

## Reading Local Plan EIP

### Matter 3: Housing, including Five Year Supply of Housing Land

*Issue 1: Will the Council be able to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land on adoption of the LPPU?*

3.1 Will the LPPU provide a 5-year supply of deliverable sites against the LPPU's target of 825 dwellings per annum on adoption?

On the basis of the trajectory submitted in EX003 the Council will have a five year land supply on adoption.

3.2 Is the housing trajectory at Appendix 1 of the LPPU realistic and does it align with the Summary Infrastructure Delivery Schedule at Table 10.2 of the LPPU and the Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (May 2025) [EV005]?

No comment.

3.3 Are the assumptions and analysis regarding site suitability, availability and achievability and development capacity in the Reading Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA) [EV015 and EV016] reasonable and realistic? In particular, are the identified capacities for sites justified?

HBF does not generally comment on specific sites and their capacity. However, the Council will need to be able to provide justification as to why specific sites are expected to come forward as stated within EX03. Where major sites without a planning permission are considered to be deliverable the Council will need to provide clear evidence, as set out in NPPF, housing completion will begin within the next five years. Typically, HBF would suggest that for larger strategic sites such evidence must include the involvement of a house builder with a clear commitment to submit an application within the next year and commence construction within the next four years for any homes to be considered deliverable within five years. For example, Hosier Street (CR12e) which is owned by the Council is expected to start delivering homes from 2029/30 but as yet there is no timetable for submission of a planning application with EVO16 also stating that no developer partner has been identified to deliver the scheme. Whilst we do not question that the site is developable there does not appear to be clear evidence that this will be achieved in the next five years.

3.4 Does the evidence give sufficient confidence that allocated sites will be deliverable and developable in accordance with the Framework?

See above.

3.5 Is there compelling evidence to show that windfall schemes coming forward on small sites will provide a reliable source of supply as anticipated in the LPPU?

No comment

3.6 What is the annual need for affordable housing and the total affordable housing need over the plan period? Has the need for affordable housing been accurately calculated and based on robust, up-to date data? Has this need been calculated in accordance with the PPG? What is the past record for affordable housing completions and forms of delivery? How does the Council consider this will change in the future?

No comment

3.7 What are the identified needs for specialist housing, for example housing for older and disabled people and student accommodation, within the overall housing need for Reading? How will these needs be met?

For Council.

**Issue 2: Are the policies for housing positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy?**

3.8 What is the evidential basis for the density and mix of housing in Policy H2?

No comment

3.9 Is Policy H2 justified and effective?

No comment

3.10 Is Policy H3 justified, effective, and consistent with national policy?

3.11 Is Policy H3 consistent with the PPG with regard to viability review mechanisms? Where would viability review mechanisms be appropriate and what are the clear process and terms of engagement explaining how and when viability will be reassessed?

Needs to be more specific as to the situations with regard to review mechanisms – must be applied appropriately ...

3.12 What is the rationale behind the tenure mix in Policy H3? Is this justified?

No comment.

3.13 Is Policy H4 justified? What is the evidential basis behind the amendment to part 2 of Policy H4 in respect of a further three-year tenancy?

No comment

3.14 Is Policy H5 justified, effective, and consistent with national policy? Is it accompanied by a robust and up-to-date evidence base?

Our concerns with regard to clause C of H5 are set out in our response to Matter 4 question 4.3.

3.15 Is Policy H6 justified and supported by robust and up-to-date evidence?

No comment

3.16 Would Policy H8 be justified and effective? How would Policy H8 be implemented as drafted? Does the supporting text support Policy H8 effectively?

No comment

3.17 Is Policy H12 justified and based on robust and up-to-date evidence?

No comment

3.18 Is the approach taken to renewal and regeneration of residential areas in Policy H14 justified and effective?

No comment

3.19 With regard to purpose-built shared living accommodation, is Policy H15 justified, consistent with national policy, and supported by a robust, up-to-date evidence base?

No comment

**Mark Behrendt**

**Regional Planning Manager – SE and E**