

Cabinet - 10 February 2022

Written question from Cllr Peter Spink to the Leader, Isle of Wight Council

1. Has Cabinet received a reply to the 2 letters written to Government re lifting the tilted balance (3 December 2021)?

Answer –

No

2. Will Cabinet ensure that the R 19 Draft Island Planning Strategy (DIPS) together with summary and supporting evidence papers will be served not less than 10 working days before the relevant meeting of the Corporate Scrutiny Committee?

Answer –

The IPS, IPS summary document and associated housing evidence papers will be published on 4 April, which is five clear working days before the Corporate Scrutiny Committee on 12 April. This is the Council's standard approach to publishing papers in advance of a meeting.

3. Will the Cabinet further ensure that the critique of the Report of the Task and Finish Group, together with the legal advice upon which the critique is based (as referred to in the email of Cllr Fuller dated 15/12) will be served in accordance with the above time-limit?

Answer –

A summary of all responses received on the Draft IPS, including the Task & Finish Group report, and how the IPS has been revised, where appropriate, to reflect these responses, will be published as a Consultation Statement alongside the IPS when it is published for public representation. Producing a Consultation Statement, which will be considered by the Planning Inspector, is a statutory requirement. The evidence papers will include the relevant legal advice relied upon when preparing the IPS and evidence papers.

The Consultation Statement will identify and summarise the issues raised through the consultation undertaken to date. As already stated we will be publishing our Consultation Statement alongside the IPS for public representation, but should the Scrutiny Committee wish to see a more detailed response to the T&FG report then this will of course be provided by officers as part of the papers to be published on 4 April.

4. Does Cabinet agree that the summary of the DIPS should represent a clear and balanced precis of the contents of the DIPS? If yes, does cabinet agree that as an absolute minimum the summary should make the following clear
 - a) the reduced figure of 486 units to be built per annum is a **minimum** figure.
 - b) with regard to the 75 sites, allocated for development, that have been removed from the DIPS 51 "**could**" (i) **and/or are expected and desired** (ii) to come forward for development.

Answer –

Yes, any summary document of the IPS should represent a clear and balanced summary of the contents of the IPS;

Yes, the summary should make clear that the housing number in the IPS is a minimum, as required by the NPPF;

Yes, the summary should be clear that other sites, in addition to those allocated in the IPS, could come forward for development

5. Does Cabinet agree that the summary should inform the reader thereof of the allocated development and the provisions for unallocated development in their area (either by description or by reference to the relevant pages in the DIPS)?

Answer –

Yes the summary should inform the reader by making clear references to where in the main IPS document the reader can find development allocated in particular areas of the island, together with information on how and when other sites could come forward for development in particular areas.

It is noted that should sites for new homes that are not proposed for allocation in the IPS come forward under the policy provisions referenced in the question, they would be sites that would be expected to provide 100% affordable housing and/or be on previously developed land (also known as brownfield land).

A key point here is that with a new plan that resets our housing number to a more realistic and Island appropriate number, it also means that our Five Year Land Supply and Housing Delivery Test requirements are reset. Assuming we are meeting these requirements, we will have a choice about we permit development under these policy provisions or not, as we would no longer be under the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

The use of sites, regardless of whether they are allocated or not, that are for an expected 100% affordable new homes and/or on brownfield land is something that I am sure all sides of the Chamber will welcome and support.

- i) **Evidence Paper B July 2021 para 4.7: “It is important to note that of the 75 sites removed from the first Draft IPS, 51 could still come forward for development** under the Rural / First Homes exception sites policy (34) or new brownfield sites policy (17). Of the 13 new sites suggested to IWC during and since the last IPS consultation that have not been taken forward as allocations, four can still come forward under the aforementioned policies. This position aligns with the housing number of 486 dwellings per annum within the Draft IPS not being a target to aim for in line with the NPPF. Windfall dwellings delivered through policies H7 and H9 would be in addition to the planned growth on allocated and permitted sites”.
- ii) **Evidence Paper C July 2021: “A significant factor to set out is that the number in the IPS is a minimum**, rather than a ceiling or target and the policies are focused on securing the housing that is most needed on the sites allocated – **it is inevitable, and indeed expected and desired, for other sustainable sites to come forward** and deliver a market facing solution that may pick up many elements discussed in this paper. Other policies in the plan, including the Previously Developed Land policy (H9) and the Rural & First Homes Exception Sites policy (H7) provide routes for additional units to be delivered over and above the allocations within the IPS”.