

flexibility and thus aid delivery.

Five year land supply

40. The NPPF requires local planning authorities to identify a supply of sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with, in this case an additional buffer of 5%³⁶. Based on 10,060 the Authorities calculate there to be a 3.5 year supply of housing sites (a shortfall of 936 dwellings). This is a significant problem. The NPPF advises that where a five year supply cannot be demonstrated relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered to be up to date, which would include policies in this Plan the day it is adopted.
41. The District Council has adopted an interim housing policy which seeks to bring forward suitable sites quickly. As indicated above the evidence from the latest SHLAA indicates that there are sufficient sites to accommodate the Local Plan target. The District Council is also committed to moving swiftly after the adoption of this Plan to the production of its Local Plan: Allocations plan. In the National Park, the Petersfield Planning Group is producing a Neighbourhood Plan for the town and expect to be at publicity stage by mid 2014. The Authorities estimate that, counting planning applications submitted and pending, there could be in excess of 5 years supply of housing sites within 6 months.
42. Whilst this is encouraging there is no guarantee that the Allocations and Neighbourhood Plans will progress as quickly as the Authorities would like or that planning applications will be made or permissions granted. The fact remains that contrary to national guidance, the District currently lacks a five year supply of housing.
43. The Authorities, through the adoption of this Plan, propose to delete reserve housing sites allocated under Policy H2 of the East Hampshire Local Plan: Second Review. Those sites were only to be released in the result of a shortfall in the strategic housing supply for Hampshire. Any undeveloped reserve sites were to be re-assessed during any review taking into account, amongst other things, national policy and whether there is a need for sites to be allocated. It was envisaged that the less sustainable reserve sites allocated in the Second Review Local Plan would be replaced by sites that are considered to be more sustainable.
44. The reserve sites at Four Marks and Liphook have planning permission for 110 and 155 units respectively and the Authorities have no objection to the retention of the reserve site in Liss (25 units). That leaves 4 sites in Petersfield with a potential of 565 units. I note that one of the sites is not favoured by either the Petersfield Planning Group or the NPA. The National Park did not exist when the Second Review Local Plan was adopted but Petersfield lay within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the landscape of which benefits from the same level of protection as a National Park. The Inspector who examined the Second Review Local Plan clearly considered all the reserve sites to be suitable for housing, otherwise they would not have

³⁶ There is no record of persistent under delivery; Appendix 5 CD11/H36