

LPP2 EXAMINATION TOPICS

13th July 2016 hearing. Comments by John Hayter, resident of Bishops Waltham

Respondent 408914723

Matter 16:

i) Bearing in mind the funding required, is the plan economically viable and practically achievable in the timescales envisaged and in the ways proposed ?

ii) Will the monitoring proposed be sufficiently comprehensive and informative ?

- 7.1 Defines one of the purposes of the AMR as *To monitor the effectiveness of LDD policies*

The plan has to meet all of the LDD policies simultaneously but the AMR considers them individually without considering interactions.

- 7.2 refers to the AMR monitoring new housing and employment but not AH. The AMR's report AH but do not monitor because there is no delivery trajectory to monitor against

- Matter 1 i)B provided evidence that AH supply over the last 3 years averaged only 14% pa of the 20 year annual build rate and was not increasing.

- The AMR breaches Reg 34 2.5 bullet 3 to " Specify the number of net additional dwellings (including affordable dwellings) during the report period and since the policy began" by not giving the AH information since the LPP1 policy began.

- Correspondingly the 5 year supply is monitored purely on net new build numbers without regard to simultaneously meet the requirement to viably provide 40% AH with a mix of dwelling types, tenures and sizes for a range of special needs.

- Similarly there is an overriding need to mitigate as well as adapt to climate change and reduce carbon footprint by including renewable energy generation, site design and location to reduce travel that conflict with *character* requirements in many policies.

- The relative weight to be given to these policies cannot be determined without monitoring delivery against all the interrelated policies.

- LPP1 and LPP2 policies in many cases are not written in a way that enables monitoring in the AMR and thus no assurance that they can and are viably and practically delivered or when.