What are the primary barriers to housing delivery that exist on the island?

What are the realistic options for removing or improving the identified constraints on housing delivery?

Legal advice sought by the council on its approach to planning for a housing requirement (based upon locally specific constraints on delivery) lower than the housing need derived from the Government's standard methodology, advised the council should look at the reasons why the delivery is constrained and explore any realistic options for removing or improving these constraints on delivery. This should include consideration of any *'innovative steps'* that could be taken to achieve delivery of the standard method housing number (currently 730 dpa as of April 2022).

This paper aims to summarise the primary barriers to housing delivery on the Isle of Wight identified by various sources and then consider what realistic options exist for removing or improving the identified constraints on housing delivery, including the potential for these options to be delivered through the local plan, the Island Planning Strategy. The main sources of information drawn on for this exercise were:

- Phase 1: Housing Delivery on the Isle of Wight, University of Portsmouth, October 2019
- Phase 2: Housing Delivery on the Isle of Wight, University of Portsmouth, November 2019
- Isle of Wight – Provision of Affordable Housing, Intelligent Plans and Examinations Ltd on behalf of the Planning Advisory Service, 12 August 2020
- Assessment of housing supply, Three Dragons, September 2020
- Island Planning Strategy 2: evidence base, legal opinion of Michael Bedford QC, Cornerstone Barristers, February 2021
- Planning Advisory Service – Local Plan Gateway Review, February 2021

From the above, seven broad areas of barriers to delivery were identified, being:

1. Affordability of housing stock to Island residents
2. Delivery of affordable housing
3. Profitability of building on the Island
4. Risk and ability to secure funding
5. Financial viability
6. Island Infrastructure
7. Limited appropriate land

The detailed analysis for each of these areas can be found in Appendix A. The table below summarises the potential options for overcoming the delivery barriers identified through Appendix A. The potential options and actions have also drawn from the council's Housing Delivery Test Action Plan 2019 – Monitoring Update 5, January 2021 and Appendix A of the Three Dragons assessment paper.

Delivery barriers summary table based upon the 7 broad areas

Delivery barrier	Options for removing or improving	Local plan role	Actions	Lead parties	Timescales
Affordability of housing stock to Island residents	Enabling access to finance, e.g. through help-to-buy and shared ownership schemes IOW now on the Homes England long list for social grant	Clear economic policy to encourage jobs and reinvigorate housing market, to include web-based home-working environments in new properties. Policy criteria on housing mix policy and consider the planning requirements for each site. Consider the role of entry level exception sites and whether the plan should actively encourage such sites, could be pursued by the council for the land it owns.	Check/test the council's housing strategy is offering support for those unable to easily access the housing market on the Island such as supporting access to finance, e.g. through help-to-buy and shared ownership schemes, local building societies or community banks. Draft/amend local plan policies in relation to economy, island definition of affordable housing (higher discounts from MV to match affordability data) and Island focused eligibility for an element of new residential units to include Government's First Homes initiative (the plan will include First Homes in exception policy and also in AH policy requiring min 25% of all AH to be First Homes).	IWC Housing team Local Plan	Ongoing Summer 2022
Delivery of affordable housing	Council should consider ways in which it can support and help deliver housing provision on the island, either directly, or through Joint Ventures with other developers, housebuilders and Registered Social Landlords (RSLs). On-Island MMC factory. Councils could act as 'housing delivery enabler' and actively use own assets and knowledge to unlock housing opportunities and deliver more homes, including building through the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), using general funds, forming partnerships with other providers and establishing its own housing company.	Draft policy to be supportive of MMC. Consider identifying sites where MMC may be appropriate, e.g. prison estate or Newport riverside etc. Likely to be large publicly owned sites that have the potential to add to a pipeline. Progress local plan to increase certainty in housing delivery.	Explore the potential for council led/ supported social housing based on-Island MMC or other method of affordable housing stock provision solution Draft policy to be supportive of MMC. Identify sites where MMC may be appropriate. Continue to progress the new Local Plan - Draft Island Planning Strategy (IPS) Development Plan Document • Confirm housing requirement • Propose a range of residential allocations to deliver housing requirement	IWC Regeneration & Housing Teams Local Plan Local Plan	Ongoing Summer 2022 Summer 2022
Profitability of building on the Island	Investigate the possibility of investing in a port facility and Modular Home factory. Liaise with local further education providers to better understand provision and demand for construction associated skills and trades courses available on the Island.	Provide greater certainty of likely market requirements associated with each allocation to include consideration of master planning on new sites to create different products that can compete in the marketplace at the same time in the same location Require an Employment and Skills Plan at Construction stage for development of a certain size.	Explore the possibility of the council investing in its own Port and Modular Home factory. Council to work with Island developers and FE providers to understand ongoing construction skills gap and how this can be addressed on-Island. Provide likely market requirements associated with each allocation to include consideration of master planning on new sites to create different products. Require an Employment and Skills Plan.	IWC Regeneration Team Local Plan Local Plan	Ongoing Summer 2022 Summer 2022
Risk and ability to secure funding	Using alternative forms of development delivery, innovative financing & grant inclusion. Decrease perceptions of risk by creating greater certainty in local decision-making and requirements through the local plan. Provide local market intelligence both through the local plan and regeneration schemes (masterplans, design briefs and housing/site prospectus's etc). Establish a single point of contact ("Delivery agent") so developers and registered providers know who to contact if they need help.	Provide detail for both individual allocations and settlement profiles in terms of local housing market and key areas of both need and demand. De-risk sites as far as possible by exploring all significant site issues and possible solutions and ensure constraints are included in viability. Consider including information on the council's website on 'what a good planning application' looks like. Include clarity on what reports & when, what viability information & when Developers and registered providers can get council support with problems and council improves its understanding of issues Reduce the need for conditions and enable development to commence as quickly as possible following consent being granted	Explore alternative forms of development delivery, innovative financing & grant inclusion (IOW now on the HE long list for social grant) and applying to Homes England for Housing Infrastructure Funds, Care and Support Specialised Housing and Shared Ownership and Affordable Housing Programme Grants, to improve the viability of housing developments on the Island and promote such financial incentives to developers on the island. Provide detail for areas of growth, allocations and de-risk sites as far as possible. Planning Service review of website to give more customer focussed offer Case Officer approach in place, website being updated, Assistant Director of Regen will support issues Set out the Council's approach to applying conditions, and ensuring that they are relevant and proportionate	IWC Regeneration & Housing Teams Local Plan Planning Services Planning Services	Ongoing Summer 2022 Summer/Autumn 2022 Summer/Autumn 2022
Financial viability	The use of council owned land assets and more direct delivery of housing by the	Ensure all council owned sites are considered in the assessment of sites for allocations. Work on the one public estate with both the prison estate and NHS trust to develop a	Report on how this has progressed since the formation of the Housing Delivery Company. What projects have advanced? Have permissions been	IWC Regeneration & Housing Teams	Summer/Autumn 2022

	Council itself, either directly or through joint venture arrangements. Review viability taking into account all likely costs, but particularly against requirements for affordable Housing.	coherent strategy towards land assembly and future development in the Horsebridge Hill, St. Marys and Parkhurst areas to the north of Newport. Review Affordable Housing Policy taking development viability into account. Consider different approaches to affordable housing dependent upon public/private ownership/developer. Review plan approach to development densities, an urban densification/urban characterisation study which identifies those locations where development capacity can be further increased would support the Council in demonstrating that it is seeking to maximise supply for promoted sites. Review existing viability evidence including land values if relevant	granted on IWC sites and what market interest is there in taking development forward (e.g. Sandham Middle School)? Review of actions in the HDT Action Plan and outcomes. Assessment of all council owned sites for allocations. Develop a coherent approach to allocation of wider public estate to include prison estate and health trust land, to include public sector infrastructure investment (e.g. access roads). Review plan approach to development densities. Reviewing viability evidence as part of Island Planning process	Local Plan Local Plan Local Plan	Summer 2022 Summer 2022 Summer 2022
Island Infrastructure	Council consider future options for port or commercial wharf development on the northern coast or Medina. Encourage the Council to discuss opportunities to receive Housing Infrastructure Funding to improve the road network and improve the highways network on the Island. Review access provided by the floating bridge along with the possibility of a fixed link bridge over the River Medina.	Review the potential of any sites to provide commercial waterfront access. Refresh the infrastructure requirements in light of the revised allocations, particularly with regards to highways and congestion in and around Newport. This should include the role of sustainable and public transport and look for any policy synergies with the Local Transport Plan to maximise opportunities for traffic reduction on the main roads into and out of Newport.	Explore the future potential of commercial wharfage and how this could supplement existing options for importing resources and opportunities to receive Housing Infrastructure Funding Review the potential of any sites to provide commercial waterfront access. Set out infrastructure requirements for new development and provision for sustainable transport.	Regeneration team Local Plan Local Plan	Summer/Autumn 2022 Summer 2022 Summer 2022
Limited appropriate land	Increase the range of larger sites. Require a more diverse approach to the master planning of large sites that requires a high-quality design that compliments and adds to existing character of an area and offers a range of units	Check the number and distribution of large sites considered for allocations. For large site allocations consider requirements (such as through design briefs) on both type and tenure of units with an aim to provide or add to local character and distinctiveness and avoid a homogenisation of housing stock. Increased understanding on what sites can be delivered and whether larger proposed allocations need to be sub-divided into smaller parcels	Consider use of CPO / clearance / site brief / marketing / joint venture/ package sites to create opportunities, e.g. Sandham Middle School, Nicholson Road, Branston Farm, Pier Street & Eddington Road. Review number and distribution of large sites considered for allocations and the detail associated with each allocation.	Planning & Regeneration Teams Local Plan	Autumn 2022 Summer 2022

Conclusions

The analysis of the evidence on barriers to delivery suggests that there is not one single overriding issue or limiting factor. Instead, it is the cumulative impact of a concentrated combination of factors acting at the same time. This cumulative feedback cycle is magnified and exacerbated by the physical severance of the Island from the mainland.

This is perhaps best summarised by the perceived low return on investment. By definition, this is a measure made up of contributing factors, in this case high cost and low revenue. The high cost appears to be driven in large part, but not entirely, by the physical separation of the Island. The potentially low revenue is driven by the market conditions. Housing on the Island typically has a lower sales price, compared to neighbouring areas and at a regional level, but is still unaffordable to those working on the Island. It is believed that this low return on investment, a measure which can easily be compared to other competing areas/projects, is acting as a deterrent to other national housebuilders from entering the market.

In addition to the above the council has sought further evidence on both the barriers and the willingness to overcome these from mainland-based developers, including national housebuilders.
The evidence collated shows that no new developers were considering coming to the Island in the forthcoming local plan period, however it was learnt that the remaining major developer is seeking to leave the Island once their current developments are complete.

Discussion with national housebuilders revealed that the Isle of Wight has usually been disregarded, fundamentally because it has a higher risk profile for house builders. The common concerns are:

- Logistics
- Labour/Management
- Infrastructure/services available
    - All resulting in a higher base build cost
- House prices
- Market volatility/depth of market
- Scale/consistency of opportunities
- Knowledge of Planning/Politics

Generally it is felt that the few house builders that have made it work at scale over a period of time on the Island are better placed as they have the market knowledge, relationships, local work force and materials supply and logistics etc in place to manage their risk.

Having explored the primary barriers to delivery there remain some critical factors that the local plan, the local planning authority or indeed the wider local authority will not be able to overcome. For example, modelling shows[1] how a small increase in build cost could have a significant detrimental effect on the viability of an Island based scheme. Should a development be presented with other changing factors such as slow construction rates (labour driven) and slow sales rates, then this can compound the situation considerably. Many developers have highlighted that the volatilities that developing on the Island presents give an unnecessary risk when compared to mainland delivery.

To meet more of the need for housing (particularly affordable housing) on the Island, the local plan approach should be supported by direct action by the Council either on its own or in concert with others in the housing field. Whether any of the actions (listed in the table above) have a significant impact on housing delivery is difficult to determine prior to such action, however both the plan

[1] Viability Study update, Aspinall Verdi June 2022

monitoring mechanisms and the 5 year plan review provide the means to both review what actions have been pursued and how effective they have been.

While the council will pursue all the viable actions including those for the local plan, as identified through this exercise to address housing delivery (with the focus on affordable housing), it should be acknowledged that even in discharging these actions with any degree of success, it is highly unlikely that this will lead to a significant uplift in housing delivery to the point where a quantum based on Government's standard methodology becomes realistic. As has been identified in the supporting work on this issue, "*It is unrealistic and highly improbable for the Isle of Wight to get anywhere near the proposed standard methodology requirement. The council and its partners can help overcome some of the barriers to delivery and potentially increase the number of completions but they are unlikely to be able to improve sufficiently to meet the housing requirement identified in the standard method for calculating requirements (current or proposed)*" (Three Dragons, 2020).

Appendix A: Detailed analysis of the identified seven broad areas of barriers to delivery

Delivery barrier
Affordability of housing stock to Island residents Whilst the tourism influence can be seen to inject much needed economic benefits onto the Island, as more people invest in homes on the island (for retirement and second/holiday homes), this contributes to a restricted supply which in turn has contributed to pushing house prices up to a point where many islanders struggle to be able to afford to buy them, especially as Island wages are on average over 25% less than those in the rest of the South East, and residents can find properties of similar value to the island just across the Solent, in the Southampton, Portsmouth and Gosport areas, and secure higher earning salaries. This has resulted in many residents seeking employment on the mainland, and many aspiring to achieve executive and professional roles, leaving the island, as is clear from statistics that show the number of these roles on the Island falls significantly short of the rest of the region and the UK in general.
Options for removing or improving the nature of the barrier or constraint
There are opportunities for other ways to intervene in the housing market, such as supporting the demand side in terms of affordability and enabling access to finance, e.g. through help-to-buy and shared ownership schemes, local building societies or community banks. *Innovative financing and grant inclusion* – IOW now on the Homes England long list for social grant, can longer financial appraisal terms assist in bids for grant, levels of certainty on grant given historic success (or not!), available resources within Housing & Regen and IOW being in 'Category 2' for the Levelling up funding, so a minimum of 123 LA's 'ahead' in terms of need using the Government index; More Island focused eligibility and marketing and greater focus on infrastructure promoting remote working coupled with marketing of the Island to the "creative class" able to benefit from this infrastructure may be of relevance.
Local plan role
Clear economic policy to encourage jobs and reinvigorate housing market, to include web-based home-working environments in new properties. Policy criteria on housing mix policy and consider the planning requirements for each site. Consider the role of entry level exception sites and whether the plan should actively encourage such sites, could be pursued by the council for the land it owns.
Conclusions & actions
Checking the council's housing strategy is offering support for those unable to easily access the housing market on the Island such as supporting access to finance, e.g. through help-to-buy and shared ownership schemes, local building societies or community banks. Draft/amend local plan policies in relation to economy and Island focused eligibility for an element of new residential units to include Gvts First Homes initiative (the plan will include First Homes in exception policy and also in AH policy requiring min 25% of all AH to be First Homes).

Delivery barrier
Delivery of affordable housing The initial focus with regard to Housing Need on the Island is around the provision of affordable housing and specialist housing for the elderly. Affordable housing delivery has been extremely low on the island with only 48 affordable homes being built compared to the 719 private dwellings delivered. This equates to just 6% and is significantly lower than the 35% policy requirement that the Council currently requires. To meet more of the need for AH on the Island, the planning policy approach should be supported by direct action by the Council either on its own or in concert with others in the housing field. There are a number of options available to the Council which are broadly supported by national policies. Whether any of these options are acceptable on the Island depends on factors such as the political will/aspirations, relationships with existing providers of AH and the Council's appetite for risk.
Options for removing or improving the nature of the barrier or constraint
The Council does not hold any affordable housing stock itself, however it should certainly consider ways in which it can support and help deliver the much needed housing provision on the island and this can be either directly, or through Joint Ventures with other developers, housebuilders and Registered Social Landlords (RSLs). The pent-up demand for affordable housing is also an opportunity that can be exploited to provide an ongoing pipeline of developments to attract a prefabrication factory to the Island. Creating a prefabrication factory on the Island (either from scratch or by partnering with an existing manufacturer to open their own factory on the Island to deliver prefabricated homes) would require the factory to produce and deliver at least 100 units per annum to achieve viability. The most obvious solution would be a council led / supported-social housing based solution which might also have the advantage of reducing the "burden" on private housebuilders to deliver social housing which affects their returns on investment. The Elphicke-House report (2015) advocated that councils should act as 'housing delivery enablers' and actively use their own assets and knowledge to unlock housing opportunities and deliver more homes. The work by Morphet and Clifford shows that authorities are using a variety of means of delivering housing. These include building through their Housing Revenue Account (HRA), using general funds, forming partnerships with other providers and establishing their own housing companies. Authorities are drawing on a wide range of funding sources with many starting with the HRA before moving on to other sources including the Public Works Loan Board, the Homes and Communities Agency, Bonds, Right to Buy receipts, Local Enterprise Partnerships and commercial borrowing.
Local plan role
Draft policy to be supportive of MMC. Consider identifying sites where MMC may be appropriate, e.g. prison estate or Newport riverside etc. Likely to be large publicly owned sites that have the potential to add to a pipeline.
Conclusions & actions
Explore the potential for a council led / supported-social housing based on-Island MMC or other method of affordable housing stock provision solution

Delivery barrier
Profitability of building on the Island A common theme across both RSLs and prospective Developers was that the financial returns from developing on the Island were deemed to not adequately reflect the risks and difficulties experienced. Whilst local Island based house builders hold a positive attitude of the Island housing market, developers whose main business activities are on the mainland feel that development activities on the mainland are far easier and therefore consider that build cost increases, slow sales rates, low sales values, high vendor land value expectations and labour limitations are substantial reasons not to go to the Island. The Solent played a huge part in the negative perception of the Island Housing Market. The cost of wharfage fees and transporting suitable skilled workforce were highlighted. It was considered that the gateway to access the Island was entirely controlled by three main ferry routes operated by two companies and that haulage on and off the island via these routes was with one principal island-based haulage company. The active RSLs in the area have the ability to deliver a total of over 100 new homes a year on the island, but all have stated that the cost of materials and availability of on island labour prevents them from doing so.
Options for removing or improving the nature of the barrier or constraint
Council to investigate the possibility of investing in its own Port and Modular Home factory, to ensure that building costs are not adversely affected by the Solent. Liaise with local further education providers to better understand provision and demand for construction associated skills and trades courses available on the Island.
Local plan role
Provide greater certainty of likely market requirements associated with each allocation to include consideration of master planning on new sites to create different products that can compete in the marketplace at the same time in the same location Require an Employment and Skills Plan at Construction stage for development of a certain size.
Conclusions & actions
Explore the possibility of the council investing in its own Port and Modular Home factory Council to work with Island developers and FE providers to understand ongoing construction skills gap and how this can be addressed on-Island. Provide likely market requirements associated with each allocation to include consideration of master planning on new sites to create different products. Require an Employment and Skills Plan.

Delivery barrier
Risk and ability to secure funding Whilst many National and Regional Developers do not have project specific finance, the smaller, local developers that finance their projects through Bank finance or developer funding models, often have a problem accessing project funds due to lenders perceptions of the Island Housing Market. The higher build cost, extended programmes, lower sales values and labour availability again all contribute to a risk profile considered by a lender as too high for investment. Banks that specialise in development finance such as Lloyds, Natwest/RBS, Barclays and HSBC show little appetite for Island Development Investment. In the instances that these banks have invested in schemes over the past 10 years, the terms have been less favourable to the borrower than similar mainland developments. Barriers to finance for Island developments, also creates acquisition problems for smaller developers. The lack of finance opportunities will mean that developers cannot be prompt with land purchase in the marketplace. Other issues include access to local market intelligence and perceptions of risk and difficulty.
Options for removing or improving the nature of the barrier or constraint
Using alternative forms of development delivery, innovative financing & grant inclusion Council considers promoting and applying to Homes England for Housing Infrastructure Funds, Care and Support Specialised Housing and Shared Ownership and Affordable Housing Programme Grants, to improve the viability of housing developments on the Island and promotes such financial incentives to other Developers on the island. *Innovative financing and grant inclusion* – IOW now on the HE long list for social grant, can longer financial appraisal terms assist in bids for grant, levels of certainty on grant given historic success (or not!), available resources within Housing & Regen and IOW being in 'Category 2' for the Levelling up funding, so a minimum of 123 LA's 'ahead' in terms of need using the Government index;
Local plan role
Provide detail for both individual allocations and settlement profiles in terms of local housing market and key areas of both need and demand. De-risk sites as far as possible by exploring all significant site issues and possible solutions and ensure constraints are included in viability. Consider including information on the council's website on 'what a good planning application' looks like. Include clarity on what reports & when, what viability information & when Reduce the need for conditions and enable development to commence as quickly as possible following consent being granted
Conclusions & actions
Explore alternative forms of development delivery, innovative financing & grant inclusion (IOW now on the HE long list for social grant) and applying to Homes England for Housing Infrastructure Funds, Care and Support Specialised Housing and Shared Ownership and Affordable Housing Programme Grants. Provide detail for areas of growth, allocations and de-risk sites as far as possible. Planning Service review of website to give more customer focussed offer Set out the Council's approach to applying conditions

Delivery barrier
Financial viability Since the financial crash in 2007/08 land values on the island have seen a negative position and developers with exposure have taken advantage of viability arguments surrounding affordable housing and decreased financial contributions. In addition, many prime housing sites have not been developed and many previously consented sites remain lapsed or in an extant position for future development. The Island currently has approx. 2,000 units with planning consent (of varying levels) that remain undeveloped. The consensus from consulted Island based developers and RP's was, that the land sellers are unrealistic in land value terms and/or are reluctant to take the land to market whilst the Island Housing Market is in its current state. Viability calculations also suggest that even a small increase in build costs could have a significant detrimental effect on the viability of an Island based scheme. Should a development be presented with other negative factors such as slow construction rates (labour driven) and slow sales rates, then this can compound the situation considerably. Many developers have stated that these volatilities give an unnecessary risk when compared to mainland delivery. Affordable Housing Policy is considered prohibitive in terms of levels and tenure, and this will further compound the viability of Island developments. Evidence of this can be found by reviewing the levels of viability studies that have been submitted and upheld during the planning process.
Options for removing or improving the nature of the barrier or constraint
The use of council owned land assets and more direct delivery of housing by the Council itself, either directly or through joint venture arrangements. Council consider accepting land in lieu of affordable housing, if viability is an issue. Where permitted sites remain undeveloped can these be individually chased up and working with the council and Homes England to get delivery started. In the absence of private sector interest in leading the delivery of the new garden communities, the Council could consider taking on a land assembly (consider using CPO powers or forward funding infrastructure to improve viability) and strategic master developer role, marketing (and de-risking) the opportunities for 'mainland' volume housebuilders as well as island-based SMEs.. An urban densification/urban characterisation study which identifies those locations where development capacity can be further increased would support the Council in demonstrating that it is seeking to maximise supply for promoted sites.
Local plan role
De-risking sites through the allocation process. Ensure all council owned sites are considered in the assessment of sites for allocations. Work on the one public estate with both the prison estate and NHS trust to develop a coherent strategy. Review Affordable Housing Policy taking development viability into account. Consider different approaches to affordable housing dependent upon public/private ownership/developer. Review plan approach to development densities. Review existing viability evidence including land values if relevant.
Conclusions & actions
Assessment of all council owned sites for allocations and develop a coherent approach to allocation of wider public estate to include prison estate and health trust land. Review plan approach to development densities and viability evidence as part of planning process.

Delivery barrier
Island Infrastructure Currently the Island has limited ability to import building materials onto the island from the mainland. The three main ports for this purpose are, Cowes, Fishbourne and Yarmouth. Building materials delivered in this manner attract sizable wharfage costs, which add to the cost of any development and have a negative impact on the viability of any affordable housing delivery. The Isle of Wight road network is considerably constrained in and around Newport and in particular the A3020-A3054 Coppins Bridge Interchange. Traffic from the majority of Island coastal towns all converge on the Coppins Bridge Roundabout and at certain times of the day this interchange is gridlocked. The town of Newport may benefit extensively from a full ring road solution as is partly in place on the Medina Way. This would ensure that not all traffic would need to use the same interchange and therefore relieve congestion at key locations. Recently the effectiveness and reliability of the Cowes Floating Bridge has caused extra burden upon this junction as all traffic will need to use the Coppins Bridge Interchange when the Floating Bridge in not in service. The reliability of the bridge could be reviewed along with the possibility of a fixed link bridge further South over the River Medina near Whippingham and before Island Harbour.
Options for removing or improving the nature of the barrier or constraint
Consideration could be made by the Council to investigate the possibility of developing its own port on the northern coast or medina stretch. This could operate on a commercial basis, earning the Council a return on its use and reducing the cost of building materials. Encourage the Council to discuss opportunities to receive Housing Infrastructure Funding to improve the road network and improve the highways network on the Island. The reliability of the floating bridge could be reviewed along with the possibility of a fixed link bridge further South over the River Medina near Whippingham and before Island Harbour.
Local plan role
Review the potential of any sites to provide commercial waterfront access. Refresh the infrastructure requirements in light of the revised allocations, particularly with regards to highways and congestion in and around Newport. This should include the role of sustainable and public transport and look for any policy synergies with the Local Transport Plan to maximise opportunities for traffic reduction on the main roads into and out of Newport.
Conclusions & actions
Explore the future potential of commercial wharfage and how this could supplement existing options for importing resources and opportunities to receive Housing Infrastructure Funding Determine corporate intentions with the long-term operation of the chain ferry and reliability issues. Review the potential of any sites to provide commercial waterfront access. Set out infrastructure requirements for new development and provision for sustainable transport.

Delivery barrier
Limited appropriate land The main limiting factor, at least in attracting larger national housebuilders and being able to deliver enough affordable housing, was the number and availability of larger sites, rather than land per se. Some of the mainland based businesses also disagreed that this was necessarily an island specific issue, as well as citing examples of similarly populated areas around the UK that had found large enough sites for them to develop. The limited number of opportunities for larger scale developments could impact on the potential for a better profit to be made (e.g. via economies of scale). Feedback from the development industry shows the rate of delivery on the mainland is around twice to three times that of the IoW for companies that develop in both areas, mainly related to the scarcity of large sites and the profile of the housebuilders active on the IoW. The lack of large sites reduces the attractiveness of the IoW to the national volume housebuilders. A related limitation was the irregularity, or dearth in opportunities over time, to commit to a longer-term lower risk strategy by having a number of sites, or "pipeline" of delivery. There was also little evidence of 'landbanking' by developers. Instead, it was more the case that sites were taking a longer time to develop. The 'Independent Review of Build Out' report by Sir Oliver Letwin (2018) investigated the gap between housing completions and the amount of land allocated or permissioned in areas of high housing demand. It concluded that a key driver in the slow rate of build-out was the homogeneity of the type and tenure of the homes on offer on large sites which restricts the rate in which they are absorbed by the market. Alongside recommending that authorities get greater powers in controlling development on larger sites, it also suggests a requirement for a more diverse offer.
Options for removing or improving the nature of the barrier or constraint
Increase the range of larger sites. Require a more diverse approach to the master planning of large sites that requires a high-quality design that compliments and adds to existing character of an area and offers a range of units Make provision for sites that are attractive to all scales of developers.
Local plan role
Check the number and distribution of large sites considered for allocations. Ensure there is sufficient variety to satisfy both the Island based developers and national/mainland companies. For large site allocations consider requirements (such as through design briefs) on both type and tenure of units with an aim to provide or add to local character and distinctiveness and avoid a homogenisation of housing stock. Increased understanding on what sites can be delivered and whether larger proposed allocations need to be sub-divided into smaller parcels
Conclusions & actions
Consider use of CPO / clearance / site brief / marketing / joint venture/ package sites to create opportunities, e.g. Sandham Middle School, Nicholson Road, Branston Farm, Pier Street & Eddington Road. Review number and distribution of large sites considered for allocations and the detail associated with each allocation.