeal decisions which supported this view... I agree that there are special circumstances which justify the provision of affordable housing below the Framework’s suggested threshold... As a result, the proposal would be contrary to Policy CP4 of the CS which amongst other matters seeks to increase the provision of affordable homes including by means of a commuted sum payment for sites of between one and nine dwellings... I have also had regard to the obvious benefits in relation to the provision of a much-needed new dwelling. However, the benefits of this are outweighed by the lack of provision for affordable housing”

- **APP/P1940/W/20/3259397 24 Wyatts Road**
Decision Date 8th February 2021

“...I consider that the specific circumstances within this district together with the updated evidence to support Policy CP4 are sufficient, in this case, to outweigh the guidance of the Framework.”

- **APP/P1940/W/20/3260602: 8-10 Claremont Crescent, Croxley Green**

Decision Date 18th February 2021

“The Council’s case is that Policy CP4 should continue to apply to all housing developments, notwithstanding its lack of consistency with the more recent Framework. In justifying this position, it has provided robust evidence of a high affordable housing need in the district as well as an independent viability assessment in relation to this appeal. Furthermore, a number of similar appeal decisions, cited by the Council, show that Inspectors have considered development plan policies with lower affordable housing thresholds to outweigh national policy given the local evidence of substantial affordable housing need. Whilst the Framework is a material consideration of very considerable weight, based on the local circumstances of this case, in this instance it does not outweigh the relevant development plan policy. In making this judgement, I have given considerable but not full weight to Policy CP4.”

- **APP/P1940/W/20/3244533 2 Canterbury Way**

Decision Date 4th March 2021

“Over the plan period there have been times when the Council have applied Policy CP4 of the CS and times when they have not. I accept that this may have implications for the delivery of non-major sites, perhaps encouraging whether or not developers will bring forward proposals. However, it cannot be the only factor which influences whether or not such sites are brought forward. Furthermore, there is no substantive evidence to suggest that if Policy CP4 of the CS was not applied it would significantly increase the supply of housing in the district. Moreover, Policy CP4 of the CS was subject to an assessment of viability alongside all other requirements through the Local Plan process... Overall, on the basis of the evidence before me I am not convinced that the Council’s application of Policy CP4 of the CS is directly discouraging developers from bringing forward small sites due to the need to provide or contribute towards affordable housing or demonstrate that it viably cannot... housing affordability in the district is acute such that, based on the specific circumstances of this case and the evidence presented, I find on balance the proposal should make appropriate provision for affordable housing.”

- **APP/P1940/W/20/3260554: Land adjacent to 2 Coles Farm**

Decision Date 15th June 2021

“The appellant’s comments regarding the importance of small sites is noted as is the Council’s lack of a five-year housing land supply. Despite this, the proposal is required to secure a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing, however, at the point of determination no executable undertaking is before me... The proposal would be contrary to CS Policy CP4 and the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document 2011 which require all new development resulting in a net gain of one or more dwellings to contribute to the provision of affordable housing.”

Conclusion

- 2.27 Planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Having regard to the Framework as a material consideration of significant weight, officers' view is that the local evidence of affordable housing need continues to deserve significant weight in deciding whether, for the purposes of Section 38(6), the revised Framework policies weigh sufficiently against the Core Strategy Policy CP4. Having undertaken this assessment in 2017 and further reviewed it post the new NPPF in 2018, in December 2019, December 2020 and February 2022 with regard to more up to date evidence, where available, officers are of the view that the Framework does not outweigh the weight to be attached to the local evidence of affordable housing need. That evidence shows that the need for affordable housing in Three Rivers is great and the contribution that small sites have made has been significant. Furthermore comparisons

between 2016 and 2020 ONS data shows that the affordability of housing in Three Rivers is deteriorating year on year and the need for affordable housing is growing. As such proposals for the residential development of sites of 10 dwellings or less (not “major development”) will currently be expected to contribute towards the provision of affordable housing in accordance with Policy CP4 as a condition of grant. The Council will keep this evidence under review.

Appendix 1: Appeal Decisions 3146699 (Elmbridge Borough Council), 315661 (Reading Borough Council), 3142834 (South Cambridgeshire District Council) and Islington Borough Council (3154751, 3164313, 3174582, 3177927 and 3182729), Three Rivers District Council (3222318, 3221363, 3225445, 3230999, 3230911, 3230458, 3213370, 3219890, 3229274, 3238285, 3229189, 3249107)

Appendix 2: Letter from the Planning Inspectorate to Richmond and Wandsworth Councils, March 2017

Sources Used:

1. Core Strategy (October 2011)
<http://www.threerivers.gov.uk/eqcl-page/core-strategy>
2. Annual Monitoring Report 2020/2021 (December 2021)
<http://www.threerivers.gov.uk/eqcl-page/annual-monitoring-report>
3. Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (June 2011)
<http://www.threerivers.gov.uk/eqcl-page/supplementary-planning-documents>
4. South West Hertfordshire Local Housing Needs Assessment (August 2020)
<https://www.threerivers.gov.uk/eqcl-page/new-local-plan-evidence-base>
5. Office of National Statistics Housing Data 2002-20
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/housing/datasets/ratioofhousepricetoresidencebasedearningslowerquartileandmedian>

February 2022