

## ROSSENDALE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

### MATTER 4 HEARING STATEMENT OF THE PEEL GROUP (REPRESENTOR ID 5160)

**Issue – Have affordable housing needs, traveller accommodation needs and the housing needs of other groups been satisfactorily assessed and addressed in the Plan in line with national policy?**

**a) What is the total affordable housing need over the plan period (overall and by affordable housing type)**

1.1 The SHMA Update 2019 (Evidence Base Document EB002) identifies a need for between 102 and 170 affordable homes in Rossendale per annum over the plan period (total of between 1,530 and 2,550 between 2019 and 2034).

**b) How will the affordable housing need be met (overall and by affordable housing type and from which sources)**

1.2 Affordable housing would be principally delivered through a requirement that market housing schemes provide a proportion of units as affordable. The realistic provision of affordable housing is therefore intrinsically linked to and reliant on the delivery of market housing. This is reflected in Policy HS6 which requires the provision of 30% of units on all residential schemes to be provided as affordable homes, subject to site considerations (including viability).

1.3 Evidently, at this level of provision the housing supply identified has a low level of affordable housing capacity relative to the need. The theoretical affordable housing capacity of the identified housing land supply based on 30% provision is just 64 dwellings per year (30% of 3,180). This alone justifies an increase in the planned housing requirement such that this is able to deliver additional affordable housing given the need – supply gap. This is considered further in Peel’s Matter 3 Statement.

1.4 In reality, the identified supply will not deliver that level of affordable housing for number of reasons. Most notably, the Council’s own evidence base (Rossendale Local Plan Economic Viability Assessment 2019 EB019) demonstrates a limited level of viability to provide affordable housing across the Borough. In the defined Zone 1 area (Bacup and Stacksteads) affordable housing is not viable at any level on brownfield sites of any size and density. Affordable housing is shown to be viable at 10% on larger sites developed at a high density only. Zones 2 to 4 are progressively more viable. As an example, in Zone 3 (Rawtenstall, Haslingden, North and South Rural Areas) 20% is viable within certain parameters on brownfield sites and at 30% in most circumstances on greenfield sites. Affordable housing is most viable in Zone 4 (Helmshore, Edenfield, Parts of West Rawtenstall and Haslingden) including at 30%.

1.5 The Council’s evidence therefore demonstrates that the Borough faces significant constraints to the delivery of affordable housing, with 30% being viable only in limited

circumstances. This in itself demonstrates that the prospects of delivering anything more than a handful of affordable units per annum are extremely limited.

- 1.6 This is significantly compounded by the spatial distribution of housing allocations across the Borough, with significant reliance on allocations in the weakest market areas (Zones 1 and 2) in the east of the Borough, which appears to be driven principally by a desire to minimise Green Belt releases. This has inevitable adverse consequences, most notably in respect of affordable housing delivery.
- 1.7 Both the proposed spatial distribution of housing and the constrained overall housing land supply will significantly hamper efforts to deliver affordable housing therefore. Delivery will fall alarmingly short of the identified need. The need to address these points are considered in further detail in Matter Statements 2, 3 and 19.

**Questions c) to t)**

- 1.8 No response at this stage.