

No. 3

Housing Distribution  
Options

(Updated February 2010)



**Core Strategy Background Paper**

**No. 3**

**Housing Distribution Options**

**Revised February 2010**

## Housing Distribution Options

### Context

- 1.1 At the Issues and Option Stage, four scenarios for future housing growth were identified, ranging from highly concentrated development in and around Selby to a dispersed strategy. The scenarios were:
- 1) Growth concentrated in Selby town and adjacent parishes
  - 2) Growth in Selby plus additional growth, over and above local needs, in Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster.
  - 3) Growth above local needs in Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster and larger Villages.
  - 4) A very dispersed growth strategy, potentially including some development in a majority of villages.
- 1.2 Preferences expressed in responses to the Issues and Options consultation were fairly equally divided between the four scenarios. Option 1 has been chosen as the preferred option for the following reasons:-
- a) the former Regional Assembly (now Local Government for Yorkshire and the Humber) took the unequivocal view that Option 1 was the only option which fully conforms to the Regional Spatial Strategy and.
  - b) local evidence<sup>1</sup> analysed since the Issues and Options Report was published supports the view that this is the most sustainable approach.
- 1.3 Development scenario Option 1, as presented at the Issues and Options stage, was a relatively generalised strategy and did not quantify the proportions of housing development to be accommodated within Selby, nor the spatial distribution across the remainder of the District. The Regional Spatial Strategy<sup>2</sup> indicates that the majority of new homes within rural areas should be provided in the Principal Towns. However, as approximately half of Selby District's housing requirement between 2004 and 2026 is already built or committed through planning permissions, the overall impact of variations in the distribution of the residual housing requirement will be limited.
- 1.4 Nevertheless there still remains some scope for variation in the distribution of housing growth whilst still remaining within the general parameters of Option 1 and in conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy.

---

<sup>1</sup> Core Strategy Background Paper No.1, Travel to Work Patterns

<sup>2</sup> The Yorkshire and Humber Plan - May 2008

1.5 Three potential approaches have been examined to help determine the distribution of future housing growth. These were based on the following themes:

A *Matching Future Housing Supply to Affordable Housing Need*

B *Maximising the Use of Previously Developed Land*

C *Maximising the Amount of New Housing in Selby.*

1.6 Approach A represents the most evenly distributed option and Approach C the most concentrated on Selby. Approach B represents a more balanced approach. The methodology used to determine the distributions based on these alternatives is explained below.

(This version of the background paper takes account of the latest information on the distribution of affordable housing need as identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2009 and replaces the previous paper which was based on a combination of the Council's 2004 Housing Needs Study and more recent Housing Waiting List.)

**Alternative Approaches**

A *Matching Future Housing Supply to Affordable Housing Need*

2.1 The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) indicates the following distribution of affordable housing need.

<b>Affordable Housing Need (SHMA)</b>		<b>Table 1</b>
<b>Settlement/Settlement Group</b>	<b>% Affordable Housing Need</b>	
Selby Area Action Plan	37	
Sherburn in Elmet	11	
Tadcaster	4	
Designated Service Villages	24	
Secondary Villages	24	
Total	100	

2.2 However, in accordance with guidance in the Regional Spatial Strategy, the Core Strategy does not promote housing growth in the Secondary Villages. Identified need in Secondary Villages has therefore been re-allocated to Selby, Sherburn, Tadcaster or Designated Service Villages. (See appendix 1) This gives the following distribution in Table 2 overleaf.

<b>Affordable Housing Led Distribution</b>		<b>Table 2</b>
<b>Settlement/Settlement Group</b>	<b>% Affordable Housing Need</b>	
Selby Area Action Plan	38	
Sherburn in Elmet	12	
Tadcaster	7	
Designated Service Villages	43	
Total (excl Secondary Villages)	100	

- 2.3 Comparison with the previous distribution in the September 2008 version of this Paper indicates a reversal in the respective proportions of affordable housing assigned to Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet. However it should be borne in mind that (unlike the previous methodology) the SHMA does not make any location specific assumptions on affordable housing levels already committed. In practice there is a significant amount of affordable housing already committed, particularly at Sherburn, which if fully implemented would cater for the initial five year need there.

**B** *Maximising the Use of Previously Developed Land (PDL)*

- 2.4 Predicting the future availability of previously developed land is notoriously difficult as it involves assessing whether currently active uses will relocate or cease over the Plan period. In the absence of more refined information, the future distribution of development on previously developed land is based on actual housing completions on PDL over the period 2004 - 2009, combined with the outstanding commitments on PDL at 31/3/09.
- 2.5 For the purposes of this calculation, no allowance is made for potential PDL completions in Secondary Villages on the basis that planned housing growth in these villages is inappropriate (as explained in Approach A). Consequently only the potential PDL land supply in the other settlement categories is used to apportion the housing requirement. The resultant distribution is as in Table 3 overleaf:

<b>PDL Led Distribution</b>				<b>Table 3</b>
<b>Settlement/ Settlement Group</b>	<b>Total PDL Comple'tns 2004 – 2009</b>	<b>Comm'nts on PDL 31/03/09</b>	<b>Total Commitments and Completions</b>	<b>PDL led Distribution  %</b>
Selby AAP	743	557	<b>1300</b>	<b>54</b>
Sherburn in Elmet	66	42	<b>108</b>	<b>4</b>
Tadcaster	13	170	<b>183</b>	<b>8</b>
Designated Villages	584	235	<b>819</b>	<b>34</b>
Total (excl Secondary Villages)	1406	1004	<b>2410</b>	<b>100</b>

*C Maximising the Amount of New Housing in Selby.*

- 2.6 In this approach, 100% of additional new development (after 2009) is allocated to Selby in order to demonstrate the effect of concentrating the maximum amount of housing growth possible in Selby over the time period covered by the Regional Spatial Strategy (2004 – 2026). Even with this approach, however, significant development would still occur across the remainder of the District owing to the implementation of current commitments.

**Implications of the Alternative Approaches**

- 3.1 Table 4 below illustrates the outcome across the District of the different approaches to distributing new house building (2009 onwards). The Regional Spatial Strategy's requirements and targets are related to the complete RSS period (2004 – 2026). In each case, completions (2004 – 2009) and commitments at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2009 (reduced by an allowance of 10% for non-completions) form a constant contribution towards the housing requirement and modify the effects of the theoretical distributions for each of the three approaches.
- 3.2 Approaches A and C are at the opposite of the range in terms of the RSS strategy, which aims to focus development in Selby. Approach A relies on a high proportion of housing being accommodated in the rural villages, at the expense of the Selby area. It would also mean releasing more 'greenfield' sites in villages than other approaches. Although providing affordable housing closer to the local area of need is a laudable objective, housing growth outside the Selby area will

increase longer distance commuting to the larger surrounding urban areas contrary to sustainability objectives. This is particularly the case as affordable housing relies to a large extent on the provision of additional, associated market housing.

- 3.3 Approach C represents a theoretical and unbalanced situation. Although it increases the concentration of new development in Selby, in accordance with the RSS, it ignores the need and potential to have a wider distribution of affordable housing and to utilise previously developed land outside Selby for the benefit of the continued development and vitality of many settlements. It indicates that, given existing commitments, the theoretical maximum proportion of all new housing which could be located in the Selby AAP over the whole RSS period is 76%.
- 3.4 Approach B falls within the range provided by A and C and would produce a distribution which provides a better balance between the objectives being sought in terms of RSS distributional policy, use of previously developed land and meeting affordable housing need. This distribution is closest to what has been happening over the last 5 years as evidenced by the similarity of the distributions for 2009 – 2026 and 2004 – 2026.

#### **Impact of windfall development on distribution**

- 3.5 PPS3 does not encourage making allowance for future windfall development when planning for future housing provision; and no allowance has been made in the Core Strategy. However the results in Table 4 do provide some indication of the potential impact of future development on any planned distribution.
- 3.6 The impact is likely to be greatest in Secondary Villages where no development other than existing commitments or 100% affordable housing schemes are planned. It can be seen that the percentage contribution of the Secondary Villages through existing commitments doubles (from 5 to 9%) if completions over the last five years are taken into account. As this is almost entirely the result of windfall development, the figures underline the contribution that windfall development can make in the smaller villages. If windfalls continue to be approved at the rate experienced during the previous five years the contribution from Secondary Villages could be as high as 20%. However, any consideration of restricting windfall development in these smaller villages will need to be balanced by the contribution such development makes to the vitality and evolution of the village.

#### **Developing a Preferred Distribution**

- 3.7 This paper does not attempt to deal with all the factors to be taken into account in coming to a final planned distribution for new development. The above scenarios attempt to provide broad information on the quantitative aspects of housing distribution. They serve only to

illustrate the general impact of favouring one of the above themes over another and also provide guidance on the overall impact over the full period of the Regional Spatial Strategy from 2004 to 2026.

- 3.8 A number of more subjective factors need to be taken into account in evolving the proposed distribution of new housing. The relative emphasis given to the various factors within the evolving proposed distribution is explained in the written text associated with Policy CP2 in the core Strategy.



**Distribution Options For Housing**

**Table 4**

<b>A Reflecting Distribution of Affordable Housing Need</b>					<b>Table 4A</b>
<b>Settlement Category</b>	<b>Selby Area Action Plan***</b>	<b>Sherburn in Elmet</b>	<b>Tadcaster</b>	<b>Designated Service Villages ****</b>	<b>Secondary Villages</b>
<b>Target Distribution 2009-2026 %**</b>	36	11	7	41	5
<b>Target Requirem'nt (Dwellings)</b>	2693	823	524	3067	358
<b>Comm'ts*</b>	1398	200	152	230	358
<b>Allocations Needed</b>	1295	623	372	2837	0
<b>Completions 2004-2009</b>	1253	129	60	741	602
<b>Distribution 2004 – 2026 (Dwellings)</b>	3946	952	584	3808	960
<b>Overall Distribution 2009-2026 %**</b>	38	9	6	37	9
* The contribution from commitments have been discounted by 10% to allow for some non-implementation					
** Percentages may not sum to 100% owing to rounding					
*** Selby together with the parishes of Barlby and Osgodby, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby are included in the Selby Area Action Plan.					
**** Excluding Barlby, Brayton/ Osgodby and Thorpe Willoughby)					

<b>B Maximising Use of Previously Developed Land</b>					<b>Table 4B</b>
<b>Settlement Category</b>	<b>Selby Area Action Plan***</b>	<b>Sherburn in Elmet</b>	<b>Tadcaster</b>	<b>Designated Service Villages ****</b>	<b>Secondary Villages</b>
<b>Target Distribution 2009-2026 %**</b>	51	4	8	32	5
<b>Target Requirem't (Dwellings)</b>	3815	299	598	2394	358
<b>Comm'ts*</b>	1398	200	152	230	358
Allocations Needed	2417	99	446	2164	0
<b>Completions 2004-2009</b>	1253	129	60	741	602
<b>Distribution 2004 – 2026 (Dwellings)</b>	5068	428	658	3135	960
<b>Overall Distribution 2009-2026 %**</b>	49	4	6	31	9
* The contribution from commitments have been discounted by 10% to allow for some non-implementation					
** Percentages may not sum to 100% owing to rounding					
*** Selby together with the parishes of Barlby and Osgodby, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby are included in the Selby Area Action Plan.					
**** Excluding Barlby, Brayton/ Osgodby and Thorpe Willoughby)					

<b>C Maximising the amount of New Development in Selby</b>					<b>Table 4C</b>
<b>Settlement Category</b>	<b>Selby Area Action Plan***</b>	<b>Sherburn in Elmet</b>	<b>Tadcaster</b>	<b>Designated Service Villages ****</b>	<b>Secondary Villages</b>
<b>Target Distribution 2009-2026 %**</b>	95	0	0	0	5
<b>Target Requirem't (Dwellings)</b>	7106	0	0	0	358
<b>Comm'ts*</b>	1398	200	152	230	358
<b>Allocations Needed</b>	6540 *****	200	152	230	358
<b>Completions 2004-2009</b>	1253	129	60	741	602
<b>Distribution 2004 – 2026 (Dwellings)</b>	7793	329	212	971	960
<b>Overall Distribution 2009-2026 %**</b>	76	3	2	9	9
* The contribution from commitments have been discounted by 10% to allow for some non-implementation					
** Percentages may not sum to 100% owing to rounding					
*** Selby together with the parishes of Barlby and Osgodby, Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby are included in the Selby Area Action Plan.					
**** Excluding Barlby, Brayton/ Osgodby and Thorpe Willoughby)					
***** Total allocations needed after taking account of completion of commitments in other settlement categories					

## Appendix 1

### Redistribution of Affordable Housing Need to Selby, Sherburn in Elmet, Tadcaster and Designated Service Villages.

Settlement Category	Settlements	Secondary Village from which Need Redistributed
<b>Selby Area Action Plan</b>	<b>Selby</b> Barlby/Osgodby, Brayton, Thorpe Willoughby	Burn, Gateforth and Barlow
<b>Sherburn in Elmet</b>	<b>Sherburn in Elmet</b>	Barkston Ash, Little Fenton, Biggin and Huddleston
<b>Tadcaster</b>	<b>Tadcaster</b>	Northern Housing Sub-Area which is composed of the following parishes:  Acaster Selby, Appleton Roebuck, Bilbrough, Bolton Percy, Catterton, Colton, Grimston, Healagh, Kirkby Wharfe, Lead, Newton Kyme, Oxton, Ryther, Saxton, Steeton, Stutton, Towton, Ulleskelf
<b>Designated Service Villages</b>	Carlton, Church Fenton, Eggborough, Fairburn, Hambleton, Hemingbrough, Kellington, Monk Fryston/Hillam, North Duffield. Riccall South Milford, Wistow	<b>Cawood to Wistow</b>  Eskrick, Kelfield, Skipwith, Stillingfleet and Thorganby <b>to Riccall</b>  Burton Salmon and Brotherton/Byram <b>to Fairburn</b>  Balne, Beal, Birkin, Chapel Haddersley, Cridling Stubbs, Heck, Hensall, Kirk Smeaton, Little Smeaton, Stapleton, Walden Stubbs, West Haddersley, Whitley and Womersley <b>to Eggborough</b>  Temple Hirst, Hirst Courtney, Camblesforth, Drax, Long Drax and Newland <b>to Carlton</b>

Selby District Local Development Framework  
Core Strategy Background Paper No 3

