

**Report of Scrutiny Board City
Development
Housing Mix
March 2016**



Contents

	Page
1. Desired Outcomes and Recommendation Summary	3
2. Introduction and Scope	5
3. Conclusions and Recommendations	6
4. Evidence	18
5. Appendix 1	20



Desired Outcomes and Recommendations

Desired Outcome – That the Core Strategy captures all relevant data

Recommendation 1 – That the Director of City Development maintains the commitment to a selective review of the Core Strategy, which should commence following the release of the 2014, based household projections.

Desired Outcome – The standardisation of methods to assess viability

Recommendation 2 – – That the Chief Planning Officer writes to the Secretary of State and the department of Communities and Local Government urging the Government to standardise the methodology for assessing viability taking into account the experiences of local planning authorities, and the full range of policy requirements for delivering sustainable development..

Desired Outcome – The continuous improvement of elected members skills and knowledge

Recommendation 3. That the Chief Planning officer arranges for Plans Panel Members to receive further information and training on best practice in dealing with scheme viability appraisals, in collaboration with other West Yorkshire authorities and the Planning Advisory Service

Desired Outcome – Raising the awareness of Housing Assessments and their importance in the planning process

Recommendation 4 – That the Chief Planning Officer reports back to the relevant Scrutiny Board the implementation and success of the proposed assessment guidance and other proposed actions around Housing Needs Assessments.

Desired Outcome – Improvement in the quality of Neighbourhood Plans

Recommendation 5 – that the Chief Planning Officer ensures that appropriate assistance is offered to Neighbourhood Forums to assist in the drawing up of Neighbourhood Plans.

Desired Outcome – That the Strategic Market Assessment Practice Guidance is brought up to date

Recommendation 6 – That the Chief Planning Officer writes to the Secretary of State and the Department of Communities and Local Government making the following points;

That as the current Strategic Market Assessment Practice Guidance 2007 was out of date that government revises Strategic Market Housing Assessments Practice Guidance (including approaches on how to calculate and monitor an Objectively Assessed Need) as a



Desired Outcomes and Recommendations

matter of urgency

The Council would expect that revised Practice Guidance takes full account of the desirability of engaging Neighbourhood Planning forums in the preparation of the evidence base underpinning SHMAs and thus the objectively assessed housing need for the City, and requests clarification on how this might best be achieved

Desired Outcome – Ensuring that Housing Mix is routinely considered in Plans Panel meetings

Recommendation 7 – That the Chief Planning Officer implements proposals to include a heading on Housing Mix on each panel report and to report back to the appropriate Scrutiny Board the subsequent outcomes of the initiative

Desired Outcome – That Housing Mix is discussed with developers at the earliest opportunity

Recommendation 8 – That the Chief Planning Officer reports back to the appropriate Scrutiny Board the improvements to housing mix achieved through the practice of discussing mix at pre application stage.

Desired Outcome – Raising the knowledge of Elected Members on the implementation of Policy H4

Recommendation 9 – That the Chief Planning Officer advises Joint Plans Panel of actions to be taken regarding the Implementation of Policy H4 and proposed actions to ensure improved delivery

Desired Outcome – The development of a policy identifying and meeting specialist housing need

Recommendation 10 – That the Director of Environment and Housing and the Chief Planning Officer explore a more coherent and detailed approach to identifying the need for specialist accommodation and how this can be met, and report back to the relevant Scrutiny Board.

Desired Outcome – To conclude the monitoring of previous recommendations made by Scrutiny Board (Regeneration)

Recommendation 11 – That no further monitoring of recommendation 1 & 2 made by Scrutiny Board (Regeneration) following its Inquiry into Housing Growth (2011) takes place.



Introduction and Scope

Scope of the Inquiry and desired outcomes.

- 1 At the July 2015 meeting of Scrutiny Board (City Development), Members agreed to undertake a joint Inquiry with Scrutiny Board (Environment and Housing) into 'Housing Mix'. It was agreed that the Inquiry would be progressed via a joint working group.
- 2 Work in this area was initially started by the then Scrutiny Board (Housing and Regeneration) following a request for scrutiny from a member of the public and former co-optee of that Scrutiny Board. This request for Scrutiny focused on a request for Members to re-examine the adequacy of the responses provided to the first two recommendations of a previous scrutiny inquiry completed in 2011 by Scrutiny Board (Regeneration) on Housing Growth.
- 3 It was agreed by both Scrutiny Boards that matters relating to previous recommendations would be considered during the course of the working group's discussions. However the focus of this fresh Inquiry would be the delivery of Policy H4¹, that is, delivery, as expressed in the Core Strategy, of the right property type and tenure within criteria of affordability.
- 4 The Monitoring of completions for the past three years shows that Policy H4 is not on course to achieve the target mix by 2028. It is of great concern to the

¹ Policy H4 aims to ensure that the new housing developed in Leeds is of a range of type and size to meet the mix of households expected over the Plan period.

working group that if possible remedial action available is not taken quickly and robustly it will be difficult to get target figures back on track. To this end Members wanted to understand and highlight the challenges in achieving housing mix objectives. We have concluded that whilst the majority of these challenges are a result of national planning legislation and guidance, others are a result of local practices within the Council's planning section.

Best Council Plan

- 5 The adopted Core Strategy takes forward the spatial objectives of the Vision for Leeds and the priorities set out in the best Council Plan, particularly in relation to 'promoting sustainable and inclusive economic growth'. Housing Growth is a City Council 'break through' project. This will be supported through the identification of land and its phasing through the Site Allocations Plan and Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan. Appropriate housing mix is a key element of this process.

Equality and Diversity

- 6 Equality and diversity issues have been considered throughout this Scrutiny Inquiry.
- 7 Where a Scrutiny Board has made recommendations and these are agreed, the individual, organisation or group responsible for implementation or delivery should give due regard to equality and diversity and where appropriate an equality impact assessment will be carried out.



Conclusions and Recommendations

Introduction

8 The Leeds Core Strategy was adopted in November 2014 following a period of extensive preparation and public scrutiny; including Examination by an Independent Planning Inspector. The Core Strategy sets an overall requirement of 70,000 homes (net) between 2012 and 2028. There is a consequent need to allocate land for 66,000 homes via the Site Allocations Plan (SAP) and Aire Valley Leeds Area Action Plan (AVLAAP). This housing requirement is derived from an extensive evidence base, which mainly comprises the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2011). This took into account 2008 based sub-national population projections. This evidence base is subject to continuous monitoring. Within this context the first question asked by members of this working group was *“is there any new information on population figures and do they have implications for housing growth?”*

Consideration of any new information on population figures and implications for housing

9 Our source document for this matter was the May 2015 Plans Panel report entitled, ‘Implications of the 2012-based household projections on the Core Strategy Housing Requirement’. This Plans Panel report provides an update on monitoring the evidence base of the Adopted Core Strategy. It

sets out the broad approach to establishing a housing requirement in the Plan and explores whether any latest evidence warrants a root and branch review of this requirement.

10 Population and household projections are released by Government every two years and estimate the future population and number of households will be if previous trends are continued. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2011) is based on 2008 projections and an employment led approach which matches new jobs to homes. Members were advised that when the Core Strategy was at examination the Council presented new evidence on projections, which pointed to lower and slower growth. The Core Strategy Inspector considered and rejected these projections concluding that they were recession based, did not account for concealed need in Leeds and, based on more optimistic employment projections, would be broadly in line with the submitted requirement of 70,000 (net)

11 The Plans Panel report concluded that, whilst on the face of it, the housing requirement may be lower if a new Strategic Housing Market Assessment was carried out immediately it was unlikely to be so significantly lower so as to outweigh the benefits of progressing a site allocations plan. The report also committed to a selective review of the Core Strategy within three years of its adoption and following more recent evidence, including household projections, which will better reflect demographic trends of a recovering economy.



Conclusions and Recommendations

- 12 Members of the Development Plan Panel therefore agreed to endorse the maintenance of the Core Strategy and housing numbers.
- 13 Members of the working group also came to the conclusion that it was now important to draw a line under the numbers debate but noted the commitment to a selective review of housing numbers within three years of its adoption and following more recent evidence, including household projections, which will better reflect demographic trends of a recovering economy.
- 14 The 2012-based projections remain incomplete and have not fully captured information from the Census on household size. The 2014-based projections will be available in 2016. It is the view of the working group that it is essential to have the right population and household figures before any such review takes place.

Recommendation 1 – That the Director of City Development maintains the commitment to a selective review of the Core Strategy, which should commence following the release of the 2014, based household projections.

Housing Mix and the Planning process

Viability

- 15 The issue of viability of development has gained increased attention since the publication of the National

Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in 2012. It is now made very challenging for the Council to refuse development proposals on issues of policy compliance where such issues can affect the viability of schemes. National guidance states that:

“development ... should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.”

- 16 This section of the NPPF provides developers with more licence to pursue their chosen proposals through the planning system regardless of the objectives of local planning policies, which can be seen as burdens on development. To that end, the task of securing objectives for affordable housing, housing mix, sustainable design, greenspace, education and public transport contributions, whilst never without difficulty in the past, has been made increasing more complex since 2012. In addition, viability assessment is important in establishing that proposed housing sites are in fact deliverable, a requirement on the local planning authority in maintaining a five year



Conclusions and Recommendations

land supply and in preparing development plans.

- 17 There is now an increasing reliance on the production of viability assessments for individual developments where financial modelling is used to justify compliance or otherwise with specific planning policies. Such assessments, whilst undertaken by a RICS surveyor and the District Surveyor and utilising industry recognised methodology, are technical with no single agreed approach and highly sensitive, especially to factors such as sales value and anticipated profit of the developer.
- 18 In the majority of cases the Council's Asset Management service commissions the District Valuer (DV) to carry out a viability assessment. A fee for the work based on the scale, size, location, quantum and type of proposed development is agreed with and paid for, by the developer. The in depth appraisal considers matters including construction costs, planning obligations, financing, including profit and fees, abnormal costs and existing use & alternative land values as well as consideration of other variables which can lead to differences in valuation. The DV produces a report from this technical assessment, providing their view on the deliverability of various policy requirements- CIL, affordable house and so on and the ability of a scheme to take place on the ground in this context.
- 19 The Government's focus since the recession has been on removing barriers to growth (they have recently announced a further "red-tape" challenge relating to house building) and increasing productivity in the house building sector to achieve greater volumes of housing. Government actions have included: easing of affordable housing provision, permitted development relaxations, removing the Building Regulations requirement for carbon neutral homes by 2016. New, as yet undefined policy areas around Starter Homes will also affect the provision of affordable homes, as will loosening the definition of the latter to include more discount market housing. The Government is pursuing an appeal against the High Court's decision that removing small sites from any requirement to provide affordable housing is not justified, and is also making further amendments to the Housing and Planning Bill.
- 20 The Adopted Core Strategy was itself subject to strategic viability testing, which confirmed that its policies could be achieved in tandem and therefore represents a sound and justifiable document. However, developers are allowed to use viability arguments as a reason for non-compliance with policy on individual proposals. Furthermore developers can appeal against the refusal of the planning authority to vary the requirements of a previously confirmed S106 agreement.



Conclusions and Recommendations

- 21 The Council is therefore in a highly challenging position which requires balancing the need to significantly boost the delivery of new homes with securing the necessary community benefits from developments.
- 22 As the housing market improves it would be expected that the viability of developments would improve and that there would be a greater chance of proposals meeting policy objectives in respect of type and tenure. This has not in practice been the case e.g. increased build costs are often used alongside reduce sales values to argue that schemes are unviable with policy burdens. Not only is this an issue that arises in association with market housing schemes officers are also finding an increasing instance of Registered Providers who are experiencing viability issues arising from changes to rent models. 23 It was noted that the Council's approach to viability will be dependent upon the government's announcement on standardised approaches to viability. Members felt this was an area of practice where it would be beneficial for Plans Panel to receive further information and training.

Recommendation 2 – That the Chief Planning Officer writes to the Secretary of State and the department of Communities and Local Government urging the Government to standardise the methodology for assessing viability taking into account the experiences of local planning authorities and the full range of policy requirements for delivering sustainable development.

Recommendation 3 –

That the Chief Planning officer arranges for Plans Panel Members to receive further information and training on best practice in dealing with scheme viability appraisals, in collaboration with other West Yorkshire authorities and the Planning Advisory Service

Policy H4

- 24 Policy H4 states the following;

“Developments should include an appropriate mix of dwelling types and sizes to address needs measured over the long term taking into account the nature of the development and character of the location. This should include the need to make provision for Independent Living.

For developments over 250 units, in or adjoining the main urban Area and Major Settlements or for developments over 50 units in or adjoining [Smaller Settlements, developers should submit a Housing Needs Assessment addressing all tenures so that the needs of the locality can be taken into account at the time of development.

- 25 The working group was advised that Policy H4 aims to ensure that the new housing delivered in Leeds is of a range of types and sizes to meet the mix of households expected over the Plan period. The policy is worded to allow flexibility to take account local circumstances. The policy does not prescribe mix per site but takes a long term view.



Conclusions and Recommendations

26 The policy has a target of 60% of all new homes built to be 1 and 2 bed and that 40% should be 3 or 4 bed. By way of context, we looked at the current position (table below) which showed a skew towards larger dwellings.

Year	Number of bedrooms			
	1	2	3	4+
2012-13	22%	27%	25%	27%
2013-14	21%	22%	28%	29%
2014-15	21%	15%	37%	28%
Policy H4 target	10%	50%	30%	10%

27 During our initial working group meetings a key issue of discussion was the fact that the policy does not prescribe mix per site but takes a long term view. Members expressed concern that that this perhaps contributed to planners taking a less robust view at a local level over required housing mix when negotiating with house builders. We were also concerned that if any potential remedial action is not taken quickly and robustly it will be difficult to get target figures back on track.

28 A range of views were expressed by Members on the short falls of the current planning process at the local level as they saw it. These included

- A feeling that planning officers were not sufficiently robust in their demands/negotiations with developers to require local needs assessments which included appropriate housing mix for fear of the development not going ahead, or being the subject of a subsequent appeal.
- A view that planning officers would too readily accommodate the demands of developers particularly when addressing viability.
- A feeling of a disconnect between the planning process and the role of the local ward member and neighbourhood Forums
- A feeling that the need for specialist housing, for example bungalows, was not being adequately raised with developers

29 In simple terms the working group expressed a view that elected Members across all wards and political groups wanted to achieve the housing mix laid down in the Core Strategy and it was incumbent upon officers to attempt to deliver that in the most effective and practicable way possible within the constraints of the planning system. (Acknowledging that compromise and mitigating circumstances would play a part)

30 Suggestions put forward by elected members to achieve this included:

- For local Members and Community Committees to undertake local needs assessments, using local housing waiting lists, Neighbourhood Plans and other available tools
- Planning officers to convey to developers during the whole



Conclusions and Recommendations

planning process (including in committee reports) that success of applications could be dependent upon the approach taken by developers to achieve housing mix.

- 31 To address these concerns Members asked for a chart of the planning process annotated with additional actions to be implemented to ensure the process of encouraging the appropriate housing mix, including affordable housing, is asserted as vigorously as possible. This is shown as Appendix 1
- 32 In addition members asked officers to draw up a list of proposed actions to ensure improved delivery of Policy H4

The Implementation of Policy H4 and proposed actions to ensure improved delivery.

Evidence and Neighbourhood Planning

- 33 It was noted that the Housing Growth Team and Forward Planning will, over the next six months, ensure that future assessments are able to provide more targeted information about need, tenure and mix, which will then inform planning officers' understanding of this issue locally. Local guidance was to be drafted to assist in the production of Housing Needs Assessments, which support development proposals as required by Policy H4. Guidance for preparing evidence at a neighbourhood level would be incorporated into the Housing Needs Assessment. This guidance will ensure a consistent approach by officers and will also

assist Neighbourhood Forums in commissioning studies for their Neighbourhood Plans. The Neighbourhood Planning Team together with the Housing Growth Team would continue to provide advice on the preparation of background evidence on housing mix and ensure that it provides weight to the implementation of Policy H4

- 34 As a direct result of the working group discussions it was noted that in future, Housing Assessments will be referenced in all forward planning and implementation and Housing consultations, and their conclusions included as background to all Plans Panel reports.

Recommendation 4 – That the Chief Planning Officer reports back to the relevant Scrutiny Board the implementation and success of the proposed assessment guidance and other proposed actions around Housing Needs Assessments.

- 35 In response to a member question and a comment that some Neighbourhood Forums felt marginalised by the Council, officers stated that the relationship between Planning and Neighbourhood Forums needed to be a two way process and that planners would always seek, within the resources available, to help Neighbourhood Forums in drawing up plans as they added strength to the planning and evidence gathering process. It was noted that the Chief Planning Officer offered to follow up, outside of the



Conclusions and Recommendations

meeting, on any specific difficulties with working relationships between the Council and Neighbourhood Planning Groups.

Recommendation 5 – that the Chief Planning Officer ensures that appropriate assistance is offered to Neighbourhood Forums to assist in the drawing up of Neighbourhood Plans.

- 36 It was also acknowledged that on occasions there was a tension between local communities and the Council in relation to Neighbourhood Plans and the Core Strategy. It was reaffirmed by officers that Neighbourhood Plans had to be drafted so as to complement the Core Strategy.
- 37 It was asserted that that the current Strategic Market Housing Assessment Practise Guidance 2007 version 2 dated August 2007 was considered out of date. New guidance was recommended in the Taylor² review and accepted by the Government. In light of this assertion, the working group recommends that the Chief Planning Officer to write to the Secretary of State and the Department of Communities and Local Government.

Recommendation - 6

That the Chief Planning Officer writes to the Secretary of State and the Department of Communities and Local Government making the following points;

That as the current Strategic Market Assessment Practice Guidance 2007 was out of date that government revises Strategic Market Housing Assessments Practice Guidance (including approaches on how to calculate and monitor an Objectively Assessed Need) as a matter of urgency

The Council would expect that revised Practice Guidance takes full account of the desirability of engaging Neighbourhood Planning forums in the preparation of the evidence base underpinning SHMAs and thus the objectively assessed housing need for the City, and requests clarification on how this might best be achieved

Monitoring

- 38 The working group welcomed confirmation that to gauge implementation of Policy H4, planning permissions for housing would be closely monitored at planning consent stage not just when developments were built.

² Lord Taylor of Goss, External Review of Government Planning Guidance 2012



Conclusions and Recommendations

- 39 In response to a question, officers confirmed that they viewed monitoring to be extremely important and that the annual review of Policy H4 had been successful, however it was difficult to monitor the effects of new stock on existing stock in terms of mix.

Panel reports

- 40 As a result of recommendations made by the working group during discussion, officers confirmed that a heading on Housing Mix will be on each panel report that describes the specific housing needs of the area.

Recommendation 7 – That the Chief Planning Officer implements proposals to include a heading on Housing Mix on each panel report and to report back to the appropriate Scrutiny Board the subsequent outcomes of the initiative

Pre –Application Discussions

- 41 The working group believes that the issue of housing mix should be raised at the earliest opportunity.
- 42 The working group was advised that the issue would be consistently flagged at pre-application stage. It was noted that if a submitter proposed a housing mix that is at or around the target sought, a Housing Needs Assessment may not be necessary and can be removed as an obligation from the developer. Such negotiations would happen as early on as possible.

Recommendation 8 – That the Chief Planning Officer reports back to the appropriate Scrutiny Board the improvements to housing mix achieved through the practice of discussing mix at pre application stage.

- 43 It was acknowledged that many of the improvement actions identified by the working group were now being implemented. Members thanked officers for their positive approach in this regard and asked that Members of the Joint Plans Panel be made aware of actions now being taken.

Recommendation 9 – That the Chief Planning Officer advises Joint Plans Panel of actions to be taken regarding the Implementation of Policy H4 and proposed actions to ensure improved delivery

Affordability

- 44 The working group received a report detailing targets for affordable housing by provider and also information about current barriers to achieving targets. The focus of the working group debate was barriers and risks to delivery particularly within the Registered Social Housing sector and local authority sector. The main points to emerge were;
- Delivery by Registered Providers is largely funded through the



Conclusions and Recommendations

Homes and Communities Agency's Affordable Homes Programme which although has delivered fairly sizeable programmes in Leeds, is constrained by reducing grant levels over time and the sector's reliance on borrowing which is funded through rents.

- The recent Budget statement wherein all social housing providers are subject to a 1% rent cut for the next four years impacts investment programmes and all of the Registered Provider's management boards are evaluating the impact on business plans and have indicated the potential for cancelling schemes.
- In response the HCA is encouraging a tenure switch towards housing for sale rather than rent where this is economically viable.
- The Housing and Planning Bill sets out the broad details for the extension of the Right to Buy to Registered Providers which has created uncertainty for Registered Providers and, coupled with rent reductions, caused lenders to review the sector's credit rating.

Council led delivery

- The borrowing cap on the Housing Revenue Account remains a constraint to building more stock over the longer term.
- The use of Right to Buy receipts is subject to several spending criteria put in place by government which makes committing the

programme difficult and puts the funds at risk of claw back.

- Impact of the rent cut on Housing Revenue Account Business Plan which could constrain future delivery.

- 45 The working group held a general discussion on the robustness of the Council's approach to affordability with developers and the role of local ward members (In the same vein as the discussions around housing mix)
- 46 There was also discussion around the Council's partnership working with registered providers and the need to work smarter and in closer collaboration.

Specialist Housing

- 47 The working group came to the conclusion that there is a developing need for Specialist Housing whether that is for families with disabilities, nursing care or more generally for older persons housing.
- 48 The Council has responded to the latter with a review of its own sheltered accommodation leading to around £14 million of investment in existing sites to make them fit for purpose. The Council launched a prospectus for older persons housing aimed at the provision of extra care which received good support from the market and bids are expected by early April on Council owned sites.
- 49 An approach is being developed by the Council towards the provision of more specialist accommodation for



Conclusions and Recommendations

families with children that have severe disabilities or adults with severe disabilities. Demand is currently being assessed but we do know that there are 950 people/families on the Council's waiting list that need significantly adapted properties. In addition Children's Services have 28 priority families that need appropriate housing. The working group was advised that work is also underway with Adult Social Care assessing the need more generally within the private sector

- 50 In addition the Council has commissioned designs for a "template property" as a house and as a bungalow and is actively looking for sites in its own ownership on which to build some properties.
- 51 The working group concluded that the provision of this type of accommodation should be central to the discussion on housing mix and that all avenues should be explored to increase the number of such properties. The working group is of the view that this could be achieved via a number of ways, those being by the Council undertaking its own building within the current council house growth programme, enabling registered Partners to develop bespoke properties or through imaginative use of s.106 agreements.

Recommendation 10 That the Director of Environment and Housing and the Chief Planning Officer explore a more coherent and detailed approach to identifying the need for specialist accommodation and how this can be met, and report back to the relevant Scrutiny Board.

Reviewing previous Scrutiny Board Recommendations

- 52 As detailed in our introduction, an element of the working group's remit was to consider the claim that previous recommendations made by the Regeneration Scrutiny Board had not been executed in a satisfactory way.
- 53 The recommendations in question were

Recommendation 1

That dependent upon the outcome of the 2011 Census the Executive Board makes representations to the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) that in order to achieve greater accuracy in the data provided by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) a population register should be introduced.

Recommendation 2

That the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods consider whether there would be an advantage in moving away from the DCLG household model altogether and relying on local data which would be more accurate in determining housing need. That the Director of Environment and Neighbourhoods report back to this Scrutiny Board on the outcome within three months of its report being published

- 54 The first recommendation relating to dialogue with ONS is mainly covered



Conclusions and Recommendations

in evidence submitted by Malachi Rangecroft³.

- 55 In addition to this the Council wrote to ONS in May when the methodology for the 2012-based projections had been released for consultation. The Council sought assurance via an ONS consultation process in February 2014 that the errors in ONS mid-year estimates would be removed from future projections. As a result the ONS identified that Leeds had an “unattributable population change” of 40,000 people which is likely to be a result of flawed past assumptions on international migration. The work carried out by Edge Analytics, referred to below, tested scenarios which removed this unattributed population change at a local level.
- 56 The second recommendation concerns moving away from the DCLG household model altogether and relying on local data which would be more accurate in determining housing need. A number of factors are relevant to this recommendation. First, the requirements of national guidance. Second, local evidence used to support the Core Strategy.
- 57 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that Local planning authorities should have a clear understanding of housing needs in their area. They should⁴: prepare a SHMA to assess their full housing needs, which should identify the scale and mix of

housing and the range of tenures that the local population is likely to need over the plan period. This in turn should meet household and population projections, take account of migration and demographic change, addresses the need for all types of housing, including affordable housing and the needs of different groups in the community and cater for housing demand and the scale of housing supply necessary to meet this demand. It is important to note that other factors which have a bearing on a housing requirement, such as the historic provision of housing, the supply of land, local policy constraints and the wider housing market context, e.g. the ability of people to afford a home, were familiar inputs into plan preparation under (Planning Policy Guidance) PPG 3. The NPPF shifted the emphasis to establishing full objectively assessed needs for housing which were free of such local constraints so as to boost significantly the supply of housing.

- 58 The working group concludes that both recommendations had been monitored with updates being provided to the relevant Board in March 2012 and October 2012
- 59 The working group would also reiterated that the Scrutiny Board (Regeneration) had not concluded in its inquiry that overall housing numbers were wrong nor had it made recommendations to that affect

³ Leeds City Council and ONS following the release of the 2011 census



Conclusions and Recommendations

Recommendation 11– That no further monitoring of recommendation 1 & 2 made by Scrutiny Board (Regeneration) following its Inquiry into Housing Growth (2011) takes place.



Evidence

Monitoring arrangements

Standard arrangements for monitoring the outcome of the Board's recommendations will apply.

The decision-makers to whom the recommendations are addressed will be asked to submit a formal response to the recommendations, including an action plan and timetable, normally within two months.

Following this the Scrutiny Board will determine any further detailed monitoring, over and above the standard quarterly monitoring of all scrutiny recommendations.

Reports and Publications Submitted

- SHNA, GVA and Edge Analytics (2011)
- Leeds demographic Analysis and Forecasts Update, Edge Analytics (2013)
- Housing need Submission to Core Strategy Examination, LCC (2013)
- Housing Needs and Demand, Alan Holmans (2013)
- Housing demand and need Note, House of Commons (2014)
- Stimulating Housing Supply, House of Commons (2014)
- Adopted Core Strategy Policy H4 Housing Mix (2014)
- Executive Summary SHMA, Open House (2007)
- Note from Malachi Rangecroft on ONS
- Housing Growth Breakthrough Project Note
- 2012 –based Sub-National Population Projections (chart)
- Implications of the 2012-based household projections on the Core Strategy Housing Requirement – development Plan Panel may 2015
- Report of Chief Planning Officer –population growth, household projections and housing numbers(Nov 2015)
- Report of Chief Planning Officer – Planning application process (Nov 2015)
- Report of Head of Housing Partnerships – Affordable Housing (Nov 2015)
- Joint report of Chief Planning officer and Head of Housing Partnerships (Jan 2016)
- Submission from George Hall (Jan 2016)
- Submission from Jennifer Kirby (Jan 2016)



Evidence

Witnesses Heard

Tim Hill – Chief Planning Officer
John Statham – Head of Housing Partnerships
Martin Elliot – data team Leader – City Development
Maggie Gjessing, Executive Manager, Regeneration
George Hall – Community Representative

Dates of Scrutiny

22nd July 2015 (Scrutiny Board City Development)
29th September 2015 – Joint Working Group
9th November 2015 – Joint Working Group
11th January 2016 – Joint Working Group
3rd March 2016 – Joint Working Group



Evidence

Appendix 1 Flow chart of decision taking with additional actions on securing housing mix

Stage	Action
1. Pre-Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Headline Policy H4 targets and thresholds • Affordable housing requirement demonstrated • Alert developer to evidence base existing and discuss need for any further housing needs assessment evidence – in conjunction with the Housing Growth Team
2. Submission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure evidence supporting proposal is sufficient and proportionate to reaching decision on housing mix and type and tenure of affordable housing • Early discussion with HGT and FPI if mix is below minimum threshold
3. Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be mindful of additional evidence submitted on mix / local evidence / ambitions for specific mix including type and tenure of affordable housing • Assess need for viability testing / scenarios testing if mix is below minimum threshold
4. Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detail in panel report under “Housing Mix” heading: proposed mix, affordable housing component, local needs evidence from a variety of sources, balance of considerations, any viability concerns, up to date monitoring and any negotiations.
5. Decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panel to take fully informed decisions on mix of dwellings and affordable housing supported by evidence
6. Discharge Conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional specific condition identifying house types and mix
7. Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor permission, under construction and completion status



Scrutiny Board (City Development)
Housing Mix
March 2016
Peter Marrington
www.scrutiny.unit@leeds.gov.uk