



Ministry of Housing,  
Communities &  
Local Government

Simon Gallagher  
Director, Planning  
**Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local  
Government**  
Fry Building  
2 Marsham street  
London  
SW1P 4DF

[www.gov.uk/mhclg](http://www.gov.uk/mhclg)

Leigh Palmer  
Interim Head of Planning  
Lewes District Council and Eastbourne Borough  
Council  
Via email

Date: **22 October 2019**

Dear Leigh,

Following our correspondence, we have considered the evidence you have provided and agree that the Housing Delivery Test score for Lewes District Council ('Lewes') should be revised.

You brought to our attention that notwithstanding the partial quashing of policies SP1 and SP2 of the Local Plan Part 1, as they relate to South Downs National Park Authority (Wealden v SSCLG [2017] EWHC 351 (Admin)), Part 1 of the Plan was not quashed as it relates to Lewes.

The unique circumstances of Lewes' situation, in particular the partial quashing of the joint plan by the Wealden judgment, still requires MHCLG to determine a reasonable housing requirement in line with the HDT rulebook.

In terms of the requirement figure, you confirmed to MHCLG, as a result of the Wealden judgment, supported by Tables 4 and 5 of Local Plan Part 1, that the housing requirement figure inside of the South Downs National Park is **1,252** excluding windfalls. This is to be subtracted from the overall housing requirement which you have confirmed to be **6,926**, as confirmed by the distribution breakdown within Spatial Policy 2 of Local Plan Part 1. The resultant total is **5,674**. In establishing the windfalls that also need to be accounted for, we have accepted your information on windfall delivery which identifies **180** to be met in South Downs National Park. Removing this from the residual requirement would give Lewes a housing requirement figure of **5,494, 275** (rounded) annual average over the plan period.

Based on this information above, the resultant housing requirement figure is lower than household projections in each of the monitoring years, this results in a housing requirement of **824 (rounded)** for the period from 2015 to 2018. As this housing requirement does not apply to the National Park, it is right that Lewes should not benefit from delivery of homes within the National Park. This requires the deduction of 92 homes, delivered in the National Park, from the published net additional dwellings statistic over the period (801). **This results in delivery of 709 for the period from 2015 to 2018.**

I am therefore in a position to confirm that Lewes' revised 2018 measurement is as follows:

Number of homes required			Total number of homes required	Number of homes delivered*			Total number of homes delivered	Housing Delivery Test: 2018 measurement	Housing Delivery Test: 2018 consequence
2015-16	2016-17	2017-18		2015-16	2016-17	2017-18			
275	275	275	824	257	167	285	709	86%	Action Plan

\* Once applying adjustment for delivery with the National Park.

**For the avoidance of doubt, this letter supersedes the measurement for your local authority area which was published on 29 August 2019 and takes effect from the time of issue.** We do not usually amend Housing Delivery Test results but have done so here given your unique circumstances. However, the new result, and the method of calculating the decision, do not bind the Secretary of State in any future Housing Delivery Test calculation. Upon receipt of this letter, this result will remain in place until the next full publication of the Housing Delivery Test measurement.

Yours sincerely,



Simon Gallagher