LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK FOR CRAVEN DISTRICT OUTSIDE THE YORKSHIRE DALES NATIONAL PARK

Craven District Council

STRATEGIC HOUSING AND EMPLOYMENT LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT

Draft Methodology for Consultation

12th October – 23rd November 2007

Prepared by Envision Consultants on behalf of Craven District Council

Colin Walker
Director of Environmental & Planning Services

Craven District Council, Planning and Building Control, Council Offices, Granville Street, Skipton, BD23 1PS

Telephone Number 01756 706472 Email: ldf@cravendc.gov.uk
Web: www.cravendc.gov.uk

CONTENTS

1. Introduction

This proposal is put forward following discussion in order to identify how Envision could collaborate with Craven District in preparing, as a matter of urgency, the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). We understand that the SHLAA will form a critical part of the evidence base for the Council's Core Strategy and Allocations DPD and that progress is needed on this in order that consultation can begin on the Preferred Options and that the exercise must be completed before submission of the Core Strategy in March 2008.

In our discussions, we have identified how we can work with some of your in-house staff in this exercise and how the mechanism being established for the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (namely the HEMP) can be used to enable the SHLAA. This joint working has been incorporated into this proposed methodology which is to form part of a contract between Envision and the Council.

The recent release of Practice Guidance on SHLAAs has enabled us to update this proposal from that previously submitted for discussion purposes.

In addition we can see synergies between the SHLAA and the Employment Land Review. This has already been undertaken in two stages, by Ecotec and in-house, and has been reviewed by Drivers Jonas. As part of a separate commission, we are advising Craven on how to respond to the Drivers Jonas recommendations, and we have already concluded that economies of scale could be achieved if the supply side element of the ELR was reviewed in parallel with the SHLAA.

As a result we have re-titled the Proposal to Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA).

2. Government Guidance

A Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment should be carried out in accordance with the requirements of:

- PPS3;
- the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments Practice Guide (July 2007)

It is also required to take account of the policy framework contained in the emerging Yorkshire and Humber Regional Spatial Strategy.

Moreover, given the aim of including a further check of the Employment land Review's supply evidence within the SLAA, the assessment will need to pay heed to the Guidance on Employment Land Reviews (ODPM 2004), in particular Steps 2 ("Collate Data on Land Stock and Demand"), 8 ("Quantify Employment Land Supply") and 13 ("Identify additional sites to be brought forward").

Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing

PPS3 requires local planning authorities to:

- identify specific, deliverable sites for the first five years of a plan that are ready for development , and to keep this topped up over-time in response to market information;
- identify specific, developable sites for years 6–10, and ideally years 11–15, in plans to enable the five year supply to be topped up;
- where it is not possible to identify specific sites for years 11–15 of the plan, indicate broad locations for future growth; and
- not include an allowance for windfalls in the first 10 years of the plan unless there are justifiable local circumstances that prevent specific sites being identified.

Guidance on Employment Land Reviews

Step 2 of the ELR guidance recommends planning authorities set up a comprehensive database of employment sites from a variety of sources, including planning/ economic development databases, OS maps, and site visits, with a minimum site size threshold of 0.25 has (or 500 sq. m.). It also recommends collation of information on the recent pattern of employment land supply, namely grant and take-up of permissions by market segment and sub-area, together with loss of employment land to other uses.

Step 8 advises LPAs to undertake a stock analysis of land and premises, together with flow analysis, which looks at take up of planning permissions for employment use as well as in some cases the loss of employment sites to other uses and the much greater flows associated with the turnover of business premises in existing buildings.

Step 13 sets out a process for identifying "additional" employment sites in a formal way, but stating that it must be tailored to the extent of the site search that is required. It starts with confirming the nature of the "gap" in market requirements in terms of market segment, location/ access, environmental quality, plot size and overall quantum, using such criteria to identify potential suites.

Housing Land Availability Assessments: Practice Guidance

Purpose of a SHLAA

The primary role of a SHLAA is to:

- identify sites with potential for housing;
- assess their housing potential; and
- assess when they are likely to be developed.

It should aim to identify as many sites with housing potential in and around as many settlements as possible in the study area. The study area should preferably be a sub-regional housing market area, but may be a local planning authority area, where necessary. As a minimum, it should aim to identify sufficient specific sites for at least the first 10 years of a plan, from the anticipated date of its adoption, and ideally for longer than the whole 15 year plan period. Where it is not possible to identify sufficient sites, it should provide the evidence base to support judgements around whether broad locations should be identified and/or whether there are genuine local circumstances that mean a windfall allowance may be justified in the first 10 years of the plan.

The SHLAA is an important evidence source to inform plan-making, but does not in itself determine whether a site should be allocated for housing development. It will identify:
- the recent pattern of housing development;
- the choices available to meet the need and demand for more housing; and
- whether action would need to be taken to ensure sites will become deliverable or whether plan policies need to be reviewed to enable identified sites to be developed for housing.

There are advantages in undertaking land availability assessments, particularly for housing, employment, retail and other built uses, in parallel so that land availability and suitability can be considered across the whole range of land requirements.

Importance of a Partnership Approach
Regional planning bodies and local planning authorities should work together, with key stakeholders, to undertake assessments to ensure a joined-up and robust approach. Assessments should preferably be carried out at the sub-regional level, for separate housing market areas, by housing market partnerships (where established). Housing market partnerships should include key stakeholders such as house builders, social landlords, local property agents, local communities and other agencies.

Key stakeholders should be involved at the outset of the SHLAA, so that they can help shape the approach to be taken. In particular, house builders and local property agents should provide expertise and knowledge to help the partnership to take a view on the deliverability and developability of sites, and how market conditions may affect economic viability.

There may be particular reasons why an assessment cannot be prepared for the whole housing market area, for example, where a local planning authority needs to urgently update its five year supply of specific deliverable sites. Where this is the case the SHLAA should be capable of aggregation at a housing market area level at a later date.

Core Requirements
A SHLAA should, as a minimum, provide the following core outputs:
1. A list of sites, cross-referenced to maps showing locations and boundaries of specific sites (and showing broad locations, where necessary)
2. Assessment of the deliverability/developability of each identified site (i.e. in terms of its suitability, availability and achievability) to determine when an identified site is realistically expected to be developed
3. Potential quantity of housing that could be delivered on each identified site or within each identified broad location (where necessary) or on windfall sites (where justified)
4. Constraints on the delivery of identified sites
5. Recommendations on how these constraints could be overcome and when

The SHLAA should involve key stakeholders and the methods, assumptions, judgements and findings should be discussed and agreed upon throughout the process in an open and transparent way, and explained in the SHLAA report. The report should include an explanation as to why particular sites or areas have been excluded.

The use of the standard methodology in the guidance is strongly recommended because it will ensure that the SHLAA findings are robust and transparently prepared. When followed, a local planning authority should not need to justify the methodology used in preparing its assessment, including at independent examination.

Differences between the SHLAA and the Urban Capacity Study
The SHLAA is significantly different from an Urban Capacity Study, previously required by PPG3. Therefore, even where there is a recent Urban Capacity Study that has identified sites, it will be necessary to carry out further work, in particular to:

- determine whether identified sites are still available and to review assumptions on housing potential;
- identify additional sites with potential for housing which were not required to be investigated by Urban Capacity Studies, such as sites in rural settlements, brownfield sites outside settlement boundaries and suitable greenfield sites, as well as broad locations (where necessary);
- carry out further survey work within settlements to identify additional brownfield sites that have come forward since the Urban Capacity Study was carried out; and
- assess the deliverability/developability of all sites.

Keeping the Assessment up-to-date
The SHLAA is not a one-off study and updating it should be an integral part of the Annual Monitoring Report process, in order to support the updating of the housing trajectory and the five-year supply of specific deliverable sites. The main information to record is set out in the Guidance. It should only be necessary to carry out a full re-survey when plans have to be reviewed and rolled forward to a longer time horizon, or some other significant change makes it necessary

Main Stages
The main stages steps in undertaking the SHLAA are as follows. They form the basis for our proposed methodology and so are described in more detail in the next section.

1. Planning the Assessment
2. Determining which sources of sites will be included
3. Desktop review of existing information
4. Determining which sites and areas will be surveyed
5. Carrying out the survey
6. Estimating the housing potential of each site
7. Assessing when and whether sites are likely to be developed
8. Reviewing the Assessment
9. Identifying and assessing the potential of broad locations (where necessary)
10. Determining the housing potential of windfalls (where justified)

3. Methodology

We propose that the approach for the study be based on the main stages of the Practice Guidance. The main differences between our proposal and that in the Guidance are that we are proposing a Strategic Land Availability Assessment which covers both housing and employment land, and indeed mixed uses, and that we propose to make use of work already done on broad locations through the Environmental Capacity Study, rather than treating this as a separate Stage towards the end of the assessment (see below).

1. Planning the Assessment

The planning of the SHLAA starts with this methodology, but will also take into account the comments of key stakeholders involved through the partnership approach. Management issues referred to in the Guidance have been or will be addressed as follows:

- *whether it is possible to carry out the Assessment with the other local planning authorities in the housing market area:* it has been decided that the SLAA should be undertaken for the planning authority area only, in view of the urgent need to progress this study, the relative geographical isolation of Craven outside the Yorkshire Dales National Park from other North Yorkshire authorities to the east, the existence of the border with the North West region to the west, and the timescale for the North Yorkshire Sub-Regional housing market study.
- *whether there is an existing housing market partnership that could be used as the forum to take forward the Assessment and, if not, whether it could now be initiated:* an internal working party has progressed proposals for a Housing Market Partnership (HEMP) group as a thematic group of the Housing Forum which is part of the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP). It is proposed to use this group to guide the SLAA. Further details of how this will be done are set out below.
- *whether all relevant partners are already involved in the partnership:* initial consideration has been given to this, especially in relation to the various statutory undertakers, many of whom may not wish to commit time to membership of the HEMP. Instead, they will be consulted separately. This will have the advantage of establishing contact with them earlier than would have been possible through the HEMP, the first meeting of which is not proposed until late September.

  It is intended to invite as many relevant parties as possible to join the partnership, particularly those who were involved at the Issues and Options stage. However actual attendance cannot be predicted, since it will be dependent on other commitments and the willingness of the private sector to devote unpaid time to this activity.
- *the resources for the project – within the local planning authority(s) and the partnership:* resources for the project will be provided by Envision (as described in Section 2) working with two temporary members of staff and the GIS officer, together with close collaboration on a regular basis with the Principal Planner (Policy) and other in-house staff as necessary (including CDC staff in other departments). An estimate of the cost has been provided based on the previous methodology and this has been reviewed as part of this revised Proposal –see Section 5. The financial resources required are understood to be available from Planning Delivery Grant.
- *the composition and skills needed by any project team who will be carrying out the Assessment on behalf of the partnership:* The Envision team and its experience and skills are described above. In addition Envision will provide support and guidance to two work experience persons who will assist with both the desk-top review and the survey work.
- *the management and scrutiny arrangements, including who is responsible for what and who makes the decisions:* It is proposed that monthly project monitoring arrangements be put in place to ensure milestones are met and work is being undertaken in accordance with this methodology, or as otherwise agreed. The HEMP group will also have a role in scrutiny but not

in day to day management, given the voluntary nature of their involvement and the less frequent nature of their meetings.

- *how the quality of the project work will be ensured:* close monitoring of quality will be undertaken by Envision with Keith Reed allocating specific time for checking. However the key to ensuring quality will be close collaboration with the client and in-house staff to ensure that the consultants' expertise and experience is complemented by local knowledge. In addition regular, monthly, project management meetings will address not only issues of timescale but also any emerging quality issues that have not already been dealt with as part of day to day liaison.
- *the work programme and project milestones:* these are set out in Appendix 1 but will be subject to change following consultation with stakeholders, particularly the HEMP group, and as part of the ongoing project monitoring with the client.

The establishment of the HEMP group will have involved the key landowners, local estate agents, developers and/ or their representative bodies operating in the area. Many of these have already been identified during the response to the Issues and Options consultation and were involved in the consultation event which we held in January 2007. By including the SLAA as a key item on the agenda of their first meeting we will seek to establish:

- Key principles, procedures and project plan (which we will propose for comment and agreement).
- Roles and responsibilities of different partners (taking account of their willingness and ability to devote time and resources over and above those that the Council are putting into this commission).
- Methodological issues, particularly in relation to which types of sites should be excluded and included and how to assess the potential and market viability of sites (see Stages 2, 4, 6 and 7 below).

This part of the meeting will take the form of a participative workshop. Commitment will be sought to involvement later in the process (see Stages 6- 8 below).

We will also contact the House Builders Federation (if not already represented on HEMP), District Valuer and key statutory consultees/ infrastructure providers, including County Highways, County Education, health trusts, utilities providers, Environment Agency etc. to inform them of the methodology and timetable for the SLAA and seek their views and cooperation, including any information on potential surplus land (see Stage 2).

2. Determining which sources of sites will be included

Tapping the Potential and previous draft guidance listed several sources of potential housing, some of which were land and some of which related to existing buildings (i.e. re-use of vacant houses, conversions of commercial property, sub-division of houses and flats above shops). Many of the latter were best accounted for by means of an allowance, rather than identifying and surveying specific sites.

The new guidance places less emphasis on allowances and more on the identification of sites. Presumably because of PPS3's general exclusion of windfall sites from the first 10 year's supply, it only includes Windfall assessment as an optional stage (see below). The main sources of sites are as follows:

A. Sites in the planning process

1) land allocated (or with permission) for employment or other land uses which are no longer required for those uses
2) existing housing allocations and site development briefs
3) unimplemented/outstanding planning permissions for housing
4) planning permissions for housing that is under construction

B. Sites not currently in the planning process, e.g.

1) vacant and derelict land and buildings
2) surplus public sector land
3) land in non-residential use which may be suitable for re-development for housing, such as commercial buildings or car parks, including as part of mixed-use development
4) additional housing opportunities in established residential areas, such as under-used garage blocks
5) large scale redevelopment and re-design of existing residential areas
6) sites in rural settlements and rural exception sites
7) urban extensions (broad locations normally identified in RSS)
8) new free standing settlements

There is no longer a distinction drawn between "brownfield" sites and those not previously developed, so that the Tapping the Potential category of "vacant land not previously developed within the urban area" is presumably subsumed in B.1 above (or possibly in B.2 if it is in public ownership, such as public open space or school playing fields).

Moreover, although B.2 and B.3 refer only to land, it is assumed that they refer also to buildings.

Site source B.4 was previously referred to as "intensification" and included large gardens and backland as well as garage blocks. These are therefore proposed as sub-categories.

B.6, B.7 and B.8 comprise sites which would not previously have been included in an urban capacity study since they lie outside the urban area. However, they appear to exclude the most important source of new development land, namely the small-scale extension of urban areas and other settlements which do not come into the category of urban extensions because they are too small and are not sites in (as opposed to on the edge of) rural settlements.

This would appear to be because the Guidance considers such sites separately at Stage 9 under the heading of "Broad Locations – Within and Adjoining Settlements". However, in order to enable more efficient organisation of survey work, and in the light of work already done on the settlement strategy in the Preferred Options Report and in the Environmental Capacity Study, it is considered that such sites should be included in Stages 3 to 5 of the main study. Stage 9 may therefore not be necessary.

It is also proposed to add an extra category, "Land adjoining Settlements", to cover such sites.

Identification of such land would need to be heavily qualified to ensure that this implied no commitment to granting planning permission either now or at any time in the future. At the same time, some element of judgement and selection would be involved at Stage 4 in order to focus only on those sites/ broad locations with a realistic chance of allocation. This selection would be based on the Environmental Capacity Study already undertaken.

Unlike Tapping the Potential, the Practice guidance does not require the geographical area of search to be defined, presumably because the assessment is no longer confined to the urban area. However paragraph 21 of the Practice Guidance does allow particular types of land or areas to be excluded from the assessment provided the reasons for doing so are justified and agreed by the members of the partnership (i.e. the HEMP). It also states that, except for clear-cut designations such as sites of Special Scientific Interest, the scope of the Assessment should not be narrowed down by existing policies designed to constrain development. In the Craven context this would mean, for instance, that the Green Wedges in South Craven and Bentham should not be a reason for excluding sites from consideration and the results of the Environmental Capacity Study will need to be viewed in that light.

Sources no longer listed in the Guidance (although note that the above are only given as examples) are:

- Sub-division of existing housing
- Flats over shops

- Empty homes

It is suggested that these sources, which relate to buildings rather than land and which are small-scale in terms of each site (although possibly making a large cumulative contribution), should be dealt with as part of any windfall allowance.

Appendix 1 lists the above site sources from the new guidance, relates these to sub-sources including those that were in the previous Tapping the Potential guidance, and adds additional categories for land adjoining settlements and windfall allowances. It also indicates the likely source of information for each category and sub-category (see Stage 3 below) and the method proposed for collecting the information. These are subject to further discussion with the client and key stakeholders and so could change as the assessment progresses.

3. Desktop review of existing information

The Guidance suggests various sources of information to be used in the desk-top study. On the basis of investigation and discussions held to date, the key sources for the Craven SLAA are likely to be:

- The in-house housing land availability information, which is updated monthly to take account of new planning permissions and completions. It is suggested that a base date of 1st August 2007 be used.
- The Annual Monitoring Report 2006 for allocated/permitted employment sites and allocated housing sites.
- A search of the planning register for sites refused permission for housing development and for sites recently granted permission for employment uses.
- Database of sites submitted in response to consultation on the Allocations DPD.
- The previous Urban Potential Study 2003.
- National Land Use Database returns (mostly duplicating the UPS sites).
- The draft Employment Land Review.
- Economic development department's Sites and Premises Register
- Survey information from the PPG17 study of public open space.
- Surplus public sector sites identified through consultation with key stakeholders.
- Any commercial property databases identified via the HEMP group.
- Rating records/ Valuation Office database (subject to further investigation)
- Ordnance Survey maps as a basis for discussion with development control officers and other staff with local knowledge.

It is understood that employment sites are not regularly monitored in the same way as housing sites and that there is no LPA Empty Property Register. Our investigation of the national Register of Surplus Public Sector land reveals no sites in Craven. The only available aerial photographs date from 2002 and are therefore likely to be of limited use, but will be looked at, together with Goggle Earth/ Google Map information (where available) to support or reject sites revealed by study of the OS maps and in support of the discussion with DC officers.

At this stage of the process, no strict lower threshold site size will be used since this would add to rather than reduce the workload – but see discussion below about deciding which sites to survey.

The sites identified from the above sources will be recorded on GIS software and cross-related to an Excel database setting out a range of characteristics, such as site reference, address/location description, source category, brownfield or greenfield, grid reference, site area, existing land use, existing buildings present, planning status, adjoining land uses, constraints etc. Some of this information will be entered at desk top study stage and the remainder after site survey (see below).

During the establishment of this initial data base, duplication and overlap of sites will be sought out and eliminated. A series of meetings will be arranged with appropriate staff in Development Control, Economic Development and Housing to assist in this process. A unique referencing system will be devised which ensures that a particular site features in only one site source category (with a cross-reference where more than one applies).

4. Determining which sites and areas will be surveyed

The guidance notes that assessments will need to be more comprehensive (in terms of geographical coverage) and intensive (in terms of minimum site size to be surveyed) where housing targets are high and /or where housing market conditions signal worsening affordability. This is the case in Craven.

Moreover, where the area is dominated by smaller rural settlements, as is the case here, then it may be necessary to identify all the sites with potential for housing. Also where a large proportion of housing is expected to be delivered on small sites, then the survey will need to identify smaller sites than would be necessary where larger sites are likely to make up the bulk of supply. According to the current monitoring information x% of current sites with planning permission are less than y hectares in size, indicating a low site size threshold for the survey.

However the guidance also states that the methodology should take account of the resources available.

It is therefore proposed that all sites currently within the planning process (A 1-4 above) will be included in the database but that, in order to minimise workload and given the threshold size suggested for affordable housing in the Preferred Options report, only those sites of 0.1 hectares and above be surveyed (as opposed to 0.2 hectares used in the previous UPS).

Moreover, to conform with sustainability objectives and the draft RSS, the survey of sites identified by the desk top study as not currently within the planning system, together with identifying any further potential sites not picked up in the desk top exercise, will be confined to areas in or adjoining sustainable settlements.

Typically these would (or have scope to) contain shops and services, be accessible by public transport and be capable of having a sensible settlement 'envelope' drawn around them. This is similar to the way in which the settlement strategy in the Core Strategy Preferred Options was defined. It is therefore proposed that the SLAA should be based on this and so involve the service centres of:

- Skipton;
- Glusburn/ Crosshills / Sutton
- Settle with Giggleswick
- High Bentham
- Ingleton
- Gargrave

and the larger villages of:

- Burton in Lonsdale
- Carleton
- Clapham (outside the National Park)
- Cononley
- Cowling
- Embsay
- Hellifield
- Kildwick (with Farnhill)
- Low Bentham

- Low Bradley

For these settlements, we propose to look for sites in or adjoining the settlement boundaries defined in the adopted Local Plan, taking account also of the suggested sites put forward for the Allocations DPD. However not all the latter would necessarily be included. We would use the results of the Environmental Capacity Study to sieve these down to those which are most sustainable and which would have the least environmental impact and concern, taking account also of the Guidance at paragraph 21 already referred to above.

The Guidance refers to mapping certain areas in order to help identify which geographic areas (e.g. development hotspots, town and district centres, principal public transport corridors and specific locations within and outside settlements) could be covered by the survey (i.e. in to order to pick up additional sites which had not been identified in the desk top study). However given the relatively small size of the settlements in Craven, the extent of work already done (including the UPS 2003, the draft ELR and the Allocations DPD consultation) and the absence of specific locations as described in the Guidance, it is not considered that this needs to be done explicitly, although special attention will be given to Skipton town centre and the main public transport routes into it.

Based on the size threshold and the locational criteria, a list of sites will be prepared and a survey schedule drawn up which will minimise travel time.

As soon as possible after the formulation of this list a questionnaire and site plan will be sent to the key statutory consultees/ infrastructure providers and, after the first HEMP meeting, to HEMP members who have agreed to help, seeking information on physical constraints (access, ground conditions or infrastructure) or other factors (e.g. operational uses, traffic impact, flooding or ecological factors) affecting the sites and on whether they can be overcome and at what (approximate) cost and in what time frame. The HEMP members will also be asked to comment on legal and ownership problems and on market, cost and delivery factors affecting the sites, for use at Stage 7 below.

5. Carrying out the survey

We will prepare a survey form based on that used for the UPS 2003 and similar surveys elsewhere, but also allowing for the fact that non-residential uses may also be proposed for some of the sites. The form will be split into a section for completion in the office and a part to be filled in on site. As much information as possible will completed before undertaking the survey, including any available information on constraints from the GIS and CDC staff which can then be checked on site where possible. CDC would provide a large scale plan of each site to be surveyed.

Generally each site will be visited by one Envision member (usually DW or KK), but it is proposed to carry out a pilot survey in one area in which DW, KK and KR visit some sites together so that any problems of interpretation and use of the survey form can be identified and corrected. Smaller sites may be surveyed by in-house staff, as agreed.

Sites will be viewed from the public highway or from footpaths, unless they are in public ownership or there appears to be general public access to them. CDC should provide Envision with a letter to authorise them to view sites on their behalf, although it is understood that this will not confer any right to access sites without permission from the owner. Where it proves difficult to adequately survey the site from public vantage points, CDC will be asked to seek permission for a visit at a later date.

The surveys will accurately map the boundaries of each site, note any constraints either on site or from adjoining land uses and character of surrounding area, and note other relevant factors such as existing land-use, buildings, topography, vegetation, water-courses, pylons, accesses and public rights of way. Where appropriate this will be annotated on the large scale plan as well as on the form. Digital photographs will be taken of all sites.

On return to the office, the exact site boundaries will be entered onto the GIS and a revised site area calculated, together with any sub-divisions of the area (e.g. to take account of undevelopable parts). For each site, an initial assessment will be made of its suitability for housing and other development in order to classify it as either:

- A housing site
- A mixed use site
- An employment site
- A site not suitable for development.

6. Estimating the potential of each site

6.1 Housing

Capacity of housing and mixed use sites will then be calculated by subtracting undevelopable areas and then applying an appropriate net density to the remaining site, based on site size and location. The larger the site, the lower will be the gross to net ratio, while there will also be an increase in density with distance from town centre and facilities along the lines of Table 1 (for illustrative purposes at this stage- to be agreed with client/ HEMP).

Table 1: Illustrative Density Assumptions

	Site size	<0.4 has	0.4 - 2 has.	>2 has.
		dph	dph	dph
Location	***Gross to net ratio***	*100%*	*90%*	*80%*
Town / service centre	Gross density	60	60	60
	Net density	**60**	**54**	48
Edge of town centre	Gross density	50	50	50
	Net density	**50**	**45**	**40**
Suburban	Gross density	40	40	40
	Net density	**40**	**36**	**32**
Rural	Gross density	35	35	35
	Net density	**35**	**31.5**	**28**

All identified sites will be assessed in the same way, but we will select (in discussion with Council officers and HEMP partners) sites for further design-led study, using the sample scheme approach recommended in the guidance. It may be necessary to identify innovative sample schemes from outside the district in some cases (e.g. high density schemes in Conservation Areas and for town centre car-parks).

The sites selected for this approach would be from the larger sites in the following categories:

- *Unimplemented/ outstanding planning permissions for housing*
- *Existing housing allocations*
- *Land allocated for employment and other uses*
- *Vacant and Derelict Land and Buildings*
- *Surplus Public Sector Land*
- *Under-used industrial and commercial premises*
- *Development of Car Parks*
- *Housing Opportunities in Established Residential Areas*

Where there is an existing sketch scheme of brief which can be used as a basis for assessing capacity, this will be used unless, in discussion with the client and/ or HEMP, there is reason to believe that a higher density could be achieved. It is understood that a higher density has already been assumed for the existing housing allocations, so these are unlikely to be selected.

In the case of identified opportunities for *Conversion of Industrial and Commercial Buildings* a site visit will be made to identify site boundaries and constraints, but the assessment of capacity will based on a yardstick approach using a gross to net ratio to determine the usable floor area (60-80% depending on the depth of the building) which is then divided by an assumed unit floorspace (say 70 sq.m.).

6.2 Employment

Sites identified for employment and mixed use will be assessed for their potential by reference to the market sector for which each site is considered suitable (e.g. small business units, warehouse and distribution, general industry), applying a plot ratio and employment density applicable to that sector. Where a mixed use site involves more than just a simple split of the land between residential and employment use (i.e. genuine integration of uses on different levels), then some form of design-led approach as discussed above may be necessary.

7. Assessing when and whether sites are likely to be developed

For all sites identified as developable (for housing, mixed use or employment) in the initial assessment at the end of Stage 4, we will assess whether it is deliverable, developable or not currently developable (as defined in paras. 54 and 56 of PPS3). This will involve assessing whether each site is:

- **Suitable**, i.e. in terms of sustainable development and as a location for housing/ employment/ mixed use, taking into account policy restrictions (but subject to the ability to ease restrictive designations through the Core Strategy), physical problems or limitations, potential impacts (e.g. on landscape or conservation) and environmental conditions for future residents. This assessment will have already been done at Stage 4 (and is generally not needed for sites in the planning process), but will be checked in the light of the work done at stage 6.
- **Available**, i.e. within 5 years of the date of adoption of the Allocations DPD, based on available information on owner's intentions and on legal and ownership problems, as obtained through discussion with DC and economic development staff and through the consultation with members of HEMP undertaken at Stage 4. Where problems have been identified an assessment will be made as to how and when they can be overcome (including the prospects for CPO on key sites) and this information will be used to classify the site as either: available (i.e. within 5 years), available in 5-10 years, available in 10-15 years or not available for at least 15 years (all from the date of adoption of the Allocations DPD).
- **Achievable,** i.e. whether the site is economically viable (i.e. the residual value for the use and at the density proposed exceeds the value of the site remaining in its existing use) and saleable over a given period, taking account of market factors, cost factors and delivery factors as set out in paragraph 40 of the Guidance. Information on these factors will be sought from HEMP members at an early stage (see 4. above) so that it is available for this assessment.

  In addition Keith Reed could undertake basic residual valuations of the major sites. The results of these calculations would be shared with the HEMP members to check that they are reasonably accurate, while accepting that they will not be as detailed or robust as would be required for commercial decision making. Depending on the number of such sites, this may be done through allocating sites between HEMP members or by asking all members to look at all sites in order to obtain a spread of views on each. Depending on the number of major sites, this approach may be used just for a sample of them, combined with a more general request for HEMP views on the other sites.

For each site where constraints have been identified we will provide a schedule of actions needed to remove them, drawing on the response to the questionnaire of key statutory consultees/ infrastructure providers and HEMP members issued at the end of Stage 4.

8. Reviewing the Assessment

All the above information will be entered into the Excel spreadsheet and this will be used to produce a trajectory of anticipated completions each year from 2006/7 to 2020/21. This will then be reviewed to assess the extent to which it meets the aspirations in the Core Strategy Preferred Options report for the 15 years to 2021 (with indicative additional development for 2021- 2024) and to identify the extent to which sites in the Land adjoining Settlements category can be either put back or brought forward to bring the two into line. This may involve identifying alternative land releases in order to meet the requirement.

It is anticipated that there will be more than enough land to meet this requirement, but if not consideration will then be given as to whether an additional Stage 9 assessment is needed.

At this stage we feel it would be helpful to debate and exchange views on the key findings and do a "reality check". We therefore propose to call together the HEMP partners and the key statutory consultees and infrastructure providers in the form of a "**Developability Workshop**" in order to report back on the work done so far, seek views on the above factors in relation to the larger sites identified and on the windfall allowance (see below), and seek consensus as far as possible that the findings and assumptions are reasonable. This will be a half day workshop facilitated by Kate Bailey.

9. Identifying and assessing the potential of broad locations (where necessary)

It is assumed that this will not be necessary and this stage is not therefore included in this proposal.

10. Determining the housing potential of windfalls (where justified)

PPS 3 states that allowances for windfalls should not be included in the first 10 years of land supply unless there are genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites being identified. In these circumstances, an allowance should be included but should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends.

Recorded housing completions for the year 2005/06 were 146; 132 of these were 'windfall' units developed on land not allocated for housing, predominantly on seven sites identified in the Urban Potential Study. It is therefore clear that Craven relies on such sites in arriving at its current housing land supply but also that it would have been possible to identify most of such sites in advance through the methodology outlined above.

Nevertheless there remains an element of small windfall sites for which allowance must be made in order to avoid the unnecessary release of greenfield land. The preferred Options report, while stating that large "windfall" sites will be specifically identified and therefore taken out of the windfall category through the SHLAA, still refers to such an element of small windfalls as part of total supply.

Such windfall sites are likely to comprise small infill plots within the built up areas; conversions of existing small buildings, including former farm buildings; and subdivision of existing houses. It is proposed to undertake an analysis of the completions on these and other sources of windfall sites over the last 10 years and to use these average completion rates to determine the realistic housing potential from each source, taking into account whether these rates are likely to increase or decrease in the light of current and projected market conditions and the availability of suitable premises. This consideration will be informed by a consultation with HEMP members, the Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the calculation of potential for sub-division based on Census data that was undertaken for the UPS 2003.

In addition, there are two sources of sites which were in earlier Tapping the Potential Guidance but would not be revealed by an analysis of planning permissions and the survey process described above. These are:

- *Flats Over Shops*
- *Empty Homes*

A survey of flats above shops was undertaken for the UPS 2003 and a calculation made based on this. It assumed that only 25% of the total potential could be realistically realised. We will review the assumptions made in discussion with relevant Council officers and HEMP but do not propose to repeat the survey which will remain generally valid.

The Council's Empty Homes Strategy shows that in April 2006 there were 744 recorded empty dwellings in Craven and of these 327 private sector properties had been empty for longer than 6 months. The vacancy rate in Craven (3.1%) is above average for both North Yorkshire and the Region. We will use the information from the strategy and a meeting with the Housing Department officer in order to arrive at a reasonable estimate of the amount of currently vacant private housing which can be expected to be brought back into use over the plan period.

Reporting

The results of the survey, consultations and assessments will be written up in full and the conclusions drawn together in the form of a full report with Appendices in the form of tables of sites for each use and site plans. An Executive summary will also be included.

A consultation statement will also be prepared as an appendix to the report which shall list all consultees/ attendance at meetings/ minutes/ notes of meetings etc. All correspondence/ records will be electronically scanned and made available on disk in a searchable format (to be agreed with client).

A draft report will be provided for review by the client and any comments fed back into a final draft. This will then be reported to the Spatial Planning Committee. We will attend the committee meeting to present and explain the Assessment.