

**Selby District Council**

**Supplement to AMR December 2012**

**5 Year Housing Land Supply 2011/12  
And Housing Trajectory**

**Methodology and Results**



## Contents

	<i>Page</i>
1. Introduction	1
2. Background	1
3. 5 Year Housing Land Supply Methodology	5
4. 5 Year Housing Land Supply Results	16
5. Housing Trajectory (including affordable housing)	17
<i>Appendix 1 –SWG Representation Summaries</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Appendix 2 –Agent/Developer Questionnaire</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Appendix 3 – Historic completions on non-allocated sites</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Appendix 4 – SHLAA 2011 Sites (0-5 Years)</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Appendix 5 – SHLAA 2011 Sites (6-10 Years)</i>	<i>32</i>

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This paper supplements the AMR. The purposes of this paper are to:
- set out the methodology used in assessing the 5 year housing land supply;
  - summarise the key issues and changes to the methodology compared to 2010/11 in the light of work undertaken with stakeholders and in the light of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);
  - provide the 5 year housing land supply calculation; and
  - provide a housing trajectory including an affordable housing trajectory in line with NPPF.
- 1.2 Sections 2, 3 and 4 of this paper deal with the 5 year housing land supply methodology and results. Section 5 deals with the housing trajectory.

## 2.0 Background

- 2.1 The previous 5 year supply (2010/11) was undertaken with regard to PPS12 (Local Development Frameworks) which required local development frameworks to include information on housing policy and performance, particularly in terms of net additional dwellings.
- 2.2 The methodology for the 5 year supply calculations has previously been based on the PPS3 housing monitoring requirements. However, that guidance has now been deleted by the new NPPF.
- 2.3 The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2011 methodology has been used as a starting point for the 5 year housing land supply methodology. However, since the SHLAA was finalised in January 2012, the NPPF has been published and further additions to the 5 year housing land supply methodology have been necessary.

### *Monitoring context*

- 2.4 The NPPF paragraph 47 requires Local Authorities to:
- 'identify and update annually of supply a specific deliverable<sup>11</sup> sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under*

---

<sup>11</sup>To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and in particular that development of the site is viable. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans.

*delivery of housing, local planning authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land;*

#### *5 Year Housing Land Supply Stakeholder Working Group*

- 2.5 In accordance with the new NPPF to ensure that only those sites which are deliverable are included, it was considered appropriate to consult on the draft methodology and involve a Stakeholder Working Group
- 2.6 The aim of the consultation and workshop was to agree a consistent and transparent method for calculating the 5 year housing land supply appropriate to Selby District with the aim of achieving proper planning and ensuring that planning decisions can be made based on a robust evidence base and applicants are clear about the process. It will mean fewer disagreements about supply on a case by case basis resulting in more efficient and effective decision making and a better use of resources, saving money for both the Council and our customers and avoiding costly appeals.
- 2.7 The Council invited all members of the existing SHLAA Stakeholder Working Group, inviting participation in the new 5 year housing land supply Stakeholder Working Group. An open invitation was placed on the letters/emails sent to developers/agents who were contacted for details on their current site delivery. The final 5 year housing land supply Stakeholder Working Group included developers who are active on local sites, agents and landowners.
- 2.8 The Council circulated a draft methodology, based on previous practice and already reviewed in the light of up-to-date evidence and the NPPF, and included a series of questions. The 5 year housing land supply Stakeholder Working Group met in July 2012 to undertake a workshop to discuss the issues raised.
- 2.9 Responses were received at the meeting and following via email/letter. The questions and a summary of responses can be found under Appendix 1. Changes have been incorporated into the methodology where necessary. The final methodology is set out in the remainder of this paper with the issues highlighted where appropriate, including:
- Density assumptions
  - Annual delivery rates
  - Larger sites assessments
  - Smaller sites non-delivery discount
  - The buffer
- 2.10 The revised methodology which was developed in association with the Stakeholder Working Group takes into account the new NPPF. The key

issues and changes are set out below.

### *Viability*

- 2.11 The Council has previously worked with stakeholders as part of the SHLAA methodology. Developers and other stakeholders considered that sites in Selby District are generally marketable and that viability is not an issue. Based on that advice, the Council as part of the 5 year housing supply work has assumed that in general all sites in the supply are viable in Selby District. However, in addition, the Council has annually contacted developers/owners of larger (15 dwellings or more) sites to obtain specific intelligence.
- 2.12 The NPPF at paragraph 47 (see above) places emphasis on viability and states that sites should only be included which are deliverable and in particular that development of the site is viable. Also those sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years.
- 2.13 With this greater emphasis on viability, this year it was considered necessary, to re-consider the assumptions and approach to assessing viability through the involvement of the 5 year housing land supply Stakeholder Working Group.
- 2.14 It was concluded that it was not necessary to alter the methodology. That is, all sites are generally considered viable in Selby District unless there is clear evidence to the contrary. Issues on particular sites are picked up by the methodology on a case-by-case basis.

### *Buffer*

- 2.15 As part of the NPPF there is also the new requirement to provide a buffer of 5% or 20% in land supply to offer greater choice and flexibility in the market.
- 2.16 The Council assessed the local requirements for a buffer based on past completion rates and the 10 year average compared to the annual requirement and concluded that there was no evidence of persistent undersupply and as such a 5% buffer is demonstrated. However the Stakeholder Working Group noted that using different approaches an under-supply was demonstrated. This report (at paragraph 3.47 / Table 5) considers the 5%/20% issues (taken from the 6-10 year period as set out in the NPPF).

### *Definition of Previously Developed Land (PDL), Windfalls and Garden Land*

- 2.17 The 5 Year Housing Land Supply calculation seeks to identify sites from the SHLAA which will contribute to supply in the 0-5 year period.

- 2.18 In identifying which sites to include in the 5 year housing land supply calculation the Council only included SHLAA sites in the 5 year supply which were PDL and inside the Development Limits of settlements. This was consistent with the policy approach in PPS3 and adopted development plan policy in SDLP for 2010/11 calculation<sup>1</sup>.
- 2.19 However because the NPPF (2011) provides the latest national guidance, the methodology has been further amended for 2011/12.
- 2.20 Paragraph 53 of the NPPF states '*Local Planning Authorities should consider the case for setting out policies to resist inappropriate development of residential gardens, for example where development would cause harm to the local area*'.
- 2.21 In addition, paragraph 48 of the NPPF states '*Local Planning Authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five – year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens*'
- 2.22 In the light of evidence from historic supply (explained in more detail in paragraph 3.33) and the SHLAA methodology coupled with expected future trends in line with emerging local Policy (CP1A), the Council is taking into account windfalls in the 5 year housing land supply in line with paragraph 48 of the NPPF. This approach is reasonable because the Core Strategy is reaching its final stages and the 5 year housing land supply will be delivered during the new plan period covered by the Core Strategy,
- 2.23 In order to quantify the allowance, the Council has considered expected delivery through emerging policy, which allows for the development of greenfield land (which could include residential gardens) within Selby, Sherburn in Elmet, Tadcaster and Designated Service Villages in emerging Policy CP1A of the Submission Draft Core Strategy. The Policy does not allow the development of greenfield land including garden land in Secondary Villages. This approach is considered to be consistent with the NPPF.
- 2.24 As such, in addition to those sites which are PDL sites within Development Limits, those SHLAA sites which are greenfield and within the Development Limits of Designated Service Villages (DSVs) are also considered within the 5 year supply for the 2011/12 5 year housing land supply<sup>2</sup>. Further explanation is provided within paragraph 3.35.

---

<sup>1</sup> In 2010, the Government announced changes to PPS3 amending the definition of previously developed land (PDL) to remove garden land from within this category. The change of definition in 2010 resulted in some changes to sites within the 2010/11 5 year supply calculation.

<sup>2</sup> But excludes garden land in line with NPPF


### 3.0 Methodology for calculating the 5 year supply and Housing Trajectory.

3.1 This methodology for the 5 year housing land supply sets out all the data sources and criteria which are applied in the calculations.

#### *Data collection for 5 year housing land supply*

3.2 The flowchart below identifies the process involved in undertaking the annual update and the which data sources are used. Further explanation of each stage is outlined in detail later in this section.

**Figure 1. 5 Year Housing Land Supply Process**



\* Only those sites which meet the criteria set out in this methodology

### **Calculations**

- 3.3 Table 1. sets out the calculation method for how the data in Figure 1. is used. How sites are selected is explained further below.

**Table 1. 5 Year Housing Land Supply Calculations**

<b>Stages</b>	<b>Data</b>
A =	Outstanding Planning Permissions (Full & Outline)*
B =	Existing Allocations (Phase 2 sites)*
C =	SHLAA 2011 Sites*
<b>5 years housing land supply = A + B + C</b>	
D =	5% (or 20%) buffer of sites* pool in addition to the 5 years housing land supply calculations

\* only those sites which meet the criteria set out in this methodology

### **A = Outstanding planning permissions - Planning Applications Records System (PARS)**

- 3.4 The Council undertakes an annual survey of sites with planning permission within the District to ascertain the status of each site to determine what is built and what remains outstanding for future development.
- 3.5 A list of planning permissions which are yet to be implemented (outstandings) is produced annually as at the 31 March to be included as part of the 5 year housing land supply calculations.
- 3.6 This list of outstandings also includes outline planning permissions as the principle of development has been established, subject to reserved matters.
- 3.7 To avoid double counting, SHLAA sites (category C below) are assessed against the list of planning permissions so site yields are not included twice in the calculations.
- 3.8 As set out above, NPPF states that sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years. In undertaking the site assessments, small sites and large sites are treated differently for practical reasons.



**A1 Smaller sites (less than 15 dwellings)**

- 3.9 Small sites are not individually assessed. However, in order to take a cautious approach, a non-implementation discount is applied to the total number of outstanding dwellings on sites of less than 15 dwellings. In previous monitoring reports a discount rate of 10% has been applied in line with emerging Policy CP2 of the Core Strategy and this approach has been retained this year following debate at the Stakeholder Working Group.
- 3.10 This 10% discount is not used for larger sites (15 dwellings or more) and allocated sites because a further fine-grained assessment of expected delivery is undertaken (see below) and accounted for in the calculations.

**A2 Larger sites (15 dwellings or more)**

- 3.11 As part of the 5 year housing land supply, even prior to the NPPF, commitments have been examined critically in accordance with the methodology below, in order to ascertain the likely rate of deliverability on large sites. This was considered prudent in light of the poor current market conditions which were expected to influence the delivery of housing on the larger sites as it was considered unlikely that the potential of the land supply would be fully realised.
- 3.12 This approach has been taken forward again this year, in the light of the NPPF so that all developers on larger sites (15 dwellings or more) are contacted directly by telephone and/or email to obtain a record of their expected delivery on sites over the next 5 years for inclusion in the 5 year housing land supply calculations to support the delivery rate used. A copy of the developer questionnaire is attached at Appendix 2 for information.
- 3.13 As long as there is clear evidence provided by the landowner/developer of the expected delivery, this 'actual' figure is used and it is assumed that these sites with permission can realistically be delivered within the 5 year period.
- 3.14 Added to this, on very large sites which have the potential to supply housing throughout and beyond the 0-5 year time period, an assumption has been made (in accordance with that made in the SHLAA 2011 methodology and in the light of recent evidence of delivery on large sites) that a maximum of 50 dwellings will be built per year. This reduces the potential delivery for any site over the five-year period to 250 dwellings within the 5 year period even if their potential yield is higher than this.

## Results for A

### ***A = Outstanding Planning Permissions – Planning Applications Records System (PARS)***

- 3.15 Following the annual survey of sites with planning permission, outstanding planning permissions for the 2011/12 monitoring year total 1890 GROSS dwellings, providing 1852 NETT dwellings. Following further assessment of outstanding planning permissions in this supporting paper (see section 2) there were 598 dwellings included that were on sites of 15 dwellings or more and a total of 472 dwellings on smaller (<15 dwellings) sites, which was reduced by 10% for potential non delivery to 425. A further 29 dwellings were outstanding on sites with outline planning permission.

#### **Table 2.**

##### Summary of Outstanding Planning Permissions

Total dwellings outstanding GROSS		1890
Total dwellings outstanding NETT		1852
Outstanding planning permissions following assessment		
i	Outstanding NETT dwellings available within plan period (large sites = 15+ dw)	598
ii	Outstanding NETT dwellings available within plan period (small sites = <15 dw) – reduced by 10% for potential non-delivery	425
iii	Outstanding Outline planning permissions	29
TOTAL		<b>1052</b>

- 3.16 The final figure of outstanding planning permissions to be included within the 5 year housing land supply is 1052 dwellings

### ***B = Selby District Local Plan Allocations***

- 3.17 Phase 2 allocations have also been analysed in order to include those sites and / or plots within the 5 year housing land supply calculations where realistic / reasonable to do so.
- 3.18 As with all larger sites with planning permission, the landowners of Allocations are contacted directly (see Appendix 2) to ascertain when the site will be coming forward as a planning application, viability and when they expect to be on site. This information is then used to determine which sites to be included within the 5 year housing land supply calculations, the anticipated lead times and expected delivery.
- 3.19 Only sites which are ‘oven ready’ (i.e. have already had a planning application submitted or there is clear intention that the landowner/developer will submit within the next 18 months) and considered deliverable would be included within the 5 year housing land

supply calculations.

- 3.20 Once sites have been selected for inclusion and an expected start date has been received from the developer, the delivery rate of up to 50 dwellings (maximum) per annum is used to calculate the number of plots to be included within the calculations.
- 3.21 Where no information has been provided by the landowners it is assumed that the site is not available for development and it is not included within the 5 year housing land supply calculations.

## Results for B

### ***B = Selby District Allocations (Phase 2)***

- 3.22 Table 3 below identifies the Phase 2 allocated sites, and in green, those which have a clear intention from the landowner/developer to be delivered in the next 5 years.
- 3.23 Where planning permission has already been approved on allocated sites these are included within the PARS assessment (see A above) and are not included in this table in order to counter any double counting of sites.

**Table 3. SDLP Phase 2 Allocated Sites**

Phase 2 Site	Site Area (ha)	SDLP Site Capacity	5 Year supply figures based on information provided					
			12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	Total
BYR/1	0.7	21	-	-	-	-	-	-
CAM/1	2.12	55	-	-	-	17	18	35
CAR/1	2.4	79	15	15	15	15	15	75
CAR/2	2.6	12	-	-	-	-	-	-
EGG/2	1.5	23	-	-	23	-	-	23
EGG/3	6.76	210	-	50	50	50	60	210
HAM/1	0.53	15	-	15	-	-	-	15
OSG/1	1.47	45	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEL/1	21.9	450+	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEL/2*	56	0 – Staynor Hall development	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEL/2A*	1.04	0 – Part of Holmes Lane/Coupland Road development	-	-	-	-	-	-
SHB/1B	39.3	900+	-	50	50	50	50	200
STM/1B	4.23	127	15	50	50	-	-	115
TAD/2	3.48	105	-	-	-	-	-	-
THW/2	4.96	148	-	50	50	48	-	148
Expected delivery by year			30	230	238	180	143	<b>821</b>

\* These sites have planning permission and are accounted for in 'Results for A' above as at 31 March 2012.

**C = SHLAA 2011 sites.**

- 3.24 As set out at Figure 1. and Table 1. and above, in addition to planning permissions and allocations, further contributions to the 5 year housing land supply are identified from the SHLAA and included in the 5 year housing land supply calculation where they meet the specific criteria.
- 3.25 The SHLAA was recently updated in 2011/12 and a call for sites exercise was undertaken. Through this process the number of sites within the SHLAA database has doubled as more landowners seek to promote their site for development. Although it should be noted that not all SHLAA sites are included in the 5 year housing land supply calculation – only those which meet certain criteria – see paragraphs 3.33 – 3.37 below for information.
- 3.26 All sites within the SHLAA database accord with the following assumptions:
- 3.27 Site Criteria  
A minimum size of 0.4 hectares (or 10 dwellings) being suitable minimum criteria to use.  
  
'Abeyance' sites – those which are located in the open countryside and that do not share a boundary with Development Limits (unless the site formed a significant brownfield site in the countryside).  
  
To be 'held in abeyance' means that the site is excluded from further assessment at this time, but will remain in the store of known potential sites, and will be reconsidered when the SHLAA is next updated, as criteria of search and market circumstances may well have altered.  
  
The planning status of each site was recorded. If a site has permission for housing, it will be known to be suitable at this time, and if development has commenced, it will be apparent if a site has 10 or more plots to build remaining. Sites with planning permission have also been assessed as part of the SHLAA.
- 3.28 Yield  
The potential yield for each site is calculated using a density of 45dph for sites within the Selby Urban Area and 35dph in the rest of the District, as per SHLAA 2011. These figures were agreed as part of the SHLAA Working Group in October 2011<sup>3</sup>.
- 3.29 Landowner intentions  
Information is gathered on the details of site ownership and the landowners' intentions of when they may seek development of the site. Sites have only been included in the plan period if there are clear intentions provided by the landowner.
- 3.30 Site assessment  
Based on planning guidance, each site is assessed in terms of its

---

<sup>3</sup> Agreement on site yield was also re-established in July 2012 through the 5 Year Housing Land Supply Stakeholder Working Group.

suitability, availability and achievability, using a traffic light system (green, amber, red), to assess when the site is likely to come forward, within which time period (0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years).

*SHLAA sites selection to be included within the 5 year housing land supply*

- 3.31 5 year housing land supply calculations in all previous years have used SHLAA sites on PDL within Development Limits as those sites which are likely to make a contribution in line with the current SDLP policy at that time.
- 3.32 For the 2011/12 calculation the following criteria are used for site selection:

*Windfall Sites and Potential Garden Land*

- 3.33 As set out at paragraph 2.21 above, NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens.
- 3.34 Appendix 3 provides the historic data for completions on non-allocated sites (windfalls) in the District since 2005 as submitted to the recent Core Strategy Examination In Public. This shows that there has been a high level of completions on non-allocated sites. However, for the 5 year housing land supply calculation it is proposed to only include the potential for new development in line with the emerging Core Strategy Policy CP1A which is expected to be much lower<sup>4</sup>.
- 3.35 Therefore, only those SHLAA sites which are within Selby, Sherburn in Elmet, Tadcaster and the Designated Service Villages which are on previously developed land (PDL) or on greenfield land (in line with emerging Policy CP1A of the Core Strategy), which are considered available within the 0-5 year period are selected from the database to be included in the 5 year housing land supply.
- 3.36 To avoid double counting sites are not included in the calculations where they already have planning permission or are on allocated (Phase 2) sites. Sites which contain garden land are also excluded in accordance with NPPF (paragraph 53).
- 3.37 In Secondary Villages, emerging Policy CP1A supports development on previously development land and the infilling of small linear gaps in

---

<sup>4</sup> The Council has done some work on this and submitted some evidence to the Core Strategy EIP, September 2011 see SDC Written Statement No. 6 at <http://www.selby.gov.uk/upload/Matter-2-SDC-WS6.pdf>

otherwise built up residential frontages which are considered available within the 0-5 year period. However, because this source of supply is expected to be minimal and only comprises very small sites within the restrictions of the policy, they are not included as part of the 5 year housing land supply calculations. Such sites are not identified and so would not comply with NPPF.

### **Results for C**

#### ***C = SHLAA 2011 sites***

- 3.38 The list of SHLAA sites included is provided under Appendix 4.
- 3.39 In line with the methodology these are sites within Selby, Sherburn In Elmet, Tadcaster and DSVs which are considered available within the 0-5 year period, providing a total of 37 sites.
- 3.40 The sites highlighted in green are considered to contribute to the five year land supply and do not include sites with planning permission, sites containing garden land or sites on allocated (Phase 2) sites. This reduces the total sites to be included within the 5 year supply figures to 9 with a total potential yield of 463 dwellings.

#### ***D = Buffer***

- 3.41 The NPPF (paragraph 47) requires that Local Planning Authorities should have a 5 year housing land supply “with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. Where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing, Local Planning Authorities should increase the buffer to 20% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land”
- 3.42 A 5 % buffer means an extra 5% on top of the 5 year housing land supply. For Selby District this would be 5% of  $(440 \times 5) = 5\% \text{ of } 2200 = 110 \text{ dw extra}$ . A 20% buffer is an extra 20% on top of 2200, which would be 440 extra dwellings.
- 3.43 Advice from the Planning Inspectorate and Planning Advisory Service suggest that in order to assume a 5% or 20% buffer, it would be appropriate to consider the long-term average delivery, and suggests the past ten years, to inform the Council’s decision.

#### ***Previous completions and the ‘buffer’ for the 5 year supply***

- 3.44 Table 4 illustrates the completions for the past ten years within the District.

**Table 4. Annual Completions 2002 -2012**

Year	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12
Total Completions	363	297	469	638	874	583	226	270	366	338

- 3.45 The average annual completion is 442 dwellings over this period. This exceeds the current annual requirement in the Regional Strategy of 440 dwellings per year. Taking the past 10 years allows for variations and it can be seen that there has been over-delivery and under-delivery year by year (Table 5).
- 3.46 The Council considers this demonstrates that there is no “*record of persistent under delivery of housing*” (Paragraph 47 of NPPF) and therefore there is justification for providing a 5% buffer of sites to supplement the 5 year supply for the 2011/12 monitoring year.
- 3.47 However it has been noted by the Stakeholder Working Group that the earlier requirement of 620 dpa (up to December 2006) means that there has been under-delivery. With the years 2002/03 – 2005/06 having a housing target of 620, this means over the past 10 years the average annual requirement was 525.5 dwellings compared to the actual average delivery of 442 dwellings.

**Table 5. Annual Housing Requirement and Annual Completions**

Year	02-03	03-04	04-05	05-06	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11	11-12
Total Completions	363	297	469	638	874	583	226	270	366	338
Target	620	620	620	620	575*	440	440	440	440	440

\* Total annual dwelling requirement up to 31 December 2006 is 620 and 440 from 1 January 2007, providing a requirement of 575 dwellings between 1 April 2006 and 31 March 2007.

- 3.48 As table 5 shows there was under-delivery in 7 out of the previous 10 years and it could be argued therefore that this demonstrates there is a record of persistent under delivery and should be providing 20%.
- 3.49 On balance it is considered appropriate to demonstrate an additional buffer of 20% in this year’s 5 year housing land supply. This will be reviewed annually.

*SHLAA sites to provide the 5% or 20% ‘buffer’*

- 3.50 The NPPF suggests that the additional buffer is ‘moved forward from later in the plan period’. It should be noted that SHLAA sites in the later plan period have not been assessed as available in the next 0-5 years in line with the SHLAA 2011 methodology because they are

considered to be constrained by current planning policy or other constraints which may delay delivery on site such as contamination on site, legal/ownership issues or third parties considerations.

- 3.51 However, in order to accord with the NPPF, in discussion with the Stakeholder Working Group, the SHLAA 6-10 year which meet specific criteria are included as a pool for the 2011/12 housing land supply buffer.
- 3.52 The SHLAA sites which meet the following criteria are considered in the buffer pool:
- have been assessed as 6-10 years, but are being promoted by the landowner as being available in the 0-5 year period, and
  - are within the parishes of Selby, Sherburn in Elmet, Tadcaster and the Designated Service Villages; and
  - are within or, adjacent to but outside Development Limits; and
  - where the only reason they have been pushed back is due to them not currently meeting policy tests.
- 3.53 To avoid double counting sites are not included in the calculations where they already have planning permission or are on allocated (Phase 2) sites. Sites which contain garden land are also excluded in accordance with NPPF (Paragraph 53).
- 3.54 Some of these sites may be released through a review of Development Limits, the planned Green Belt review and the Allocations process as part of the emerging Local Plan within the next 5 years (progress on the Sites Allocations DPD has already been made and will be progressed directly following the adoption of the Core Strategy in 2013).
- 3.55 As such each site is brought into the buffer up to an annual max delivery of 50 dw per year over the 5 years (maximum of 250 dwellings per site for the 6-10 year period). The yield of all such sites will be considered to be the buffer for the purposes of the 5 year housing land supply in order to comply with the NPPF expectations.

## **Results for D**

### ***D = Buffer***

- 3.56 The results for the sites providing the buffer can be found under Appendix 5. In line with the NPPF requirement for a buffer the SHLAA sites within Appendix 5 are sites within Selby, Sherburn In Elmet, Tadcaster and DSVs which are considered to be available within the 6-10 year time period but the landowners intentions are known to be 0-5 years.
- 3.57 In fact there are only 2 sites which meet the criteria providing a total maximum yield of 500 dwellings.



**Table 6**

Site ref	Total potential yield	Available yield for 6-10 years
PHS/19/025	1467	250
PHS/53/003	477	250
TOTAL (available yield for 6-10 years)		500

- 3.58 This provides an extra 500 dwellings which is equivalent to a 22.7% buffer
- 3.59 The two sites above can also deliver into the 11-15 year period providing a further 447 dwellings.
- 3.60 Sites are not individually assessed, as this is more appropriate for the Local Plan process. In this way it is clear to landowners and developers that this does not mean that their sites which fall into this category are considered acceptable for development immediately.
- 3.61 The buffer sites therefore provide enough dwellings to accommodate both a 5% or 20% buffer.

#### 4.0 The 5 Year Housing Land Supply Results Summary

4.1 All sites included in the calculations are set out in the Appendices of this report. Individual results for each element are also set out in Section 3 (above).

#### Schedule of sites included in the 5 year supply and plots available

Summary of sites contributing to 5 year supply		Potential Yield (Dwellings)
A	Outstanding Planning Applications (NETT) (2011-12)	1052
B	SDLP Phase 2	821
C	2011 SHLAA	463
Total plots considered to contribute to 2011/12 5 Year Supply		2336

<b>5 YEAR HOUSING LAND REQUIREMENT (440 x 5)</b>	<b>2200</b>
<b>5 year land supply position (supply/annual requirement)</b>	<b>2336/440 (dpa)</b>
	<b>5.31 Years Supply</b>

#### Buffer

NPPF Buffer sites		Potential Yield (Dwellings)
D	SHLAA 6-10 Year sites	500
<b>5 year land supply position (supply/annual requirement)</b>		<b>500/440 (dpa)</b>
<b>5 YEAR HOUSING LAND REQUIREMENT BUFFER (500/2200) x 100</b>		<b>22.7%</b>


## 5. Housing trajectory

- 5.1 Paragraph 47 of the NPPF sets out the requirements for producing a housing trajectory; *‘for market and affordable housing, illustrate the expected rate of housing delivery through a housing trajectory for the plan period and set out a housing implementation strategy for the full range of housing describing how they will maintain delivery of a five year supply of housing land to meet their housing target’.*
- 5.2 The NPPF introduces for the 2011/12 trajectory the inclusion of affordable housing in the trajectory. The Council therefore includes expected affordable housing delivery throughout the plan period.
- 5.3 Overall the trajectory comprises an initial relatively firm prediction of housing delivery for the first five years (based on the 5 year housing land supply), together with a longer term illustration of expected delivery which will arise through the implementation of the Local Plan (emerging Core Strategy and Sites Allocations documents).
- 5.4 The trajectory is set against future housing requirements. Currently, and until revoked, the adopted Regional Strategy (May 2008) sets out that the minimum housing requirement for Selby District is 440 dwellings per annum from 2008 to 2026.
- 5.5 As with previous years, market housing will be presented in the housing trajectory based on the 5 year supply figures for the first 5 years and the adopted housing target of 440 per annum for the remainder of the plan period (years 6 to 15).
- 5.6 It should be noted that the emerging Core Strategy proposes an annual figure of 450 dpa, but this is not yet adopted. Any new figure in an adopted plan which would supersede the RS will be taken into consideration in next year’s (2012/13) 5 year housing land supply trajectory.
- 5.7 As part of the telephone and email survey of current sites being developed within the District landowners and developers are asked for an indication of their expected delivery of market and affordable housing over the next 5 years (See Appendix 2).
- 5.8 In addition local Registered Providers (RP’s) have been contacted to ascertain their delivery programme to inform what units they are expecting to manage over the next 5 years.
- 5.9 Both the information we receive on a site by site basis from the engagement with developers and RP’s alongside policy expectations informs the 5 year supply element of the trajectory based on existing permissions.
- 5.10 On SHLAA sites and SDLP Phase 2 allocations that have not yet been granted planning permission a target of 40% affordable housing units of the expected site yield will be used in ascertaining the amount of affordable housing expected to be delivered within the first 5 years

of the plan period.

- 5.11 For the remainder of the plan period (years 6 to 15) of the trajectory a 40% delivery rate of affordable housing will be used in the housing trajectory. This is in line with existing Council policy in RS policy H4 and the Developer Contributions SPD (and the emerging Policy CP5 of the Core Strategy which would be adopted by then).
- 5.12 The housing trajectory and first affordable housing trajectory is shown below at Figure 2. Over the 5 year supply there is a rise and dip in the amount of housing projected. This is due to the release of SDLP Phase 2 allocations where a number of sites have developer intentions known. A drop in the delivery of sites is expected due to some smaller allocations been built out before the end of the current 5 year housing land supply<sup>5</sup>.

**Figure 2**



<sup>5</sup> It is expected that the release of the Core Strategy Strategic Development Site will boost supply but this is not included in this trajectory in advance of the Core Strategy being adopted.

## 5 Year Housing Land Supply 2011/12

### Appendices

## Appendix 1

### 5 Year Housing Land Supply representations summary following comments from Stakeholder Working Group

The comments made through the Stakeholder Working Group are summarised below and have been incorporated into the 5 year land supply methodology and amendments made where appropriate, to ensure the methodology is robust.

#### Non-delivery discount rate

- 20% as a cautious approach.
- 50% where sites have been subject to multiple renewals or long extant permissions.

#### Lead-in times

- Consideration should be given to 'lead-in' times to minimise against under performance.
- Many existing consents are currently unviable due to S106 and infrastructure requirements.

#### Housing delivery, delivery rate and density

- Delivery rate of 20-30 dwellings per annum (dpa) is more achievable or 40 dpa where there are multiple developers.
- Revisit yield calculation due to market trends reducing density.
- NPPF para 150 – need to take account of market signals.
- Previously developed land and windfall sites should be considered as a bonus, not a mainstay in the forecasting of supply.
- Inclusion of SHLAA sites will be taken as an endorsement of their suitability for housing development at the density being suggested.
- Viability of sites needs to be tested as landowners can sometimes only have a partial appreciation of the costs of development.
- Sites with permission should be discounted if they:
  - have consents older than 2007 and have not come forward or development has stalled;
  - have existing uses and are not vacant;
  - are subject to other policy constraints;
  - have had no response from developer/landowner.
- Garden land and small sites should be included as this would otherwise restrict small scale developers.
- Consider it appropriate to consider under/over supply against the last five years.
- Sites can only be brought forward if a phasing policy is proposed.

#### Emerging policy

- Remove reference to CP1A as this is an emerging Core Strategy policy

**Buffer**

- Based on past delivery, more often than not the Council has under performed.
- Large amount of delivery has come from windfall – suggest larger buffer due to limited control of ensuring such development will come forward.
- Annual completions table to include figure for under/over provision to clearly demonstrate annual completions against target.
- Sites with a history of not being developed to be moved from the housing supply and added to buffer sites in order to make developers and landowners reconsider their historic approach to land banking.
- Council should focus on sites with planning permissions and allocations.

**Housing Trajectory**

- Not advisable to calculate affordable housing at 40% due to the Core Strategy not been adopted and due to viability issues.
- Affordable housing trajectory should be viewed in addition to the annual dwelling requirement of 450.

**Existing 5 Year Housing Land Supply (2010/11)**

- Concerns that appeal (ref APP/N2739/A/11/2162857) is been used as a means of suggesting the Council has a clear 5 year land supply.
- Existing 5.57 year supply (2010/11) should not be relied upon due to decision being made under PPS3, not the NPPF and that the challenge focused on larger sites rather than viability and deliverability of numerous small and medium sites.

## Appendix 2 – Developer Questionnaire

Dear developer/agent,

The Council is currently assessing its 5 year housing land supply for the 2011/12 monitoring year. In order to realistically project the expected housing numbers to be included in the assessment we are contacting developers and agents to provide information on expected site delivery.

This time last year you kindly supplied us with information regarding the anticipated housing completions for this year, and the next 4 years.

I would be very grateful if you could refresh this data up to 2017 by **the 20<sup>th</sup> July**.

Please can you provide the following;

Site Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Location: \_\_\_\_\_

Planning Perm No: \_\_\_\_\_

Site Developer / Owner \_\_\_\_\_

Total site capacity: \_\_\_\_\_

Outstanding Plots as at (date) \_\_\_\_\_

### Current delivery programme

Please can you provide expected market dwellings per annum in the table below. The NPPF also requires Local Planning Authorities to include expected affordable housing delivery within their 5 year supply.

Year	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17
Market Housing					
Affordable Units					
First time buyer offer*					

*\*Expected units First time buyer offer provided directly by housebuilder (e.g. Home Buy, First Buy etc).*

As part of the 5 year supply assessment we would also be interested to know the current market interest in your site, if market conditions are improving and



if houses are selling in the area? Please provide any comments you may have on this matter as part of your response.

We will also be setting up a Stakeholder Working Group to discuss the 5 year supply methodology in more detail, if you would like to be part of this group please let us know.

The Policy Team

### Appendix 3 – Completions on Non-allocated Sites

For convenience the table below sets out the last eight years’:

- Total completions on allocated sites
- Completions on non-allocated sites (SDC windfall definition)
- Completions on windfall and PDL (PPS3 windfall definition)

Period	Completions total	Figures for non-allocated sites (SDC definition)				Figures for only those non-allocated sites which are also PDL			
		Completions on allocated sites	% of completions On allocated sites	Completions on all other sites (windfall)	% of Completions on all other sites (windfall)	All completions on PDL	% of all completions on PDL	Of windfalls, how many on PDL*	% of windfall completions on PDL
2010-11	366	155	42.3	211	57.7	181	49.5	174	82.5
2009-10	270	107	39.6	163	60.4	125	46.3	117	71.8
2008-09	222	59	26.6	163	73.1	154	69.4	146	89.6
2007-08	583	240	41.2	343	58.8	299	51.3	271	79.0
2006-07	874	187	21.4	687	78.6	585	66.9	585	85.2
2005-06	633	53	8.4	580	91.6	473	74.7	473	81.6
2004-05	469	167	35.6	302	64.4	242	51.6	242	80.1
<b>TOTAL 2005-2010</b>	<b>3417</b>	968	-	2449	-	2059	-	2008	-
<b>Average 2005-2010</b>	<b>488</b>	138	30.7%	350	<b>69.2%</b>	294	58.5	287	<b>81.4%</b>

\*All allocated sites with the exception of HAM/2 are Greenfield. HAM/2 has 51 of its 89 dwellings on PDL, delivered as follows:

- 2007/08 = 33 completions of which 28 on PDL
- 2008/09 = 16 completions of which 8 on PDL
- 2009/10 = 13 completions of which 8 on PDL
- 2010/11 = 28 completions of which 7 on PDL

All other PDL was from windfalls.

**Appendix 4 SHLAA 2011 sites available in 0-5 years – Sites highlighted in green are included and contribute to supply.**

Site Reference	FINAL TIME PERIOD	Site Size (ha)	Potential yield for 0-5yrs	Yield estimate	Land Type	Development Limits	Main Issues TIMESCALE	Garden Land?	Phase 2 site?	Extant PP for resi?	Green sites Yield
PHS/15/002	Yes 0-5 years	0.42	15	15	Mixed	Within	N/A	Part	No	No	
PHS/15/003	Yes 0-5 years	0.85	30	30	Mixed	Within	Outside dev. limits of DSV.	Part (small)	No	No	
PHS/15/005	Yes 0-5 years	0.51	18	18	Mixed	Within	Planning application currently pending on the site for 13 dwellings, submitted by Linden Homes.	Part ? Farmstead	No	Yes - 2011/1048/FUL	
PHS/16/003	Yes 0-5 years	1.33	0	0	Mixed	Within	Linked to other land with access issues over railway line. Industrial site with associated clearance costs and potential for contamination.	No	No	No (app for Demolition 2011/1190/DEM)	0 yield in SHLAA due to double counting with PHS/16/007 - actual yield is 60
PHS/16/004	Yes 0-5 years	4.27	0	0	PDL	Within	Linked to need to provide access over railway to land to south in same ownership. Industrial site with associated clearance costs and potential for contamination.	No	No	No - 2012/0540/FUL (Pending)	0 yield in SHLAA due to double counting with PHS/16/007 and 008 - actual yield is 192

PHS/16/005	Yes 0-5 years	0.87	0	0	PDL	Within	Linked to need to provide land for access road over railway to south in same ownership. Industrial site with associated clearance costs and potential for contamination.	No	No	No - Includes site area for 16/003 and 16/004	0 yield in SHLAA due to double counting with PHS/16/008 - actual yield is <b>39</b>
PHS/16/006	Yes 0-5 years	1.29	36	36	PDL	Within	Linked to need to provide access over railway to land to south in same ownership. Industrial site with associated clearance costs and potential for contamination.	No	No	No - Includes site area for 16/003 and 2012/054 1/EIA (Pending)	Reduced yield in SHLAA due to double counting with PHS/16/007 - actual yield is <b>58</b>
PHS/16/010	Yes 0-5 years	0.74	33	33	Mixed	Within	SDC Declared surplus; closed depot. Industrial site with associated clearance costs and potential for contamination.	No	No	No	No double counting in SHLAA - yield <b>33</b>
PHS/16/011	Yes 0-5 years	1.5	52	52	Mixed	Within	Phase 2 SDLP housing allocation release 2011. Site owner promoting site. No major physical constraints.	Part - Farmstead	Yes	Yes (small part of site) 2010/036 4/FUL	
PHS/19/015	Yes 0-5 years	0.67	74	74	PDL	Within	Site cleared. Recent planning approval for 74 bed care home - 2008/1165/FUL	No	No	Yes - 2008/116 5/FUL	

PHS/19/016	Yes 0-5 years	7.03	250	301	Mixed	Within	Existing outline planning permission for residential. Developer owned. No major physical constraints. Site cleared.	Part - small	Yes - SEL/2A (SHLAA site larger than alloc.)	Yes - 2009/0805/REM
PHS/19/018	Yes 0-5 years	45.3	250	817	Greenfield	Within	Housing allocation. Planning permission for residential.	Part - small	Yes - SEL/2	Yes - 2009/0213/REM
PHS/19/020	Yes 0-5 years	0.55	25	25	PDL	Within	No major physical constraints. Industrial site with associated clearance costs and potential for contamination.	No	No	No No double counting in SHLAA - yield <b>25</b>
PHS/19/038	Yes 0-5 years	0.89	40	40	PDL	Within	Land currently been marketed for development.	No	No	No - pending COU Yes - 2005/0677/FUL (small part of site)
PHS/23/001	Yes 0-5 years	1.68	0	0	Greenfield	Within	Phase 2 site release - September 2011. Landowner marketing site.	No	Yes - CAM/1	
PHS/23/008	Yes 0-5 years	2.37	83	83	Greenfield	Within	Part of Phase 2 release - September 2011. Landowner marketing site.	No? All dwellings/buildings demolished.	Yes - CAM/1	See 23/001

PHS/29/002	Yes 0-5 years	2.47	86	86	Greenfield	Within	N/A	No	Yes - CAR/1	No - Request for Screening Opinion - SCR/2012 /0002
PHS/33/004	Yes 0-5 years	0.82	29	29	Mixed	Within	Highway sightlines to restore - cannot be accommodated within the site. Third party land required to achieve highway visibility.	No	Yes - HAM/1	No
PHS/34/001	Yes 0-5 years	4.9	172	172	Greenfield	Within	Existing housing allocation in SDLP. Phas 2 site - released September 2011.	No	Yes - THW/2	No
PHS/34/003	Yes 0-5 years	0.41	14	14	Mixed	Within	N/A	Part	No	No
PHS/34/004	Yes 0-5 years	1.13	40	40	Mixed	Within	N/A	Part	No	No
PHS/37/001	Yes 0-5 years	1.44	50	50	Greenfield	Within	Significant highways works to be carried out. Phase 2 release - September 2011.	No	Yes - EGG/2	No
PHS/37/005	Yes 0-5 years	6.79	238	238	Greenfield	Within	N/A	Part - small area	Yes - EGG/3	No
PHS/37/011	Yes 0-5 years	2.57	16	16	Mixed	Within	Within dev. limits of DSV.	No	Yes - EGG/3	No

PHS/48/001	Yes 0-5 years	0.4	14	14	PDL	Within	N/A	Yes	No	No (2010/028 7/FUL - pending extension of time)
PHS/48/010	Yes 0-5 years	1.69	59	59	Mixed	Within	Within Dev. Limits of DSV.	Part	No	Yes - 2012/019 1/FUL
PHS/56/009	Yes 0-5 years	0.42	15	15	Greenfield	Within	Conservation area. Within development limits.	No (not sure if dwelling on site??)	No	No
PHS/56/012	Yes 0-5 years	0.72	25	25	Greenfield	Within	Within development limits of DSV. FZ3 to approx. 75% of site.	Yes	No	Yes - 2008/078 1/FUL
PHS/57/002	Yes 0-5 years	3.8	133	133	Mixed	Within	Actively promoted/subject of recent appeal. Intermediate highway works required to improve Lund Sike Lane. Phase 2 site - released September 2011.	Part - very small	Yes - STM/1(B)	Yes - 2011/056 3/FUL
PHS/58/007	Yes 0-5 years	37.75	250	924	Greenfield	Within	Large site issues and multiple developers likely. Pending res. application on site. Part FZ3. Phase 2 site - released September 2011.	No	Yes - SHB/1(B)	Current pending app and appeal

PHS/58/014	Yes 0-5 years	0.49	17	17	Greenfield	Within	N/A	No	No	No	No double counting in SHLAA - yield 17
PHS/58/015	Yes 0-5 years	0.53	19	19	PDL	Within	SDC Owned. ROS	No	No	No	
PHS/64/002	Yes 0-5 years	1.12	39	39	PDL	Within	Improvements required to Tadcaster WWTW.	No	No	No	No double counting in SHLAA - yield 39
PHS/64/004	Yes 0-5 years	1.18	41	41	Mixed	Within	Works required for capacity to be made available at Tadcaster WWTW. Floodrisk 3 on 50% of site. Complex highway works required.	Part - farmstead	No	No	
PHS/64/010	Yes 0-5 years	0.97	0	0	PDL	Within	Within development limits of DSV.	No	No	No	0 yield in SHLAA due to double counting with PHS/64/002 - yield to remain 0



PHS/73/005	Yes 0-5 years	2.11	146	146	Mixed	Within	Junction improvements required. Flood defence improvements delayed until after 2012. 20% in FZ3. SSOB(T) actively promoting site. Along with site ref PHS/73/010, capable of delivering 250 dwellings. Negotiations have been ongoing regarding Flood Allevia	No	No	Yes - CO/1992/1168
PHS/73/010	Yes 0-5 years	1.62	0	0	Greenfield	Within	Landowner actively promoting site. See ref PHS/73/005. FZ3 on 100% of site.	No	No	As 73/005

143.6      2309

**Green Sites Yield (Sites with no planning permission, no garden land and not on allocated sites) = 463**

**Appendix 5 Buffer – SHLAA 2011 sites available in 6-10 years – sites highlighted in green are included and contribute to the buffer.**

Site Reference	FINAL TIME PERIOD	Site Size (ha)	Potential yield for 6-10yrs	Yield estimate	Land Type	Development Limits	Main Issues TIMESCALE	Landowner's Intentions Known	Garden Land	Phase 2 site?	Extant PP for resi?
PHS/16/014	Yes 6-10 years	1.85	65	65	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Relies on amended SDLP designation (Strategic Countryside Gap).	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/16/016	Yes 6-10 years	1.2	42	42	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Relies upon amendment to protected designation in SDLP (Strategic Countryside Gap).	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/19/025	Yes 6-10 years	46.62	250	1467	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Main landowner indicates available in 0-5 years. Major highway constraints.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/19/030	Yes 6-10 years	1.45	50	50	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Access problems - need for third party land.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/19/031	Yes 6-10 years	6.19	204	204	Mixed	Adjacent outside	Third party land potentially required to achieve highway visibility.	Yes 0-5 yrs	Part - small resi	No	No
PHS/20/010	Yes 6-10 years	2.61	91	91	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Although promoted by landowner, requires designation change (Strategic Countryside Gap).	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No

PHS/20/012	Yes 6-10 years	6.85	0	0	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Landowner/developer promoting site, however Strategic Countryside Gap designation requires amendment. Major highway works required.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/20/013	Yes 6-10 years	26.64	0	0	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Although landowner promoting site; requires designation change (Strategic Countryside Gap). Major highway works required.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/20/015	Yes 6-10 years	31	250	760	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Requires change in protected designation from SDLP (Strategic Countryside Gap). Considerable highway infrastructure investment required.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/20/022	Yes 6-10 years	6.2	217	217	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Within Strategic Countryside Gap, would require change to designation within development plan. Approx. 50% of site within FZ3.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No

PHS/35/011	Yes 6-10 years	0.94	33	33	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Approx. 50% of site within FZ3. Third party land required for highway access.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/42/004	Yes 6-10 years	1.51	53	53	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Green Belt designation would require amending.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/42/005	Yes 6-10 years	12.97	250	454	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Green Belt status would require amending. Land required from third party land to achieve highway visibility.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/42/006	Yes 6-10 years	1.5	52	52	PDL	Adjacent outside	Green Belt designation would require amending.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/42/007	Yes 6-10 years	3.05	107	107	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Amendment to Green Belt designation required.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/42/013	Yes 6-10 years	10.97	250	384	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Green Belt status amendment required. Part in, part outside dev. limits.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/42/014	Yes 6-10 years	1.28	45	45	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Green Belt status amendment required. Part in, part outside dev. limits.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No

PHS/48/002	Yes 6-10 years	2.32	81	81	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Green Belt status amendment required. Also LILA. Improvements to Sutton WWTW required.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/48/004	Yes 6-10 years	0.4	0	0	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Green Belt status amendment required. Also LILA. Improvements to Sutton WWTW required.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/48/005	Yes 6-10 years	2.63	92	92	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Green Belt status would require amending. Also LILA. Improvements to Sutton WWTW required.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/48/006	Yes 6-10 years	1.29	45	45	Mixed	Adjacent outside	Part in. Part outside dev. limits of DSV. Green Belt amendment required. Also proximity to LILA needs to be considered.	Yes 0-5 yrs	Part - small resi	No	No
PHS/48/007	Yes 6-10 years	0.75	26	26	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Adj. dev. limits of DSV. Green Belt amendment required. Also LILA.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/49/003	Yes 6-10 years	1.74	61	61	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Adj. dev. limits of DSV Requires amendment to Green Belt designation.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No

PHS/50/003	Yes 6-10 years	2.6	91	91	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Adj. dev. limits of DSV Requires change to Green Belt designation.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/50/004	Yes 6-10 years	1.1	38	38	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Adj. dev. limits of DSV Requires change to Green Belt designation.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/50/005	Yes 6-10 years	3.33	117	117	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Adj. dev. limits of DSV Requires change to Green Belt designation.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/50/006	Yes 6-10 years	5.12	179	179	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Adj. dev. limits of DSV Requires amendment to Green Belt designation. Approx 20% of site within FZ3.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/50/007	Yes 6-10 years	2.81	59	59	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Adj. dev. limits of DSV Requires amendment to Green Belt designation.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/53/003	Yes 6-10 years	13.64	250	477	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	FZ3 issues on 30% of the sites potential. Outside dev. limits of DSV.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/56/002	Yes 6-10 years	2.39	84	84	Mixed	Adjacent outside	There may be Access issues across thrid party land. Requires amendment to Green Belt designation.	Yes 0-5 yrs	Yes	No	No

PHS/56/003	Yes 6-10 years	0.68	24	24	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Highway improvements required. Requires amendment to Green Belt designation.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/56/007	Yes 6-10 years	0.95	33	33	Mixed	Adjacent outside	Would require amendment to Green Belt designation. Adjacent outside development limits of DSV.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/56/013	Yes 6-10 years	1.08	38	38	Mixed	Adjacent outside	Adjacent outside development limits of DSV. Requires change to Green Belt designation.	Yes 0-5 yrs	Part - small resi	No	No
PHS/57/005	Yes 6-10 years	2.6	91	91	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Actively promoted but requires significant off-site highway works (including widening White Cote Lane). Amendment to Green Belt status required.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/57/006	Yes 6-10 years	2.67	93	93	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Actively promoted/subject of recent applications but requires off site highway works. Green Belt status amendment required.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No

PHS/57/007	Yes 6-10 years	2.2	77	77	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Adj. to dev. limits of DSV. Requires amendment to Green belt designation.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/57/010	Yes 6-10 years	0.57	0	0	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Adj. to dev. limits of DSV. Requires amendment to Green Belt designation.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/58/002	Yes 6-10 years	11.02	250	386	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Approx 25% of site is Green Belt - would require a change of development plan status. Also within Safeguarded Land designation within SDLP. Complex highways access and junction work will be required.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/58/012	Yes 6-10 years	2.5	88	88	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Requires amendment to Green Belt designation. Also LILA. Adj. to dev. limit of LSC.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/58/013	Yes 6-10 years	1.5	52	52	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Land within Green Belt - will require development plan status change	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No



PHS/58/025	Yes 6-10 years	2.63	92	92	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Adj. to dev. limits of LSC. Green Belt requires amendment. LILA.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No (2012/051 1/CPO - NYCC for education )
PHS/58/028	Yes 6-10 years	37.3	250	864	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Existing Safeguarded Land allocation in SDLP. Adj. to dev. limits of SV. Requires amendment to Green Belt boundaries.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/62/003	Yes 6-10 years	0.48	17	17	PDL	Adjacent outside	Proportion of site within Strategic Countryside Gap - would require change to Development Plan status.	Yes 0-5 yrs	Yes	No	No
PHS/73/012	Yes 6-10 years	4.4	154	154	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Actively promoted but amendment to Green Belt status required. Improvement works to Tadcaster WWTW required.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No

PHS/73/013	Yes 6-10 years	11	250	385	Mixed	Adjacent outside	Actively promoted but amendment to Green Belt status required. Intermediate highway improvement works required. Improvements to Tadcaster WWTW required.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/73/019	Yes 6-10 years	18.85	250	275	Greenfield	Adjacent outside	Adjacent outside LSC. Requires amendment to Green Belt designation. Approx. 15% of site in FZ3.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/19/032	Yes 6-10 years	0.62	28	28	Greenfield	Within	Access - land required for bridge over Selby Dam for SDLP allocation SEL/1. Third party land required.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	No
PHS/29/009	Yes 6-10 years	0.54	19	19	Greenfield	Within	Existing play park, provided with Barratts development.	Yes 0-5 yrs	No	No	Site developed - play park
PHS/42/003	Yes 6-10 years	0.47	11	11	Mixed	Within	Green Belt designation would require amendment.	Yes 0-5 yrs	Part - existing dwellings	No	Frontage has been developed
PHS/49/004	Yes 6-10 years	0.86	30	30	Mixed	Within	Majority of site within dev. limits of DSV. Requires amendment to Green Belt designation.	Yes 0-5 yrs	Part - existing dwellings	No	No

Sites included where landowner intentions are 0-5 and site is not on Garden Land and is not constrained by policy and third parties (i.e strategic gap, green belt or requirement for 3rd party land) = 500