

Contents

	page
1. Introduction.....	2
2. Sites with Planning Permission for housing.....	13
3. Site Specific Sources without permission, including a windfall allowance ...	15
4. Assessment of suitable greenfield locations	21
5. Summary Review of Housing Land Availability.....	26
6. Monitoring and Review	29

Appendices

Appendix 1	Sites with planning permission with delivery justification & yield summary table
Appendix 2	Table of rejected sites
Appendix 3	Potential sites in urban areas without permission – yield summary table
Appendix 4	Urban Area site analysis forms and plans
Appendix 5	Sites Beyond Settlement Policy Boundaries - sites analysis forms and plans
Appendix 6	Rejected sites from SHLAA consultation autumn 2008: too small, or outside & not adjacent to settlements
Appendix 7	Agenda for Key Stakeholder meeting on 13 November 2007

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 states that all local authorities should undertake Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs). Such assessments provide information on the opportunities that exist to meet housing need in a specified area. This assessment is a systematic study of land in Basingstoke and Deane which is likely to be available for housing development in the borough up to 2026.
 - 1.1.1. This section sets out the approach followed in the completion of the SHLAA and presents the study's main findings regarding potential housing land availability in the different site categories. Local communities, stakeholders and infrastructure providers were consulted on a draft of the document for their comments on both the methodology used for the SHLAA study and the findings.
 - 1.1.2. The Borough Council undertook the early stages of the study and Baker Associates were appointed in November 2007 to help complete the SHLAA.

1.2. Background and approach

- 1.2.1. In July 2007, Communities and Local Government (CLG) published the Practice Guidance '*Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment*'. The Guidance provides the government's view on how it considers SHLAAs should be undertaken and therefore provides the basis for conducting such studies.
- 1.2.2. All the relevant stages of the SHLAA process, outlined in the guidance, have been followed in this study. Much had already been completed by the Borough Council in previous work under a continuous monitoring process, including the 2004 *Urban Capacity Study* (UCS) and Annual Housing Monitoring Reports. The work carried out, and the processes followed by the Council in addressing housing land supply through previous Urban Capacity Studies, and through Annual Housing Monitoring Reports have been of a high standard, and have addressed all the requirements of government guidance.
- 1.2.3. The guidance emphasises the importance of a partnership approach. This involves working with key stakeholders such as local authorities within the same housing market area, developers, landowners, Registered Social Landlords and utility companies and other agencies. They can also provide expertise particularly on the operation of the housing market, and provide the study with suitable sites that are deliverable.
- 1.2.4. Given the timing of the study, collaborative working between neighbouring authorities and Regional Planning Bodies was not possible. However, a Hampshire Working Group on SHLAAs has produced some general good practice guidance to ensure consistency between areas, and this study is in line with that guidance.
- 1.2.5. A number of stakeholders have also been specifically involved in the study. Consultation took place in May and October 2007 with public land owners,

developers, registered social landlords, and agents, asking consultees to highlight sites within their ownership or control that may become available for development in the period up to 2026. Following this, a Stakeholder Forum was held in November 2007 that addressed all the issues of the SHLAA, including general housing growth issues facing the Borough, and the proposed approach to be taken. This Forum was attended by a good range of developers, planning consultants, agents and the Home Builders' Federation, and was able to address concerns about deliverability. The agenda for the stakeholder forum is attached as Appendix 7.

- 1.2.6. Following a first draft of the SHLAA, the Council carried out a further 'call for potential housing sites' through the Core Strategy Issues & Options Report in January and February 2008. These sites were subsequently assessed, and included in the consultation draft of the SHLAA of September 2008. Following consultation on this second draft SHLAA during the autumn of 2008, a further 38 sites were submitted, and these were assessed in January and February 2009. This process is discussed in para. 4.1.10 onwards.
- 1.2.7. The Council is carrying out other Local Development Framework (LDF) evidence base background studies that could result in additional potential housing sites being identified to those outlined in this report. These include: an *'Employment Land Review'*, a *'Leisure and Recreational Needs Assessment'* (including an Open Space Audit), and a *'Strategic Approach to Parking'*. When these studies are completed, the Council will look to assess any sites that are no longer required for their current use, and determine whether any have potential to be a housing site, using PPS3's suitability, availability, and achievability tests as guiding principles.
- 1.2.8. The SHLAA is not the forum for making decisions in principle about the suitability for development of specific sites. This SHLAA is being carried out before a borough-wide strategy is established through the Core Strategy, and before implications of specific spatial distributions have been analysed. This study will enable the initial work on potential areas of search and their relative constraints to be taken forward into the LDF's Core Strategy. The assessment forms part of the evidence base for the emerging LDF and will provide a starting point from which the Core Strategy can make the key strategic decisions on the distribution of housing.
- 1.2.9. The expectation of PPS3 is that housing should come forward on identified sites, and that the priority for development should remain focussed on previously-developed land (PDL) and buildings. The PDL sites identified within the settlements in the study should be the Council's priority for bringing through the planning system as allocations.
- 1.2.10. Following a review of the overall yield on sites identified through survey work, if insufficient land is available to meet housing requirements, the study will need to assess broad locations beyond settlement boundaries. These will mostly be greenfield sites, and whilst sites on PDL remain the priority, the Council will need to consider when such greenfield sites need to be brought forward in order to meet the overall requirement by the end of the plan period.

- 1.2.11. In January 2008 a new advice note was published by the Planning Advisory Service (PAS), entitled '*Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and Development Plan Document Preparation*'. It emphasised:
- partnership working with key stakeholders such as house builders, social landlords, local property agents, and local communities;
 - that the assessment of sites beyond settlement boundaries should follow an assessment of what is available within settlements, which should be compared with requirement, and the further greenfield assessment should concentrate on those sites which have the best potential; there is no expectation to consider every greenfield site on the edge of every settlement;
 - where policy allows it, windfall-type development on unidentified sites within settlements can be counted in supply, since it is based on pro-active policy, and is therefore by definition, not windfall. (This is contrary to PPS3 guidance, and confirmation has been sought from CLG as to the appropriate approach to take).
- 1.2.12. No such windfall-type allowance has been made in this SHLAA, but the Council is reserving its position on this matter, particularly with regard to further clarification that may emerge from CLG. Further information on this is outlined in section 3.
- 1.2.13. The stages of the SHLAA are set out in Figure 3 of the Guidance, and comprise:
- 1.3. Stage 1: Planning the Assessment - time periods, site-size threshold, settlements**
- 1.3.1. The initial stage related primarily to the project planning required by the planning authority when scoping the study and considering timescales for outputs. A detailed work programme and project milestones for undertaking the work was prepared for the inception meeting and remained the project programme for the study throughout the preliminary part of the process, though it was later agreed by the Council to extend the project timescale to take into consideration additional consultation responses.
- 1.3.2. In this initial stage of project planning it was also necessary to set all of the study parameters relating to the physical and time extents to be considered. The study relates to the 20-year period 2006-26 encompassing the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and Local Development Framework (LDF) plan periods, and has a base date of 1st April 2008. This date is important when considering the distinction between sites with planning permission and those where an application is submitted but not determined.
- 1.3.3. It is useful to provide an assessment of potential housing land in a series of time bands to reflect likely delivery. The new Guidance indicates that this should relate to: "the first five years of a plan", "years 6 – 10", and "ideally years 11 – 15" (para. 5).

-
- 1.3.4. The dwelling yield from the SHLAA is set in a series of time bands: 2008-2013, 2013-2018, 2018-2023 and 2023-2026. The approach to establishing the five-year land supply is addressed later in section 5.
- 1.3.5. A site of five or more units is set as the survey threshold. This is likely to identify as many sites as possible, without the problem of attempting to assess very small sites where it is impossible to assess delivery.
- 1.3.6. The study also needs to specify the settlements from which dwelling yield will be sought. The prime concern of planning policy is to develop sustainable communities. In general these locations will be focused on existing settlements and the location for the majority of housing development should be focused on larger settlements where a range of services can be accessed.
- 1.3.7. The guidance states that the study should aim to identify as many sites in and around as many settlements as possible. In line with this, the SHLAA focuses upon all of the borough's larger and more sustainable settlements, casting a wider net than the approach taken for the 2004 *Urban Capacity Study*. The focus on sustainable settlements is in line with the adopted *Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan Review 1996-2011* and also PPS3 with its continuing emphasis on sustainability and ensuring that housing is developed in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure.
- 1.3.8. The study has therefore focussed upon the following settlements:
- Ashford Hill
 - Basingstoke town (including the parish of Chineham)
 - Bramley
 - Burghclere
 - Cliddesden
 - Dummer
 - Kingsclere
 - North Waltham
 - Oakley
 - Old Basing
 - Overton
 - Preston Candover
 - Sherfield on Loddon
 - St Mary Bourne
 - Sherborne St John
 - Tadley/ Baughurst/ Pamber Heath
 - Upton Grey
 - Witchurch
 - Woolton Hill

1.4. Stage 2: Determining sources of sites to be included in the SHLAA

- 1.4.1. The maximum range of sources for sites should be considered in order to provide the most robust assessment of likely availability. These sites fall into a number of groups:
- unimplemented planning permissions
 - planning permissions that are under construction
 - existing housing allocations (in the adopted Local Plan)
 - other designated areas no longer required for allocated use
 - sites from the 2004 *Urban Capacity Study* (UCS)
 - sites subject to a planning application for housing and recent refusals
 - sites subject of pre-application discussions (although discussions are confidential)
 - vacant and derelict land and buildings within settlements (including a review of the National Land Use Database and the local empty property strategy)
 - additional opportunities within existing built up areas including potential areas for regeneration; these were either identified by Council officers, or by a desk-top site identification process by the consultants
 - sites from the consultation process, including surplus public sector land
 - sites on the edges of settlements arising from the 'call for sites'

1.5. Stage 3: Desktop Review of existing information

- 1.5.1. All of the above sources were initially reviewed and assessed by Borough Council officers. This included a review of all relevant sites listed within published material such as the previous UCS, Hampshire County Council's housing monitoring and phasing schedules, the adopted Local Plan, the Borough Council's annual housing land supply reports and the National Land Use Database. Lists of unimplemented planning permissions, withdrawn and refused planning applications and sites discussed through pre-application were also compiled and reviewed as part of the assessment.
- 1.5.2. Ordnance Survey Mapping is a key element to any SHLAA and provides the base for all assessment and presentation. At this initial stage of the process all identified sites were mapped on a GIS base and linked to an Access Database which holds information on ownership (where known) as well as site description, constraints and planning history (if any).
- 1.5.3. All sites with planning permission, at 1 April 2008, are summarised in Appendix 1. For the purposes of the SHLAA, the Borough Council has assessed all of the large sites (sites of 10 or more units) to identify which meet the 'suitable, achievable and achievable' tests (in accordance with para. 54 of PPS3, and Stage 7 of the Guidance) and therefore contribute towards the Borough's five-year housing land supply. This assessment process involved drawing on up-to-date information, discussing issues with relevant developers/landowners and making judgements on deliverability issues.

1.6. Stage 4: Determining which sites and areas will be surveyed

- 1.6.1. With the exception of sites with planning permission, all the sites identified in Stage 2 were surveyed. Following a desk-top 'characterisation' exercise by Baker Associates, a street by street survey was also carried out in the study settlements to identify sites with potential for housing development which were not identified by the desktop reviews.
- 1.6.2. However, it is not sensible or feasible to identify every site and building within the Borough capable of potentially accommodating five or more dwellings. The study must focus on realistic opportunities and then confirm that they are suitable and available for development. It would be an overly-onerous task to seek to identify each and every land owner and consider the implications of residential development.
- 1.6.3. There must be a reasonable prospect of development taking place on a site, so the study is guided by what constitutes an 'opportunity':
- An 'opportunity' is taken in the study (in addition to those arising from the call for sites) to be those sites likely to be targeted by developers which fall into one or more of the categories below. Sites that do not fall within any of these categories do not qualify as an 'opportunity';
 - sites that are appropriate, or 'suitable' for residential use in relation to the surroundings;
 - land or buildings within the curtilage of dwellings;
 - dwellings suitable for sub-division or re-development;
 - vacant or derelict sites and buildings;
 - part vacant, or under-used sites occupied by a land use which is marginal in economic terms, operating at the fringes of viability, part or all of which would be generally appropriate for residential use, or for mixed use to include residential, and would not result in a shortfall of employment land (where applicable) in the locality.
- 1.6.4. Initial surveys of settlements were completed by Borough Council officers, the findings of which were passed onto Baker Associates for verification. Council officers had identified all potential sites by detailed survey of Basingstoke, and of Tadley/ Baughurst/ Pamber Heath. The consultants visited all of the identified sites in a surveying exercise, and in addition carried out a detailed survey of all the remaining study settlements.

1.7. Stage 5: Carrying out the survey

- 1.7.1. Site surveys were undertaken by a small number of individuals from Baker Associates, ensuring a consistent approach to recording information and assessing sites.
- 1.7.2. All sites identified from all sources were visited and details recorded regarding the characteristics of the site and its surroundings. These findings are recorded in an Access Database which is used as the basis for reporting. For

sites which are considered to provide an opportunity for housing within the study period, summaries of the site findings are presented in Appendix 3.

- 1.7.3. Any sites that are currently in an alternative use, with no evidence or obvious prospect of being available for housing, and those where constraints mean that they will not be suitable for housing development, have been rejected and are presented in Appendix 2 of this report.

1.8. Stage 6: Estimating the housing potential of each site

- 1.8.1. For each site which is considered to provide an opportunity for housing, a yield has been attributed based on the characteristics of the particular site.
- 1.8.2. For some sites proposals will be sufficiently advanced that a yield will already be indicated from either a masterplan or from a planning application. However, for many sites a yield has been assessed. The starting point for assessing yield was the generation of indicative yields through the use of density multipliers. This provides an indication of the likely levels of housing provision depending on assumed density levels.
- 1.8.3. However, every site is different and therefore the density multiplier is only an initial indication. In some cases, indicative layouts of typical sites have been used as a basis for considering appropriate layouts and therefore yields. These provide a layer of analysis which has then been confirmed through the consideration of particular schemes for specific sites.
- 1.8.4. Where possible and appropriate, we have held discussions directly with developers and agents promoting individual sites so that the SHLAA is reflecting exactly what the housing market is intending. Developers and agents we have spoken to include:
- Persimmon
 - David Wilson Homes
 - Taylor Wimpey
 - Bewley Homes
 - Shackleton Blackmore
 - Berkeley Homes
 - Connells
 - Simmons & Sons
 - Bell Cornwell
 - Broadway Malyan
 - Adams Hendry
 - RPS
 - Boyer Planning
 - Pro Vision

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

1.9.1. The guidance seeks to consider all sites as one of three categories:

- **deliverable** – available now and with a reasonable prospect of development within five years. These sites are considered to have housing potential and are identified in this study as being provided within the period 2008 - 2013;
- **developable** – sites suitable for housing and having a reasonable prospect of being delivered within the period of the plan. These sites are included within this study and identified to come forward in a timeframe after 2013;
- **not currently developable** – these are the identified sites which, for whatever reason, cannot currently come forward for housing. These are included within the rejected sites list (Appendix 2).

Assessing suitability

1.9.2. The site pro-formas in Appendix 4 specifically consider the suitability of sites and indicate why each of those sites is considered suitable for housing development. Factors which make a site suitable for housing are considered throughout the assessment process, and include the character of the immediate surroundings and adjacent land uses. Review of relevant policy constraints and planning history indicates the potential restrictions to development and may identify physical problems or impacts on issues such as landscape character.

1.9.3. During site visits the potential physical limitations of sites and the conditions experienced by potential occupiers were judged. Issues of infrastructure provision, contamination and flood risk are all assessed through a review of available data and discussions with stakeholders.

Assessing availability

1.9.4. Many sites which were considered during the assessment were promoted by land owners or developers either through planning applications or informal approaches to the Council. Further sites have also been promoted through the LDF process, as a response to a further call for sites in January and February 2008 as part of the Issues and Options consultation on the Core Strategy.

1.9.5. In each case the land owner and/or developer are identifiable and their intentions are often made clear. Where this is not the case efforts were made to identify landowners through Council records. However, this is not always successful and within the constraints of this study it has not always been possible to identify and/or contact land owners. In these instances a view has been taken as to the likelihood that development will come forward based on knowledge of the site.

Assessing achievability

- 1.9.6. The guidance is clear that achievability relates to the economic viability of a site and this has been determined through a consideration of the market, as well as the particular circumstances of each site.
- 1.9.7. A market assessment forms a key part of the methodology of this study and discussions were held with developers and agents regarding the local market conditions in the area for different types of housing. This assisted the process of reaching conclusions about dwelling yields for sites identified through the survey process, and market issues are discussed in section 3.
- 1.9.8. The discussions with the housing industry addressed proposals for individual sites, as well as likely favoured house types targeted for different types of site, as well as land values for competing land uses, sales rates, selling prices, efficiency of residential land use, and the market for differing types of housing, in different areas.
- 1.9.9. This information enables the study to predict, with as much certainty as is possible, the type of housing, and therefore the likely yield, for each site, as well as the likely viability of marginal locations. This process is an essential part of assessing the deliverability of each site opportunity, and the time band for likely development. Residual valuation of each and every site is not reasonable given the extent of the study and resources available. Rather the market assessment is used as a basis for considering the viability of sites in line with para. 41 of the practice guidance. The effects of the current downturn in the housing market are considered in paras. 3.2.12 - 3.2.16.

Overcoming constraints

- 1.9.10. In certain locations and on certain sites the potential for development will be limited by a range of constraints. In some instances these constraints may be overcome through either shifts in policy or by the creation or improvement of infrastructure.
- 1.9.11. In all instances the likelihood of changes occurring has been considered in order to assess whether a site is developable or not currently developable as the difference in the distinction will be the likelihood that development will proceed.
- 1.9.12. For all sites and locations, constraints to development have been identified during the assessment process and if the constraints are considered to represent a barrier to development the sites have been rejected. Where constraints are considered to be able to be overcome, sites are included in Appendix 4 as an opportunity.

1.10. Stage 8: Review of the Assessment

- 1.10.1. Following site visits and the review of site data, all information was reviewed and the yield compared with the requirement so that conclusions could be drawn as to whether the extent of the survey has identified sufficient supply.

The review indicated that the anticipated supply of housing land within existing built up areas falls significantly short of the adopted South East Plan net housing requirement for the borough for 2006-26, meaning that an assessment of suitable greenfield sites and broad locations will be necessary.

1.11. Stage 9: Identifying and assessing the housing potential of Suitable Greenfield Sites/ Broad Locations (where necessary)

- 1.11.1. The guidance sets an expectation that housing supply should be based on specific sites, and where appropriate, broad locations, which may provide for urban extensions.
- 1.11.2. It was known at the outset of this study that there was likely to be a shortfall between identified supply and the Borough's potential housing requirement up to 2026. The assessment has used the now adopted South East Plan's housing requirement of 945 units a year in the borough or 18,900 units between 2006 and 2026 for the purposes of this study. This is in order to understand the implications of such levels in terms of the need for greenfield site allocations. The Council has maintained its position that 740 units a year is a more appropriate housing requirement for the borough but it was considered that in order to produce a robust evidence base for the LDF the most up to date position should be reflected and addressed. Section 5 of the assessment does, however, include summary tables outlining the situation for both of these requirements.
- 1.11.3. Accordingly, an assessment of areas beyond settlement boundaries has taken place that considers those sites submitted to the Borough Council through the consultation process, or 'call for sites', as well as a number of areas that were promoted through the last Local Plan. This was because these areas will have the overall capacity to meet the likely extent of the shortfall, and generally represented the most acceptable areas for future development in broad planning terms. The matter of which sites to include was addressed and agreed at the Stakeholder Forum, on the understanding that it would not preclude other sites being promoted through the LDF process in addition to those considered in this assessment. The Council may include additional suitable sites in a review of this work. Appendix 5 sets out the assessment of suitable greenfield opportunities and broad locations.

1.12. Stage 10: Determining the housing potential of windfall (where justified)

- 1.12.1. The expectation of the Guidance and PPS3 is that housing should come forward on identified sites, and that allowances for windfall should not be allowed for in the first 10 years of land supply from the date of adoption of the relevant Local Development Document, unless there are exceptional circumstances. The Core Strategy is intended to be adopted in 2011.
- 1.12.2. For the period 2021 – 2026 (that is, outside the first 10 years of the study), a windfall allowance has been made only for small sites based upon current information held on past rates of completion on previously-developed sites, site specific opportunities identified through this study and assessment of urban character and planning policy.

- 1.12.3. The recent advice note published by the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) advises that, in broad locations within settlements, where development through infilling and redevelopment is encouraged by policy, an allowance for future development based on past rates can be included in a SHLAA. By virtue of being promoted by policy, and in a broad location, and included in a SHLAA, this kind of development is, according to PAS, no longer considered as windfall.
- 1.12.4. However, this PAS advice is in direct conflict with PPS3 and the practice guidance which is still definitive. Until such time therefore as CLG clarifies this issue about windfall type development, the Council is making no allowance in the first 10 years from adoption of the Core Strategy.

2. Sites with Planning Permission for housing

2.1. All sites with permission

- 2.1.1. The table in Appendix 1 shows that a total of **5534 dwellings** could come forward from both large and small sites with planning permission as at 1 April 2008 in the period until 2026. In addition to the information that is compiled annually by the Borough Council and Hampshire County Council as part of its established annual housing monitoring process, and in light of the new guidance outlined in PPS3, all of the large sites have also been tested against deliverability criteria, namely site suitability, availability and achievability. This overall assessment process involved drawing on up-to-date information, discussing issues with relevant developers/landowners and making judgements on deliverability issues. As a result, the number of dwellings with permission totalling 5534 units has been reduced to **5464**, because 70 units with permission are considered unlikely to be delivered. The small-site capacity of 285 units was tested for appropriateness against past completion rates. The Council has followed precisely the approach intended by government in its practice guidance, and the dwelling yields are considered to be reliable estimates.
- 2.1.2. Through this approach, the Council has estimated the time period when sites will be delivered, based on the deliverability criteria, which is as follows:

Source of housing potential	2008 - 13	2013 - 18	2018 - 23	Unlikely to be Developed	2008– 26
Small Sites with planning permission	285	0	0	0	285
Large Sites with planning permission	4594	585	0	70	5249
All sites with planning permission	4879	585	0	70	5534

- 2.1.3. There may be some instances when sites do not come forward for unforeseen circumstances. However, it will be equally the case that, because of the absence of absolute certainty about the future, other sites will come forward in the short term which otherwise have not been identified which will make up for any loss.
- 2.1.4. Over the past eight years, the small site completion rate has averaged 107 dwellings per annum (dpa), exceeding the rate implied by outstanding consents of 57 dpa. Between 2005 and 2008, the average was 150 dpa. Therefore, it is not proposed to reduce the delivery of the small-site permissions.
- 2.1.5. The adopted Local Plan makes provision for small-site windfall development throughout the Borough to meet the figure of 560 units from 2004 to 2011. This equates to an allowance of 80 dwellings a year, and therefore continues past Local Plan rates. Monitoring work has indicated a net gain of 682 dwellings on

small sites between 1996 and 2004 equating to an average annual net gain of 85 dwellings over this period.

- 2.1.6. There is also no evidence to suggest that this rate might reduce in the future, and the UCS suggested that any reduction in available sites will be counter balanced by the focus on developing previously developed land and increased developer interest in smaller sites. The character area work and design-led work undertaken as part of the UCS concluded that there was unlikely to be a large increase in the number of small sites coming forward for development each year, particularly as a result of the character of Basingstoke Town. However, the current Adopted Local Plan contains a number of policies such as Policy D5: *Residential and Other Development within Settlements*, which sets a positive policy framework for the continued delivery of sites within built up areas. Adequate positive policies and remaining potential sites exist for small sites to continue to significantly contribute to the Borough's land supply position.
- 2.1.7. Therefore, it is not proposed to reduce the delivery of the small-site permissions, which comprise sites with a total capacity of 285 dwellings, or 57 dpa. It will be for the Council to continually monitor the provision of housing land and completions in order to confirm that the anticipated figures are achieved.

3. Site Specific Sources without permission, including a windfall allowance

3.1. Allocations

- 3.1.1. The adopted *Basingstoke and Deane Borough Local Plan Review 1996-2011* includes seven allocations without planning permission. All of these sites have been surveyed and updated for potential dwelling yield. Each allocation has an individual site pro-forma contained in the Access database, and are included in both Appendix 3 (the Opportunity Sites without Permission Summary), and in Appendix 4 (the individual site pro-formas). The seven sites are identified in the table below, and the total yield is estimated as a total of 1650 dwellings; 620 units are expected to be completed over the next five years (2008-13); 1,030 units for 2013-18; and no units for 2018 to 2026.

allocation site	total dwelling yield	2008-13	2013-18	2018- 26
Land between Mulfords Hill and Silchester Road, Tadley	40	40	0	0
Boundary Hall, Tadley	100	100	0	0
Evingar Road, Whitchurch	30	30	0	0
South View, Basingstoke	300	150	150	0
Aldermaston Road Triangle, Basingstoke	300	200	100	0
A339 Newbury Road 'Trumpet' Junction, Basingstoke	130	100	30	0
Land north of Park Prewett, former golf course, Basingstoke	750	0	750	0
ALLOCATIONS TOTAL	1650	620	1030	0

3.2. Sites identified through survey

- 3.2.1. The identification of a range of sites from various sources is discussed in earlier sections (1.4). These included sites that previously appeared in the 2004 Urban Capacity Study, together with allocations without permission, and sites identified in the desk-top identification exercise as not being in residential use. From this wide range of sources over 250 sites were identified. Each was mapped on the GIS base and linked to an Access Database which stored information about the site and an assessment of its potential for housing.
- 3.2.2. Of the original total of 250 sites 126 were considered unsuitable for housing in principle, for various reasons including being in alternative uses with no evidence as to why they should be targeted for housing, or being in an unsuitable location. Most of these were identified from the desk-top identification exercise, but on survey were found to have no sound basis for inclusion as a housing site. Typical reasons for unsuitability were being in an alternative use such as car park, public open space, and gardens of properties

where there is no reason to suppose that the owners wish to build houses in their garden. These sites are not included in the rejected sites list.

- 3.2.3. All the remaining 124 sites were visited and assessed by the consultant team. Based on these assessments and an understanding of previous planning history where appropriate, the consultant team identified a total of 61 sites which are considered to provide opportunities for housing within the current policy framework.
- 3.2.4. 63 sites were considered 'undevelopable' for a variety of reasons, including being in an alternative use, with insufficient evidence to demonstrate how it might come forward for housing, unacceptable access, unavailability due to lack of owner interest, or being protected for employment use. These sites include all the sites identified by Council officers, and all the sites arising from previous studies, and these are included in a list of rejected sites in Appendix 2 with a reason for rejection. It was felt that because they had been put forward there needed to be recognition that they had been transparently assessed, and a reason given for rejection. This is in contrast to the unsuitable sites identified from the desk-top identification exercise where no purpose would be served by inclusion in a rejected list.
- 3.2.5. The list of the 61 acceptable sites is included as Appendix 3 and each is considered in detail in Appendix 4. For each site, consideration of its particular characteristics, assessment of the local market and owner expectations all combined to provide a likely yield for the site and, in line with the practice guidance, was indicated in one of the time periods.
- 3.2.6. In reaching conclusions about whether and when sites will come forward, it is essential to assess the suitability of each of the identified sites for housing development, taking account of the housing market, alternative possible land uses, the characteristics of each site, and the constraints to development. This takes into account:
- environmental constraints, such as nature conservation value
 - development constraints, including the means of achieving satisfactory access, flood risk and ground conditions
 - market considerations.
- 3.2.7. A key element in understanding where, how much and what type of housing is likely to come forward in any particular area is the operation of the local housing market. Understanding the economics of the local market is identified as a central component of a SHLAA by the practice guidance and the input of house builders and local property agents is important to this understanding.
- 3.2.8. Therefore in preparing this study a brief overview and update of the current state of the housing market has been undertaken and has been utilised in considering the likely type and number of dwellings which will come forward on identified sites. This is in line with advice in para.41 of the Practice Guidance,

as it is not considered necessary, or indeed practical, to undertake a valuation of each and every site.

- 3.2.9. Therefore, the assessment of opportunities has been assisted by consultations undertaken during the work with people familiar with the areas and knowledgeable about the operation of the local markets, such as local agents and house builders identified in para.1.8.4, to assist in building up knowledge of the factors affecting the likelihood of development.
- 3.2.10. In addition, the assessment has tried to take account of a variety of 'deliverability' factors, particularly in the first five-year period, when sites should be demonstrably suitable, available and achievable. These factors include access, ownership, adjacent land uses and economic viability in the light of local market considerations, though exhaustive investigations have not been possible in every instance.
- 3.2.11. Those familiar with the housing market over the long-term appreciate that any analysis is a view at a particular time. The market will undoubtedly vary over the period considered by this study, and it should be reviewed at regular intervals.
- 3.2.12. Due to the current market downturn from the credit squeeze apparent since September 2007, which has become particularly severe since April 2008, developers, agents and private housing developers confirm a much reduced local housing market. The three largest national housebuilders have temporarily stopped land acquisition in response to reduced demand for new housing, preferring instead to rely on their current land banks. Developers are in particular wary of large schemes of flats. No one can predict the length or severity of the current downturn, but its effect will evidently be to limit market capacity in the short term.
- 3.2.13. It is anticipated that after a period of re-adjustment underlying demand will return to recent levels, albeit at re-structured prices. The market emphasises that there must be a balanced delivery of a mix of house types, and an over-reliance on one type of dwelling creates over-supply and low demand problems.
- 3.2.14. Because of these recent market difficulties, there is now evidence that residential land values have decreased by around 10 - 15%, depending on individual and local circumstances. The most obvious change in the land market is that developers are less willing to compete against each other to acquire sites, and 2008-09 is likely to see a further softening of price due to this reduction in demand.
- 3.2.15. Whilst short-term demand has fallen medium and long-term demand is still considered by the market to be strong. This is underpinned by government policy to deliver a much increased level of housing to meet a national shortage. In the medium term, the housing land market in the Basingstoke area will continue to be comparatively strong for most house types in all locations, whilst housebuilders and private vendors are adjusting prices to align with demand.

- 3.2.16. It is considered that, due to the historically strong land-values in the area, it is unlikely that any competing uses or abnormal development costs would adversely affect the economic viability for housing of any of the identified sites.
- 3.2.17. Accordingly, most abnormal development costs should be able to be absorbed without falling below the value for alternative uses, such as general employment and warehousing land. Housing land is worth at least £1m more per developable acre than employment land, which enables most community gain packages and abnormal development costs to be allowed for, still producing a higher land-value. Economic viability is therefore unlikely to be in doubt for the housing sites identified in this study. The HBF has welcomed the fact that we assess an overview of viability in relation to planning obligations.
- 3.2.18. Each identified site needs to have a yield attributed based on the characteristics of the particular site, as well as a consideration of the market. For some sites proposals will be sufficiently advanced that a yield will already be indicated from either a masterplan or from a planning application. However, for many sites a yield has been assessed. The starting point for assessing yield was the generation of indicative yields through the use of density multipliers. This provides an indication of the likely levels of housing provision depending on assumed densities.
- 3.2.19. However, every site is different and therefore the density multiplier is only an initial indication. In some cases, indicative layouts of typical sites have been used as a basis for considering appropriate layouts and therefore yields. These provide a layer of analysis which has then been confirmed through the consideration of particular schemes for specific sites
- 3.2.20. Housing availability studies are about informing the decisions to be made in the LDF about housing provision based on what is possible and what is desirable, but also what is probable. There are very many factors affecting whether an opportunity should be used and is likely to be developed, and design considerations are only one part of this spectrum of relevant issues. The design that proves to be 'right' for a site when it is eventually developed may well be different from, though just as appropriate as, what is suggested during the study.

Findings

- 3.2.21. The surveys and subsequent assessment resulted in the identification of a total of 60 suitable sites, including seven allocations, across the study area, potentially providing a total of 3761 dwellings up to 2026. The vast majority of these are considered likely to be developed before 2018. The allocated sites have a capacity of 1650 dwellings, so the remaining 53 sites could provide a total of 2111 units to 2026. The table below summarises the number of units that could potentially be provided in individual settlements, grouped into the specific timebands.

Opportunity Sites (excluding allocations)				
Source of housing potential	2008-13	2013-18	2018-23	2008-26
Basingstoke (including Chineham)	433	1197	295	1925
Bramley	27	0	0	27
Tadley	16	68	0	84
Oakley	27	0	0	27
Sherfield on Loddon	9	0	0	9
Kingsclere	9	0	0	9
Whitchurch	30	0	0	30
Total identified through survey	551	1265	295	2111

3.3. Windfall allowance

- 3.3.1. PPS3 states that housing should come forward on identified sites and no allowance should be made for windfalls in the first 10 years from adoption of the relevant Local Development Document (LDD), unless exceptional local circumstances prevent specific sites being identified. The Basingstoke and Deane Core Strategy is expected to be adopted in 2011.
- 3.3.2. This study looks to project a reasonable completion allowance of small windfalls on previously-developed sites within the study settlements between 2021 and 2026. Between 2001 and 2007 (7.5 years), 642 dwellings were completed on small windfall sites, 81% (520 units) on previously-developed sites.
- 3.3.3. Furthermore, 67%, or 430 units, were located in Basingstoke Town, or in the rural wards containing the other main urban settlements in the district, Whitchurch, Kingsclere, Overton, Tadley, Bramley, and Oakley. This is an annual average of 58 dpa. The past rate of 58 dpa has therefore been achieved mostly within urban areas on previously-developed sites, including infilling, conversions, surplus public-sector land, and redevelopment of sites in other land uses.
- 3.3.4. The character of Basingstoke and other settlements in the Borough is not such that these redevelopment opportunities will suddenly dry up. There is a continual process of urban regeneration which will bring sites forward for redevelopment; many buildings have a life span of 30 - 50 years and when that time is up, alternative uses need to be considered, including housing.
- 3.3.5. Until completion figures relating to only previously-developed sites within the study settlements are available, it is proposed to use a cautious average figure of 50 dpa to project future windfall on small sites between 2021 and 2026, a total allowance of 250 dwellings.
- 3.3.6. In addition, in reality there is also likely to be an average of around 50 windfall completions on previously-developed sites for the 13-years from 2008 to 2021,

a potential 650 dwellings that cannot be counted in the Council's housing land supply using the PPS3 approach. Some of this will arise from the current stock of unimplemented permissions, but will have the effect of requiring the Council to allocate land for additional dwellings on greenfield sites through the LDF. It is noted that subsequently the completions from this windfall source can be counted after they have been completed. However, to comply with PPS3, and so as not to risk the evidence base being found 'unsound', this study only makes a windfall allowance for 2021-26.

- 3.3.7. As outlined earlier in this report, the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) published an advice note in January 2008. This clarifies the situation with regard to broad areas where non-site specific dwelling yield might arise, and be counted in supply in a SHLAA. In broad locations within settlements development through infilling and redevelopment is encouraged by policy, so an allowance for future development based on past rates can be included in a SHLAA. By virtue of being promoted by policy, and in a broad location, and included in a SHLAA, this type of development which used to be considered by local authorities as windfall sites, can no longer be considered. This PAS advice is in direct conflict with PPS3 and the Practice Guidance. Therefore, until CLG clarifies this issue about windfall-type development, no allowance will be made in the first 10 years of the study period.

Source of housing potential	2018 - 23	2023 – 26	2018-26
	allowance only for 2021 - 2023		
Small site windfall	100	150	250

4. Assessment of suitable greenfield locations

- 4.1.1. The Practice Guidance on SHLAAs requires an assessment of greenfield locations if there is likely to be a shortfall against housing requirements. It has already been demonstrated that this is likely to be the case in Basingstoke and Deane (see para. 1.11.2).
- 4.1.2. The potential housing supply set out in sections 2 and 3 amounts to **9,575** dwellings between 2006 and 2026. This is set out in the table below.

Source of housing potential	2008-13	2013-18	2018-23	2023-26	2008-26
Small Sites with planning permission	285	0			285
Large Sites with planning permission	4594	585			5179
Allocations	620	1030	0		1650
Site specific sources (identified through survey)	551	1265	295		2111
Small site windfall	0	0	100	150	250
Total supply	6050	2880	395	150	9475

- 4.1.3. The adopted *South East Plan* (Regional Spatial Strategy for South East England) indicates a requirement for 945 dpa or 18,900 dwellings (2006-26) for Basingstoke and Deane. Between 2006 and 2008 there were 2146 net dwelling completions, which count against the RSS requirement, so the shortfall the Council needs to address in its Core Strategy reduces to 16,754 units.
- 4.1.4. Counting these completions towards the overall requirement, there is a shortfall of 7179 dwellings. Accordingly, it is considered prudent to conduct an assessment of greenfield locations outside settlement boundaries. However, it is the view of the consultants and the council that the proper and most appropriate stage at which to make comparative decisions about development locations adjacent to the borough's settlements will be through the LDF Core Strategy DPD.
- 4.1.5. It is important that the identification in this SHLAA of either suitable greenfield sites or broad locations will not pre-empt decisions that should properly be taken in the context of the LDF, and will be subject to formal consultation. Furthermore, the identification in this study of certain sites or broad locations does not exclude other areas which may potentially come forward through other means.
- 4.1.6. The basis upon which these critically important decisions are reached about the identification of sites must include a raft of reliable evidence, including transport models, assessments of landscape, accessibility, ecology, archaeology and historic environment, flood risk, water quality, contamination,

air quality, noise, etc. Indeed, on-going work on Basingstoke's Water Cycle Study Phase II is a critical element of the borough's evidence-base work for the Core Strategy.

- 4.1.7. The *South East Plan Examination in Public Panel Report* refers to areas east and west of Basingstoke and their potential for urban extensions and, according to the Practice Guidance, this SHLAA should be identifying: "as many sites with housing potential in and around as many settlements as possible" (para.7).
- 4.1.8. Consequently, the council has carried out a consultation exercise to inform the assessment in the form of 'call for sites' consultation letters to agents, consultants, developers and institutional landowners. This was followed by a Stakeholders' Forum. The practice guidance encourages this approach, emphasising that Key Stakeholders should be involved at the outset of the Assessment, so that they can help shape the approach to be taken. In particular, house builders and local property agents should provide expertise and knowledge to help the partnership to take a view on the 'deliverability' and 'developability' of sites, and how market conditions may affect economic viability.
- 4.1.9. Accordingly, an assessment of areas beyond settlement boundaries has taken place that considers those sites submitted to the Borough Council through the consultation process, or 'call for sites' in March 2008, as well as a number of areas that were promoted through the last Local Plan. This was because these areas will have the overall capacity to meet the likely extent of the shortfall, and generally represented the most acceptable areas for future development in broad planning terms.
- 4.1.10. From the consultation on the draft SHLAA during the autumn of 2008 a further 38 sites were submitted, and these were assessed in January and February 2009, see table on page 23. In addition, the Council required 14 sites to be reviewed following the receipt of additional information and comment, see table on page 24. Appendix 5 sets out the assessment of suitable greenfield opportunities and broad locations. In order to be considered in the study, a site must be adjacent to one of the 19 settlements specified in the call for sites consultation letter. A number of sites that were submitted are in isolated locations, outside and not adjacent to any study settlement. Others were too small and below the study threshold of five dwellings. These were immediately rejected without further consideration as being outside the study parameters, and appear in Appendix 6.

Additional Potential Housing Sites Identified from Draft SHLAA Consultation

Site No.	Consultee	Location	Dwelling Potential
sites with potential			
BRAM007	Tony Thorpe Associates	British Legion Club grounds/car park, Bramley	22
BAS039	Atis Real	10 & 14-18 Winchester Road, Basingstoke	60
OV007	Mr. Iain Paterson	Land North of Court Farm, Overton	80
OV006	Mr. Paul Newman	Land Off Pond Close, Overton	200
sites requiring further investigation			
KING007	Mr. Bruce Williamson	Land between A33 / Longcroft Road, Kingsclere	
SOL006	Pool Companies	Land adjacent to Reading Road, Sherfield-on-Loddon	
BAS105-107	Worting Business Park	Land at Worting	
rejected sites			
KING005	Middleton & Portway Estate	Land comprising part of Field Barn, south of Kingsclere (2 ha)	
KING006	Middleton & Portway Estate	Land comprising part of Field Barn, south of Kingsclere (13.5 ha)	
KING008	Mrs M Ramsay	Land North of Prior Mill, North Street, Kingsclere	
ASH001	Mr and Mrs Appleton	Land north of Chapel Lane, Ashford Hill	
	Mr A V Bowater	Land at Sherfield Hill Farm, Basingstoke Road, Sherfield-on-Loddon	
BAS133	The Skinners Company	Hounsme Fields, west of Winchester Rd, Basingstoke	
BAS134	Grainger PLC	Area N, Beggarwood Lane, Kempshott Park, Basingstoke	
	Mr and Mrs M Ryan	Land at Sanfoin Lane, Oakley	
NWAL003	Mr and Mrs C Fletcher	Land south of St.Michael's Close, North Waltham	
NWAL001	Ms Phillippa Evans Bevan	Land opposite school, North Waltham	
	Hospital of St Cross	Land north of Blosswood Lane, Whitchurch	
WHIT016	Hospital of St Cross	Land north of Caesar's Way, Whitchurch	
	Harry West Investments	Land north of Chestnut Cottage, Ashford Hill	
	Major W. Knight	Dickers, Aldermaston Road, Pamber Heath	
	Major W. Knight	Wakeford Paddock, Aldermaston Road, Pamber Heath	
	Major W. Knight	St Margarets, Aldermaston Road, Pamber Heath	
	Major W. Knight	Wigmore, Aldermaston Road, Pamber Heath	
	Mr. P. Rogers	Oak Tree Farm, Little London,	
	Mr. Simon Benney	Land south of Ramsdell Road, Charter Alley	
	The Wasing Estate	Land at Larkwhistle Farm between Brimpton Road and B3051, Baughurst	
	P. Edwards, Planning Perspectives	Land adjacent to Sherfield Court, Reading Road, Church End, Sherfield-on-Loddon	
	Mr. Philip Clements	Upper Farm, Wooton St Lawrence, Basingstoke	
	Linde Holdings	Sports Field at Water End, nr Basingstoke	
	W.A.T. Stacy and Partners	Land south of Newnham Lane, Old Basing	
	W.A.T. Stacy and Partners	Land north of London Road, Old Basing	
	Pheasant Eye Ltd	Upper Farm, Wotton St Lawrence, Basingstoke	
	Mr. Don Coles	Station Road, Cliddesden	
	Middleton & Portway Estate	Land adj. to Willersey Warren Cottage, Overton	
WHIT015	Mr. M. Fitzgerald	Arnolds Farm, London Road, Whitchurch	
	Mr. Colin Pink	Land rear of Willow Garth, Sandy Lane, Pamber Heath	
	Mrs Carina Ward	42 The Green, Tadley	

The 14 sites reviewed following the receipt of additional information and comment in October 2008:

Site Ref. No.	Address	Draft SHLAA	Reason for Review	Final SHLAA
TAD004	Land to rear of 88a-94 Franklin Ave, Tadley	Rejected	Further information received	Potential for 13 dwellings (2008-13)
BAS069	Playing Field, Pack Lane, Basingstoke	Rejected	Further information received	Potential for 100 dwellings (2008-13)
TAD017	Bishopswood Road, Baughurst	Rejected	Assessment of site was not clear	Requires further investigation
CLID002	Church Farm, Cliddesden	Rejected	Further explanation of assessment required	Rejected
BAS132	Basingstoke Golf Club, Kempshott, Basingstoke	Potential for 1200 dwellings (2013-19)	EA identify site constraints	Potential for 1200 dwellings (2013-19)
BAS036	Basingstoke College of Technology, Worting Rd	Potential for 80 dwellings (2013-18)	EA identify site constraints	Potential for 80 dwellings (2013-18)
BAS059	Land East of the Ringway West, Basingstoke	Potential for 40 dwellings (2018-23)	EA identify site constraints	Rejected
BAS060	Land North of Churchill Way Basingstoke	Potential for 45 dwellings (2013-18)	EA identify site constraints	Potential for 45 dwellings (2013-18)
BAS067	Land at Grove Road, Basingstoke	Potential for 12 dwellings (2008-13)	EA identify site constraints	Rejected
BAS101	Black Dam, Basingstoke	Potential for 200 dwellings (2012-15)	EA identify site constraints	Requires further investigation
BAS102	Lodge Farm, Basingstoke	Potential for 2000 dwellings (2014-20)	EA identify site constraints	Potential for 2000 dwellings (2014-20)
BAS121	Land East of Basingstoke	Potential for 900 dwellings (2014-17)	EA identify site constraints	Potential for 900 dwellings (2014-17)
BAS128	Basing Lime Pits	To be considered further through LDF	EA identify site constraints	Requires further investigation
WHIT009	The Gables, London Road, Whitchurch	Potential for 120 dwellings (2013-15)	EA identify site constraints	Potential for 100 dwellings (2013-15)

NB.: sites in bold have either had their status or the number of dwellings expected to come forward changed between the draft SHLAA and final SHLAA

- 4.1.11. The consultation exercises have identified both broad areas, and smaller individual sites. The assessment considers the potential for suitability for housing for all of the sites, looking at physical and policy constraints,

environmental impacts, planning background, deliverability, timing, and overall capacity.

- 4.1.12. This assessment is being carried out before a strategy is established through the Core Strategy, and before implications of specific spatial distributions have been analysed. This will enable the initial work on potential areas of search and their relative constraints to be taken forward into the LDF Core Strategy. The assessment will provide a starting point from which the Core Strategy can make the key strategic decisions on the distribution of housing.
- 4.1.13. Appendix 5 summarises the potential of all sites brought to the attention of the study as a result of the consultation exercise. The assessment surveyed 90 sites outside SPBs, and found that 21 had development potential; 47 sites should be rejected because on first judgement they appear to be either unsuitable, unavailable, or unachievable; and the remaining 22 sites were found to be neither immediately acceptable nor unacceptable, and require further scrutiny through the LDF. Further assessment by the Council might bring some of these potential opportunities into contention.
- 4.1.14. With the exception of one site, none of the completions from the sites identified outside SPBs, are predicted to be forthcoming in the first five-year period, partly because of allowing time for adopting the relevant part of the LDF that will allocate sites, and partly because of the infrastructure lead-in time on large sites. In years 5-10, it is estimated that there could be 5655 completions, 4800 completions in the 10-15 year period, and finally in the 15-20 year period there could be a further 2000 completions. The total theoretical completions if all identified sites were developed in the period to 2026 could be up to 12,540 dwellings.
- 4.1.15. It should be noted that this total potential contains a number of alternative scenarios, particularly in Whitchurch and Overton. The actual achievable total if one preferred development site option is chosen in each of these settlements will be about 11,300.

Summary yield from suitable greenfield sites and broad locations

Period/ settlement	years 0 - 5	years 5 - 10	years 10 - 15	Years 15 - 20	Years 0 - 20
Basingstoke (inc. Chineham)		3900	4800	2000	10,700
Sherfield on Loddon		250			250
Bramley		225			225
Whitchurch		450			450
Overton	85	830			915
TOTAL	85	5655	4800	2000	12,540

5. Summary Review of Housing Land Availability

- 5.1.1. CLG's Practice Guidance on SHLAAs requires that figures for the anticipated level of housing provision in the period to 2026 are presented in order to be compared with the adopted South East Plan's requirement.

Five-year requirement and supply

- 5.1.2. The preceding sections have set out the estimated supply of housing from 2008 to 2026 from various different sources. These are:
- sites with planning permission
 - allocations without planning permission
 - site-specific sources identified through the study
 - windfalls
 - greenfield sites.
- 5.1.3. The requirement set out in the adopted South East Plan is 945 dpa for 2006-26, a total of 18,900 dwellings. Between April 2006 and March 2008 there were 2146 completions, leaving a shortfall of 16,754 dwellings (subject to further clarification on this issue – see para.4.1.3.)
- 5.1.4. The Council will need to be able to continue to demonstrate a rolling five-year supply, so this study shows the supply from 2008 to 2013. The study suggests a five-year supply of 6050 dwellings (5499 dwellings from allocations and sites with planning permission, and 551 dwellings from sites within the built-up area identified in this study). This is equivalent to 7.5 years' supply based on the RPG9 requirement of 804 units per annum, or 6.4 years' supply against the rate required by the RSS (945 units per annum).

Summary Tables

- 5.1.5. A summary table showing the predicted supply from each of the sources, set out in relevant time bands, with shortfalls, is shown overleaf. This uses the RSS requirement of 945 dwellings per annum.

Source of housing potential	2008 - 13	2013 - 18	2018 - 23	2023 - 26	2008 – 26	2006 - 26
Total supply - permissions, allocations, survey sites & windfall (from 4.1.2)	6050	2880	395	150	9475	11,621 (9475 + 2146 completions, 2006-08)
Net RSS requirement (945 dpa), allowing for accumulated shortfalls/surpluses	4725	3400 (4725 – 1325)	5245 (4725 + 520)	7685 (2835 + 4850)	17,010 (945 x 18)	18,900 (945 x 20)
Shortfall/surplus	+ 1325	-520	- 4850	- 7535	- 7535	- 7,279
greenfield sites potential yield (from 4.1.13)	85	5655	4800	2000	12,540	

5.1.6. As shown in the summary table, the study identifies a potential shortfall of 7279 dwellings over the period 2006-26. This shortfall will need to be met from sources other than sites with planning permission, existing allocations and sites identified by the study within built-up areas. These other sources include greenfield sites beyond existing settlements. The greenfield element of the study has identified the potential for over 12,500 dwellings beyond settlement boundaries, and the Council will need to consider the most appropriate way to meet the shortfall through the LDF Core Strategy, making use of this potential.

	2008- 13	2013- 18	2018- 23	2023- 26	2008- 26	2006-26
Total supply – permissions, allocations, survey sites and windfall (para.4.1.2)	6050	2880	395	150	9475	11,621 (9475 + 2146; completions 2006/08)
Requirement of 740 dpa, allowing for accumulated shortfalls / surpluses	3700	1350 (3700 - 2350)	2170 (3700 – 1530)	3995 (2220 + 1775)	13,320 (740 x 18)	14,800 (740 x 20)
Shortfall / surplus	+ 2350	+ 1530	- 1775	- 3845	- 3845	+ 3179
Potential yield from greenfield sites	85	5655	4800	2000	12,540	

- 5.1.7. As outlined in paragraph 1.11.2, the Council has maintained its position that 740 units a year is a more appropriate housing requirement for the Borough. In light of this, a summary table has also been produced to outline the situation if this requirement was used. This is shown below. The table illustrates that with a requirement of 740 dpa, the shortfall is 3845 dwellings between the base date of the study (April 2008) and 2026, and 3179 over the period 2006-2026.
- 5.1.8. This SHLAA has thus assessed all sources of identifiable supply within the study settlements, made a suitable modest allowance for continuing windfall development from small sites, outside the 10 year period from adoption of the Core Strategy, and looked at the potential contribution that could be made from large number of greenfield sites adjacent to the settlements. This has demonstrated that there is the potential through the LDF to address the shortfall between the housing requirement set out in RSS, through the use of the supply of potential housing land highlighted in this report.

6. Monitoring and Review

- 6.1.1. A SHLAA should, by definition, be dynamic and this initial study will be updated on an annual basis as part of the annual monitoring report process. The Council's commitment to updating the study reflects the requirement for plans to maintain a five- year land supply as sites are developed out.
- 6.1.2. A key element of this study will be its updating "at least annually" (practice guidance para. 17) and it is through this monitoring that the Council should identify how specific sites progress towards development, what other sites come into the system and how progress is being made towards achieving the requirements of the RSS.
- 6.1.3. All the sites without permission are provided with a pro-forma in an Access Database linked to the GIS, enabling convenient and simple updating as there is greater certainty about dwelling yield. Since all the pro-formas and plans are all linked through the database, automatic summary tables can be generated. In this way, this study provides the basis for future monitoring and enables the Council to manage the future release of land as necessary.