

Appendix MDB2

Assessment of Deliverability of Allocated and Large Identified Sites

1. I first started examining the delivery of housing on identified housing sites in 1977 whilst in the employ of West Sussex County Council. That work included interviews with development managers, and sales managers on site and at their offices. I have used and expanded that experience throughout my career in private practice and have given evidence at four major public inquiries in the midlands in the last two years. I also gave evidence at public inquiry on this subject in Weymouth earlier this year. I have assisted a valuation colleague in development viability appraisals. I also live in West Dorset. I have used all of my accumulated knowledge in this assessment to analyse the individual site reports appended to the 2014 SHLAA.
2. My Findings are as follows:-

ALLOCATED SITES

- a. BEAM1 relates to a site west of Beaminster, which is a small town, remote from the main transport network. The trajectory anticipates delivery of 40 dwellings per annum, beginning in 2016. In my experience a more realistic assessment would be 25 dwellings per annum.
- b. Four sites are identified in Bridport with a total capacity over five years of 393. BRID 1 Vearse Farm is a large site of 760 dwellings. Construction rates are shown as being 100 dwellings per annum. In my experience it is unlikely that such a site would deliver more than 50 dwellings per annum.
- c. BRID 5, St Michaels Trading Estate is still in active use including specialist retailers, craft workshops, regular markets and auctions. There have been problems with regard to the change of planning permission, the latest setback being the identification of one of the buildings as a Listed Building. No planning permission currently exists. Footnote 11 to the NPPF states that *"To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, of a suitable location for development now and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on*

the site within five years, in particular that development of the site is viable". The site is not available now, there is an existing use which is viable in that the buildings are occupied by people paying rents. Any planning permission for residential development would have to show clear margin above existing use value, plus a developer's profit in order to be viable. In my opinion, there is no realistic prospect of this site being delivering housing within five years.

- d. Site CHIC2, Chickerell Urban Extension is a site on which housing will be delivered. Again I would question how much is likely to be delivered within five years. It depends to some extent on how many developers are involved. If it is a single developer I would not expect more than 50-75 dwellings per annum to be built. There will be a lead-in period in terms of obtaining full planning permission, Building Regulations approval and infrastructure development. A figure of 75 dwellings would be more realistic, in my opinion.
- e. Site DOR4, Charles Street, Dorchester is a redevelopment site which is currently in use as a public car park, which is intensively used throughout the week. Redevelopment would require displacement of that car park, which is the subject of considerable objection by local businesses. There are other constraints including the need to accommodate archaeological excavation and preservation. I consider that in terms of Footnote 11 this site is not deliverable now and should not be included in the five year housing land supply.
- f. St Georges Road requires infrastructure improvement, including the completion of the existing planning permission north St Georges Road to provide an alternative means of access. There is no planning permission at the present time and this site should not be considered to be available now and therefore it should be excluded from the five year housing land supply.
- g. LITT1, Littlemore Urban Extension. Clearly this is a comprehensive development area which requires a master plan and substantial infrastructure. It is also within the area of outstanding natural beauty. It has no planning permission at the present time and for that reason should not be regarded as available now and should be excluded from this calculation. It is however opposite land which is currently being developed on the south side of the road. There is a possibility, however remote, that some development could be achieved within five years and for that reason it might be reasonable to include something like 50 dwellings within five years.

- h. Woodberry Down at Lyme Regis LYME1. That is in the north of the town, access is poor, it does not have planning permission. It is clearly not available now and I should be totally excluded from the five year land supply.
- i. PORT2 – Osprey Quay. This site, clearly adjacent to existing urban development and whilst a planning permission does not currently exist, there is no doubt that this site could be developed within five years.
- j. SHER4 – Former Gas Works at Sherborne. This site does not have planning permission, cannot be regarded as available now, probably suffers from contamination and should not be included in the five year land supply.
- k. WEY10 – Markham and Little Francis has a planning permission for 180 dwellings, the trajectory comes very close to what was indicated the Public Inquiry into the Planning Appeal. Infrastructure works are currently taking place on that site and I would expect building to commence building houses in 2015. I therefore consider that 90 dwellings on this site is realistic.
- l. WEY 12, Wey Valley, is different from Markham and Little Francis. The site has no planning permission, access is from what is effectively a country Lane. I anticipate there would be substantial objection. Bearing in mind that planning permission does not already exist, I consider that it does not qualify as available now.
- m. WEY13. The Old Rectory, Lawton Lane has been the subject of a number of planning permissions, refusals of planning permission and whilst clearly a developable site, it is by no means certain that this can be delivered within five years.

LARGE IDENTIFIED SITES IN THE 2014 SHLAA

- n. There are several sites identified in Bridport, which are in existing use for employment purposes. They are clearly not available or deliverable now and should be excluded.
- o. Bridport, Flood Lane, Site 060. This site was identified by a Planning Officer not by a site owner, within a flood risk area, with potential noise from the A35, has an existing use value as a former school, training centre and residential home. Development is said to be viable the basis of that statement is not explained. There is no evidence as to deliverability. The site should be excluded.
- p. The Court House, Site 065 – Existing Court House building, open site, significant trees, some flood risk, private drive, contamination unknown, identified by Officer

to be viable, but with no evidence. This site is not available now and should be deleted.

- q. Broadwindsor, Site 012 – The current use is as a Craft Centre and car park. It clearly has existing use value, potential for contamination nearby. Identified through Officer's survey and requires closure of the Craft Centre. This site is not available now and should not be included.
- r. Charminster – High Ridge, North Street, Site 015 – This is the site of a house with garden area and paddocks. On the outside of a defined built up area. Identification of 30 units seems excessive in the context of adjoining development and Conservation Area. The site is not suitable now and therefore ought to be excluded.
- s. Dorchester – Stratton House Campus, Site 015 – Conservation Area and Listed Building. Contamination unknown. Recent planning application in part successful but there is a substantial objection from English Heritage to the proposals for the Listed building.
- t. Dorchester – Thayles Building, Pacey Combe Way Site 021 – This site is within Poundbury. Elsewhere in the Strategic Housing Land Availability the report identified an average completion on Poundbury of 108 dwellings per annum. To include this site would amount to duplication. The site was identified by Officers, not by stakeholder. There is no evidence of delivery and should be excluded.
- u. Damers First School, site 022, is an existing First School. It is currently not available. The development of the new School at Poundbury has not yet commenced. Until that has been built and children can be relocated, this site cannot be made available and should be excluded.
- v. Dorchester Barracks Site 025 – Previously used as offices for Dorset County Council, surrounded by other employment uses. Listed Building identified by Officers. Viability assessment. This site is not available now and should be deleted.
- w. Dorchester – Wessex Water Site 028 – This is currently occupied as a Wessex Water Depot. It was identified by Officers, no Viability Assessment. There is no evidence of delivery. This site should be excluded.
- x. Dorchester – Peverell Avenue East – Poundbury Site 030 – This is yet another site at Poundbury where the Local Planning Authority has already made an assessment of the annual delivery. This one is a further duplication. Furthermore

it is on part of a site allocated for the replacement First School. The potential density of 147 dwellings per hectare looks excessive. There is no Viability Assessment that I am aware of. This site should also be excluded.

- y. A number of sites in Weymouth have been identified which are open spaces previously provided by Developers in order to enable planning permission to be granted for residential development. These are recreation spaces which should be excluded from the five year land supply.
- z. Land West of Sports Centre Weymouth College – No known constraints, but density is high and there is no planning permission. This should not be regarded as developable now.
- aa. Commercial premises Waverley Road - RAD001 – This is a site in commercial use and has a lapsed consent from 2010, which indicates that there is no intention of developing the site any time soon. Its existing use value probably exceeds development value. This site should be excluded.
- bb. Land north of Sports Centre, Weymouth College – RAD007 – This is the College playing field, currently laid out and used for that purpose, adjoining Lodmore Park. Some flood risk. Access is through the College car park. There is a former landfill site within 50 metres. Proposed open space in the Adopted Local Plan. A requirement would be provisional alternative sports provision. This site should not be included as available within five years.
- cc. Land at Knightsdale Road – WESE001 – This does not have direct access from Knightsdale Road. Adjacent to a flood zone. Multiple ownership, therefore although pre-application discussions, this site should not be regarded as being available now and therefore should be excluded. The potential density shown is more than double the density in the local area.
- dd. Westway Road – This site has current land uses include gas holder, offices and Magistrates Court. A Flood Risk Assessment is required. Contamination likely. It is clearly not available now and should not have been included.
- ee. Rochester Court – WESW003 – The site is an existing elderly persons home. Numbers unknown, however it is unlikely the proposed density of development would result in any net increase in residential accommodation. The NPP has clarified that Care Home spaces should be included as part of a land supply. This should be excluded from the five year housing land supply.

- ff. Ferrybridge Inn – WYKE010 – This site is well known to me. It is at risk of flooding. My Company carried out a Viability Assessment which determined that this level of development was not viable on this site. It should be excluded from the five year housing land supply.