

Core Strategy for Chiltern District

Chiltern District Council - Response to Inspector's Questions [ID/4]

MAIN MATTER 6: Meeting the housing needs of the community SUB MATTER: Affordable Housing

DATE: 18 March 2011

Final

The following Paper sets out the Council's response to Main Matter 6, sub matter 'Affordable Housing' of the document, 'Inspector's Main Matters and Questions' ID/4. The Paper has been structured to include the specific questions raised by the Inspector (in bold) and the Council's detailed response to them.

7.2) To provide a context for the requirements of CS8 and to test the credibility of the overall affordable housing target stated in the Strategic Objectives, could the Council illustrate what is the projected outcome for the provision of affordable housing between 2011-2026, taking into account:

- a) The number expected to be provided on sites with planning permission/agreed in principle (as the proportion will already be known);**
- b) An estimate of what might be delivered from the strategic allocations and MDS housing sites. (Please show Newlands Park separately as the outcome from this site might be known during the Examination.)**
- c) An estimate of what might be delivered from development of sufficient SHLAA sites to achieve 2,400 dwellings by 2026, applying the proportions in policy CS8 to the Council's latest estimate of individual site capacities.**
- d) Any schemes for 100% affordable provision, including Rural Exception schemes.**

7.3) Please show explicitly the assumptions made, including the proportion of future developments where it has been assumed that the percentages in CS8 have been fully met and the proportion where provision may have to be discounted for viability reasons.

CDC Response:

The table set out below shows the results of applying the requirements in Policy CS8 to various sources of anticipated housing supply.

Table 1 - Projected outcome for the Provision of Affordable Housing 2011 – 2026

Source of Affordable Housing	Anticipated Supply of Affordable Housing
Sites with Planning Permission/Agreed in Principle at 31 March 2011 (q 7.2a)	201
Strategic Housing Sites / MDS Excluding Newland Park (q7.2 b)	63
Newland Park MDS (q7.2 b) <small>(with proportion shown in the current planning application CH/2010/0976/FA included in italics)</small>	120 (20)
Total Potential from SHLAA Sites (q7.2c)*	251 to 412
100% Affordable Housing Schemes /Rural exceptions schemes with outstanding planning permission (q7.2d)	0
Total Potential	635 to 796

Notes:

In addition to these estimated yields would be the affect of the requirement under Policy CS8 for financial contributions toward the provision of affordable housing on sites of 1- 4 dwellings.
*based on the analysis of SHLAA sites in CDN 115

In total the categories of housing supply in Table 1 shows that the potential exists for between 635 and 796 affordable dwellings to be provided over the CS period. This range would be between 515 and 676 affordable dwellings, were the potential contribution from Newland Park MDS excluded.

In carrying out this work it has been assumed that the proportions required in Policy CS8 have been fully met and no discounting has been applied (Inspector's questions, paragraph 7.3). However, were the potential total yield of affordable housing from the SHLAA sites to be discounted in a way similar to that in paragraph 3.1.10 of CDN114, the actual yield from SHLAA sites

could be between 113 and 309 dwellings (i.e. assuming that between 45% and 75% of all the housing potential of the SHLAA sites is realised over the plan period).

The detailed working for the contribution from SHLAA sites and from Strategic Housing Sites and Major Developed Sites is shown in Appendix 1 to this response.

7.4) In the light of the evidence to be produced above, does the 500 target have reasonable prospects of being met?

CDC Response:

The information set out above shows that the target of 500 dwellings is an appropriate target in light of the need for affordable housing and the type of housing development that historically comes forward in the District.

Policy CS8

7.6) The Affordable Housing Development Economics Study - 2009/10 Update (CDN082) assessed the viability of various affordable housing requirements in relation to a range of house price bands typical of the district at the time of the study. I am unclear as to what conclusion the Council has actually drawn from the Study as to the deliverability of the expectations in CS7. Council to explain, in general terms, how it considers that the Study supports the policy.

CDC Response:

The Affordable Housing Development Economics Study -2009/10 Update (CDN082) must be read in conjunction with the Chiltern District Council Affordable Housing Development Economics Study July 2007 (CDN031). As required by paragraph 29 of PPS3, the Council has interpreted the findings of CDN031 and CDN082 into a policy that sets out the *“range of circumstances in which affordable housing will be required”* (CDC emphasis). The studies tested the site size thresholds in which, given known residual land values in

the District, a contribution to affordable housing could generally be sought without economic viability being significantly impacted. CDN031 established the general contribution to affordable housing that could reasonably be sought at each of these site-size thresholds. In developing Policy CS8 the Council's objective was to provide a clear policy which sets out what the required contribution to affordable housing will be. This approach has been successfully applied to Policy H6 of the Local Plan since 2004, and clearly accords with the objectives in paragraph 29 of PPS3. The Council however recognises the acknowledgements within CDN031 and CDN082 that instances will arise where site-specific issues mean that economic viability of a particular scheme would be detrimentally impacted by the requirements of CS8. The proposed suggested additional wording to Policy CS8 therefore appropriately recognises this (refer to CDN117).

Q7.7) The Study suggests that the evidence supports the Council's approach in terms of suitably challenging targets (3.5.1), that they form a clear basis for a negotiated approach (3.5.6), and that the role of viability considerations needs to be acknowledged in the policy (3.5.8). The policy not does incorporate these words. Does it adequately reflect this advice? If not, is the Council justified in departing from it?

CDC Response:

Again it should be stated that CDN082 must be read in conjunction with CDN031. The Council has interpreted the findings of these studies into a Policy CS8. It is recognised that Policy CS8 is the starting position for securing affordable housing (and contributions to its provision) on development sites. Clarification of this is provided in paragraph 10.5 of the CS. Notwithstanding this the Council has suggested alternative wording to policy CS8 in CDN117 which is considered to address this matter.

7.8) Whether any Residual Land Value (RLV) is sufficient to encourage development to proceed, as well as to provide any affordable housing, will depend on existing/alternative use value and the owners' expectations. Most of the SHLAA sites relied on by the Council are

garden land or sites of existing residential property with relatively high existing use values (3.3.4, CDN082).

CDC Response:

Paragraph 3.3.4 of CDN082 builds on the various acknowledgements made in the study work about the relevance of the existing / alternative use value of land and the particular, variable, circumstances around sites and owners. The need for comparison with another valuation scenario applies where there is a ready market for an alternative to pursuing a residential development scheme (i.e. there must be realistic potential of releasing a level of value for it to become a firm measure for comparison against the indications for the scheme RLV).

The applicable levels of values associated with existing / alternative uses and any incentives required over and above those will be highly variable in practice.

This brings a focus on site selection and scheme design as two key and inter-related factors, and also encourages the optimum use of sites.

As a general principle, the value of land flows from its location and what the owner (meaning also the developer) can do with it in planning terms. This is then further influenced by particular characteristics and the detailed review of its potential and constraints, including as affected by local and wider planning policy. There can be no fixed notion of land value that applies regardless of these drivers.

Over time, land value expectations are duly influenced by a range of factors, as the studies recognise – including planning policy and other requirements (for example, but certainly not limited to, affordable housing).

The VOA Residential Land Reporting information of January 2010 (the latest available) referred to land values staying well below their 2007 levels, and having shown little change over the year from January 2009. Although since

2009 there was shown to be a less steep decline in land values, the information suggested a broad view of residential land values back to around their early 2004, pre peak, levels. The VOA's last published Index pointed to July 2009 residential land values around 38% below their peak levels (at summer 2007 to early 2008). This background fits with the general tone of property market reporting information around the realistic levels of expectation for residential land values.

Similar information suggests that industrial development land values had also levelled out in the year to January 2010 – at about their 2006 levels, significantly below their early 2008 peak.

The value of existing housing purchased for redevelopment will vary considerably. Similarly, the value of garden land will be highly variable since any comparison will generally be associated with the enjoyment of existing housing. A potential approach to considering its value is the reduction in the value of the existing property caused by the loss of garden land as a basis, with some degree of inducement then added.

These will be matters overcome through creative scheme proposals and will usually not be moved from viable to unviable territory simply through reason of affordable housing provision if the policies are sensitively and practically implemented as the Council proposes.

Q7.9) At what value points do the RLVs represent realistic values to exceed existing garden/residential use values? Is there an industry norm/guide for the land cost as a proportion of Gross Development Cost for small schemes on residential sites? If so, how does this compare with outcomes shown in Table 2a of CDN082?

CDC Response:

Valuation is not an exact science and there are no definitive cut-offs, as the studies emphasise and is widely recognised. However, values at Value Point

3 levels would be the point at which scenarios move to levels likely to be workable in a range of circumstances (including financial contributions).

The nature of proposals (the type of dwellings proposed etc) will directly affect the RLVs. Those will generally be boosted in the case of larger, more individual properties than the broad ranging study assumptions were based on.

The actual levels of RLVs (sums available in £s for land purchase) need to be considered as well in making judgments. There is no industry norm or particular guide on RLVs as %s of GDV, and this is just one measure of the strength of the RLV. The 'transparent assumptions' guidance that accompanies the HCA's Area Wide Viability Assessment Model mentions these principles but without steering on the % level.

Such as they are, guides generally of around 20% of GDV tend to be referred to, but only as an indication since higher and lower %s will also be required or acceptable, depending on the circumstances. The traffic light style colouring indications with the results tables to the 2007 study (CDN031) present our indications – as are explained at 3.9.4 of that.

We are aware of %RLV guides in the order of 20% GDV having been used by other prominent consultants. As an example, in a 2010 study Knight Frank used 10% as a short term figure; range 15-30% and median of 22.5% GDV as a longer term (after 2015 - market recovered) guide (Source: Southampton City Council Developer Contributions Viability Study). This is just one example. It can be seen that opinions vary, as available information does – ultimately an overview has to be made after review of the wide range of results and sensitivities.

In previous times, i.e. pre-affordable housing and other planning and sustainability etc requirements, RLV as a proportion of GDV might have been up in the order of 30-40% of GDV on a more regular basis, but again subject to variation. This links back to the points made in respect to 7.8 above about what drives land value.

The '0% Affordable' RLVs (at Table 2a and elsewhere in the results) are also relevant here in considering the context of the RLVs that reflect the inclusion of affordable housing. It can be seen that without affordable housing these are likely to need to reach Value Point 2, and possibly 3, to underpin viable schemes.

This measure of RLV does not deteriorate as schemes reduce in size. It must also be noted that these particular results are also associated with assumptions on a 20% developer's profit, affordable (social) rent biased tenure mix with no grant, £10,000 per dwelling planning infrastructure (wider planning obligations) contribution and 10% renewable energy assumption; so that quite a degree of other cost has also been factored-in and therefore viability has been looked at relatively cautiously.

Q7.10) The representation by Mr Stent (401227) provides some worked examples of small schemes. Council to comment on whether these suggest that a financial contribution may often not be achievable.

CDC Response:

The Council acknowledges again that all situations will vary and that no policy of this type can guarantee to fully deliver all the time (even if based on lower affordable housing target %s and only on higher thresholds). The viability outcome is moved around by a more complex interaction of a range of factors. The collective costs and obligations burdens on schemes need to be considered, as Mr Stent has also identified. Practical application of the approach will be important, as the Council's positions affirm.

Mr Stent's versions of broad-brush indications have been based on the notion of fixed land value (at 35 to 40% GDV). Therefore this is a different residual approach which is not consistent with the usual type of analysis for this purpose, and also with what could be justified in terms of land purchase prices in these instances given the site scope (including as influenced by planning policy and other factors). The land value would not remain at these levels with

planning policies and other aspects factored in. As has been the case with larger sites in recent years, affordable housing, wider planning and other characteristics and requirements necessitate land price adjustment.

There may well be instances where sites have already been purchased at high values, resulting in consideration of priority planning objectives and potential negotiations. However, more crucially and moving forward a key purpose of planning policy is to guide land use and development expectations enabling relevant allowances to be made at early stages and suitable land owner expectations to be arrived at as part of this process.

This comes back to site and scheme selection, as it appears Mr Stent has recognised. As referred to at 7.8 above, land value cannot be considered as a fixed element for this purpose; instead the RLV produced by the scheme proposal moves with its details and associated requirements; and needs to be compared with other measures such as existing / alternative use value as a basis.

Viability issues, where experienced, tend not to be just related to affordable housing – much wider influences have a bearing on viability too.

Q 7.11) In applying CS8, a scheme of 4 units would need to contribute 80% of the cost of a 2 bed house locally. Could this be a more onerous requirement than providing 1 affordable unit on site in a 5-7 unit scheme? When affordable housing is provided on site, does the developer normally expect a financial contribution from the RSL, such as towards build costs (funded by capital borrowing by the RSL)? (I am not assuming any additional public subsidy.)

CDC Response:

The financial contributions route on this occasion was tested through applying the Council's proposed methodology. Applying for example the viability study Value Point 3 assumptions, the 4 unit scheme (3 bed houses) generates a

GDV of £1.207m and attracts a financial contribution of $4 \times £53,250 = £213,000$ to be paid from the proceeds.

Providing 1 affordable unit on a 5 unit scheme of the same dwelling types same means the broadly the same level of market revenue (GDV from the 4 private sales) plus an approximate RP payment of about £79,000. So the overall revenue in this quick example is boosted by approximately £79,000 to about £1,286,000. However the developer in this scenario has to construct the affordable home, and bear the range of other associated other fees, costs and finance expenses; closing the gap. It is likely that in terms of the pure numbers, while this could still see the 4 unit scheme plus financial contribution look potentially less attractive in comparison (and could therefore be said to encourage the consideration of direct provision on site), the merits of each to the developer may not be that simple. This is because in practice this position would no doubt be balanced to some degree with the improved marketing prospects and having no extra input and need to involve an RP (which often entails building to varied standards and specification plus setting up management arrangements, etc). In this situation, depending on the details, a developer might also start to take the view that the value of the market units would need to be adjusted by some extent to reflect the revised nature of the mixed scheme. This example scenario does not reflect the relative merits to the developer of each approach where a scheme of larger, more valuable dwellings is under review. In that type of scenario, we would expect the financial contributions approach to present a significantly more market friendly approach compared with the on-site route, in financial as well as wider terms. Much would be dependent on the case specifics and it is not appropriate to deal with those detailed implications at the strategic level.

Increasing from 5 through to 7 dwellings whilst still providing 1 affordable on-site, would clearly improve the viability equation relative to the above and incentivise the optimal development of sites. The same applies at other points within the Council's sliding scale once the step up in scheme size has been made. Steps and variations are inevitable with the established principles of applying thresholds, regardless of the specific set up of the approach. This is

however, very much more equitable than a scenario with a very significant step at a usually arbitrary point of say 10 or 15 dwellings where affordable housing or other obligations are sought from larger schemes only.

There is a growing number of examples of this type of approach having been supported and adopted, and now in use as part of authorities' affordable housing enabling tools. (Examples that Adams Integra have been involved in recently include Sevenoaks, London Borough of Enfield and Mole Valley. Similar principles are being explored with and pursued by a range of other Councils, given the need to optimise contributions towards meeting affordable housing needs.)

When affordable housing is provided on site, normally the RP involved makes a payment to the developer for completing the homes under a form of development agreement. As explained at section 2.7 of CDN031, which also provides more information of this area, no public subsidy ('grant') has been assumed for the affordable housing, which is an appropriate starting point - recently confirmed by the HCA in respect of s.106 provision. The widely established basis, as assumed within the viability study work is that:

- for rented accommodation, the payment by the RP (revenue received by the developer) will be no more than the capitalised value of the net rental stream arising from the accommodation that is being developed (the HCA's new affordable housing funding framework position); and
- for affordable home ownership (shared ownership or similar) schemes, the RP payment will again be based on the value of its revenue stream, in this case based on a combination of the value of the initial share to be sold combined with the value of the RP's retained equity stake (which the shared owner pays a rental element for).

In the case of (social) rented affordable housing, the expectation is that invariably the payment by the RP falls short of being able to support the build costs. There is a significant gap between this and the market level of revenue

that would have been received for the dwelling on a private market sale basis; this is the developer subsidy in this instance. Social rent without grant RP payment levels are generally up to no more than around 35-40% or so of market sales value (open market value – ‘OMV’). Shared ownership RP payment levels are generally up to about 65% OMV. These vary of course. We can reasonably expect that RP payment levels for the recently announced revised form of affordable rent will fall somewhere within these two scenarios. Quite a bit of detail still has to be worked through on that, and will be appropriate for subsequent SPD or similar documents used to guide the approach and build the detail from the strategic basis.

Q7.12) Is it reasonable to expect the applicant to provide a full financial viability assessment and justification as well as to pay for an independent review of the information (CS paragraph 10.5)? Would the Council’s position be different if the policy referred to negotiations, targets and embedded viability as a policy consideration from the outset?

CDC Response:

The Council believes that given the underlying affordable housing need in the District the onus should be firmly placed on the applicant to demonstrate that it would not be viable to provide affordable housing in line with the requirements in Policy CS8. In light of general financial pressures on local authorities and the move towards setting local planning application fees, the Council considers it reasonable for the applicant to pay for the independent verification of their study. This approach is consistent with the Council’s general approach to charging.

Q7.13) What arrangements are, or will be, put in place to make transparent and accountable how financial contributions obtained towards affordable housing are used?

CDC Response:

The Council intends to produce a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Affordable Housing soon after the adoption of the Core Strategy. This SPD will draw on information contained within the Council's Strategic Housing Framework. Initially, any monies secured for contributions to affordable housing will be obtained through the use of Section 106 Obligations. This is a transparent process which needs to comply with national guidance.. Where monies have been pooled to make a contribution to affordable housing, the Council's Cabinet will take decisions in public on how this money is to be spent. Contributions and expenditure can also be reported through the Annual Monitoring Report as part of the process of monitoring the success of the policy.

Q7.14) Is it consistent with advice on affordable housing in PPS3 to expect development of only (assumed word which is missing is "one") additional new dwelling to contribute to the provision of affordable housing?

CDC Response:

The last bullet point of paragraph 29 of PPS3 sets out the approach for local authorities to use when seeking developer contributions towards the provision of affordable housing. This paragraph does not provide specific advice on whether or not developments seeking a net increase of one dwelling should make a contribution to affordable housing. The Council therefore considers that, given the underlying affordable housing need in the District and the type of housing developments that have historically come forward, this approach conforms with the objective of PPS3 to create "sustainable, inclusive, mixed communities in all areas".

7.15) In the absence of any direct comparison of predicted RLVs with likely land values for garden/residential sites, and taking account of the Study's own recommendations (section 3.5), my preliminary view is that the viability evidence does not justify the proportions in the policy as explicit requirements, but only as targets to be used as a starting point for negotiation. Also, considerations of viability should be embedded in

the policy. I invite the Council to suggest in its response paper alternative wording for discussion at the hearing.

CDC Response:

See suggested revision to Policy CS8 in CDN117.

7.16) The Study suggests that monitoring of outcomes will be important to judge the effectiveness of the policy and whether it should be reviewed. The stated indicator relates only to the overall numbers of affordable housing provided, which is a crude measure of outcome. I invite the Council to consider the need to monitor the proportion of affordable units achieved in relation to the policy targets and what might trigger a review of the policy.

CDC Response:

The Council accepts the stated position within 7.16 and suggests that the Council's Local performance Indicator LPIPE25 – 'Percentage of new homes (net) granted planning permission which are affordable', is used to monitor the success of the policy.

7.17) Where is policy CS8 (Rural Exceptions) intended to apply? It refers to adjoining the built-up areas of settlements, which could include the large towns. Does this fit the guidance in PPS3 that exception sites are to meet needs in rural areas?

CDC Response:

The rural exceptions policy CS9 has been developed in close consultation with the Rural Housing Enabler from the Buckinghamshire Rural Housing Partnership.

Paragraph 30 of PPS 3 advises that "in rural communities, where opportunities for delivering affordable housing tend to be more limited, the aim should be to deliver high quality housing that contributes to the creation and maintenance of sustainable rural communities in market towns and villages."

All of the settlements within Chiltern District are either market towns (such as Amersham and Chesham) or villages. All of them share the characteristic that all of the land adjoining the built up areas of the settlement is designated as Greenbelt and/or AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) which severely limits the scope for new development. Consequently, the Council wants to utilise the rural exception model to provide the opportunity to deliver high quality new affordable housing provision across the district on sites adjacent to its market towns and villages. This will directly fulfil the aim set down in PPS 3 as stated above. The Council has already had success with this approach in Chalfont St Giles, where an affordable housing scheme was delivered in 2010 on a green belt site adjacent to the town by using the rural exception model and utilising a Section 106 Agreement to secure that the dwellings were offered to local people.

7.18) The policy requires the housing to remain affordable in perpetuity. This is only achievable where the right to buy/stair casing is excluded in accordance with listed parishes/settlements identified in SI 1997/625 (or similar Regulations). If the policy is intended to apply only to these smaller settlements, should this be made clear?

CDC Response:

The parishes/settlements and areas identified in SI 1997/625 (or similar Regulations) are not limited to small settlements. The areas highlighted on the plans which accompany the Statutory Instrument also encompass land on the edge of larger settlements such as Amersham and Chesham. The Council does not wish to limit the use of the Rural Exceptions model to sites identified in SI 1997/625 (or similar Regulations). It wants to retain the flexibility to develop schemes on other sites where affordable housing can be secured in perpetuity through approaches such as utilising nil-grant (as per the model originally developed by the Rural Housing Trust).

7.19) Policy CS10 seeks to split provision of affordable housing between 70% social and 30% shared ownership (intermediate). Many representations seek a greater proportion of intermediate affordable

housing. Is the split in CS10 justified by evidence? Would more intermediate housing be viable in this area?

CDC Response:

The proportions of affordable housing sought of 70% social rented and a maximum of 30% (or other intermediate housing) reflect the proportions envisaged by Policy H3 ii of the SEP.

Notwithstanding this, paragraph 10.8 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District Submission Document (CDN 105) summarises the evidence relating to the type of affordable housing, in particular the Buckinghamshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (CDN051-053). The proportions within the policy are based on the information about how different housing types relate to the local housing need. Due to the high cost of housing in the area, intermediate housing is likely to have only a very limited impact on meeting the need for affordable housing in the District. This is also highlighted in paragraph 12.53 (iii) of CDN052 where it is stated that in principle about a quarter to a half of the affordable housing could be intermediate. Furthermore paragraph 9.83 of CDN 051 elaborates on this by stating that as a result of the lack of genuinely intermediate housing which has been produced, it is unlikely that more than a small fraction of the overall housing need could be met by genuinely intermediate housing.

7.20) I understand that the Council has a preferred mix for affordable housing of 80% 1 and 2 bedroom dwellings and 20% 3 bedroom dwellings. Is this correct? Is policy CS11 intended to achieve this mix? Applying the policy to the size of sites likely come forward for housing over remainder of the plan period (in the manner explained in 7.2 above) would it do so?

CDC Response:

The mix of affordable housing size is set out in Policy CS11 of the Core Strategy for Chiltern District Submission Document (CDN 105). The mix relates to the size of the site, with four categories within the policy having

different suggested mixes. There is not a 20% / 80% split throughout the policy, although this is the balance in the last bullet point of the Policy which refers to large sites.

The part of question 7.20 which asks about the mix of affordable housing size is also related to question 7.2 concerning the likely yield of affordable housing from various types of sites, including Strategic Housing Sites, Major Developed Sites and SHLAA sites. Tables which are included as **Appendix 1** to this response provide the answer to these questions. In summary, they show the estimated affordable housing yields which would come forward from these types of sites, based upon the requirements in Policy CS8 and CS11, i.e. Outstanding planning permissions– 201 affordable units, of these 165 would be one and two bed and 36 would be 3 bed

- Strategic Housing Sites and Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt – 183 affordable units, of these 148 would be one and two bed and 35 would be 3 bed. (At the request of the Inspector information for the Newland Park site is shown separately in Table 1 as there is a current planning application on the site. Totals are also provided to show the results without the contribution from Newland Park).
- SHLAA sites (lower range yield) - 251 affordable units, of these 241 would be one and two bed and 10 would be 3 bed
- SHLAA sites (higher range yield) - 412 affordable units, of these 392 would be one and two bed and 20 would be 3 bed

Appendix 1

Table 1 SHS and MDS Affordable housing yield and mix

Site	Yield shown in the Housing Land Supply Trajectory CDN113	Likely AH yield based on CS8. Note this is rounded down in all cases	Likely AH mix based on CS11, one and two bed dwgs	Likely AH mix based on CS11, three bed dwgs	Notes
Donkey Field SHS	60	24	20	4	
East of Lincoln Park SHS	44	17	14	3	
Holy Cross Convent Site SHS	0	0	0	0	No information is entered in this table as the site has outstanding planning permission and its mix is recorded separately
Chesham Campus site of A and W College MDS	57	22	18	4	
Newland Park MDS	300	120	96	24	Note there is a planning application on this site CH/2010/0976/FA for 326 dwgs with a mix of housing and a reference to 20 AH units in the Planing Statement, supported by a Toolkit Viability Report. The application is pending consideration as at 14th March 2011.
TOTALS	461	183	148	35	
TOTALS excluding Newland Park MDS	161	63	52	11	

Table 2 SHLAA SITES Affordable housing yield and mix (sites listed in CDN 115)

SHLAA #	2. Officer Assessment Yield (lower yield range) [net]	2. Officer Assessment Yield (higher yield range) [net]	Likely AH yield (lower range) based on CS8. Note this is rounded down in all cases	Likely AH yield (higher range) based on CS8. Note this is rounded down in all cases.	Likely AH mix (lower range) based on CS11, one and two bed dwgs	Likely AH mix (lower range) based on CS11, three bed dwgs	Likely AH mix (higher range) based on CS11 one and two bed dwgs	Likely AH mix (higher range) based on CS11 three bed dwgs
1	9	15	2	6.0	2	0	6	0
5	17	26	6	10	6	0	9	1
8	9	9	2	2	2	0	2	0
51	7	12	1	4	1	0	4	0
52	12	12	4	4	4	0	4	0
73	10	19	3	7	3	0	7	0
233	4	5	0	1	0	0	1	0
240	25	44	10	17	9	1	15	2
241	5	10	1	3	1	0	3	0
242	4	12	0	4	0	0	4	0
246	7	10	1	3	1	0	3	0
247	23	31	9	12	9	0	11	1
248	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
249	9	11	2	3	2	0	3	0
250	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
251	8	13	2	4	2	0	4	0
253	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
254	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
255	8	21	2	8	2	0	8	0
256	12	17	4	6	4	0	6	0
257	4	8	0	2	0	0	2	0
258	5	5	1	1	1	0	1	0
259	7	7	1	1	1	0	1	0
260	7	18	1	7	1	0	7	0
261	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
263	13	31	4	12	4	0	11	1
264	5	5	1	1	1	0	1	0
266	21	21	8	8	8	0	8	0
267	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
268	8	8	2	2	2	0	2	0
270	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Table 2 SHLAA SITES Affordable housing yield and mix
(sites listed in CDN 115)**

SHLAA #	2. Officer Assessment Yield (lower yield range) [net]	2. Officer Assessment Yield (higher yield range) [net]	Likely AH yield (lower range) based on CS8. Note this is rounded down in all cases.	Likely AH yield (higher range) based on CS8. Note this is rounded down in all cases.	Likely AH mix (lower range) based on CS11, one and two bed dwgs	Likely AH mix (lower range) based on CS11, three bed dwgs	Likely AH mix (higher range) based on CS11 one and two bed dwgs	Likely AH mix (higher range) based on CS11 three bed dwgs
271	4	8	0	2	0	0	2	0
272	6	14	1	4	1	0	4	0
273	4	7	0	1	0	0	1	0
274	6	10	1	3	1	0	3	0
275	2	5	0	1	0	0	1	0
277	2	7	0	1	0	0	1	0
278	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
279	7	10	1	3	1	0	3	0
281	13	13	4	4	4	0	4	0
282	8	18	2	7	2	0	7	0
283	3	7	0	1	0	0	1	0
284	5	8	1	2	1	0	2	0
287	4	7	0	1	0	0	1	0
288	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
289	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
290	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
293	6	12	1	4	1	0	4	0
295	25	25	10	10	9	1	9	1
296	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
297	3	7	0	1	0	0	1	0
301	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
302	18	21	7	8	7	0	8	0
303	23	34	9	13	9	0	12	1
304	4	8	0	2	0	0	2	0
305	10	17	3	6	3	0	6	0
308	16	20	6	8	6	0	8	0
316	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
318	8	8	2	2	2	0	2	0
319	11	11	3	3	3	0	3	0
320	5	7	1	1	1	0	1	0
322	7	18	1	7	1	0	7	0
323	12	20	4	8	4	0	8	0
324	7	10	1	3	1	0	3	0

**Table 2 SHLAA SITES Affordable housing yield and mix
(sites listed in CDN 115)**

SHLAA #	2. Officer Assessment Yield (lower yield range) [net]	2. Officer Assessment Yield (higher yield range) [net]	Likely AH yield (lower range) based on CS8. Note this is rounded down in all cases	Likely AH yield (higher range) based on CS8. Note this is rounded down in all cases.	Likely AH mix (lower range) based on CS11, one and two bed dwgs	Likely AH mix (lower range) based on CS11, three bed dwgs	Likely AH mix (higher range) based on CS11 one and two bed dwgs	Likely AH mix (higher range) based on CS11 three bed dwgs
325	24	24	9	9	9	0	9	0
326	11	24	3	9	3	0	9	0
327	6	6	1	1	1	0	1	0
328	7	9	1	2	1	0	2	0
330	4	6	0	1	0	0	1	0
331	13	13	4	4	4	0	4	0
332	12	12	4	4	4	0	4	0
333	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
346	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
348	3	6	0	1	0	0	1	0
349	6	10	1	3	1	0	3	0
355	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
356	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
359	11	17	3	6	3	0	6	0
361	12	12	4	4	4	0	4	0
362	46	70	18	28	16	2	23	5
363	9	9	2	2	2	0	2	0
370	8	10	2	3	2	0	3	0
371	5	8	1	2	1	0	2	0
373	6	10	1	3	1	0	3	0
374	5	11	1	3	1	0	3	0
385	5	5	1	1	1	0	1	0
387	3	5	0	1	0	0	1	0
388	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
392	6	9	1	2	1	0	2	0
393	17	28	6	11	6	0	10	1
394	2	6	0	1	0	0	1	0
408	8	8	2	2	2	0	2	0
410	6	6	1	1	1	0	1	0
411	5	5	1	1	1	0	1	0
412	7	10	1	3	1	0	3	0
413	8	8	2	2	2	0	2	0
414	6	6	1	1	1	0	1	0

**Table 2 SHLAA SITES Affordable housing yield and mix
(sites listed in CDN 115)**

SHLAA #	2. Officer Assessment Yield (lower yield range) [net]	2. Officer Assessment Yield (higher yield range) [net]	Likely AH yield (lower range) based on CS8. Note this is rounded down in all cases	Likely AH yield (higher range) based on CS8. Note this is rounded down in all cases.	Likely AH mix (lower range) based on CS11, one and two bed dwgs	Likely AH mix (lower range) based on CS11, three bed dwgs	Likely AH mix (higher range) based on CS11 one and two bed dwgs	Likely AH mix (higher range) based on CS11 three bed dwgs
416	8	11	2	3	2	0	3	0
417	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
418	5	8	1	2	1	0	2	0
419	18	27	7	10	7	0	9	1
421	7	10	1	3	1	0	3	0
433	19	19	7	7	7	0	7	0
446	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
449	80	80	32	32	26	6	26	6
451	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
464	14	18	4	7	4	0	7	0
541	5	10	1	3	1	0	3	0
Total	901	1269	251	412	241	10	392	20

108

1. Please note that for sites of less than 5 net new dwellings policy CS8 requires a financial contribution
2. Cells in aff hsg columns include mathematical rounding, avoiding the splitting of single dwellings with decimal places.