

Report of Director of City Development

Report to Executive Board

Date: 9th January 2013

Subject: Council Brownfield Land Programme

Are specific electoral Wards affected?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):		
Ardsley & Robin Hood	Armley	
Beeston & Holbeck	Chapel Allerton	
Hyde Park & Woodhouse	Killingbeck & Seacroft	
Middleton Park	Temple Newsam	
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: 10.4(3)		
Appendix number: 2		

Summary of main issues

1. The draft Core Strategy identifies a need for up to 70,000 net new dwellings to meet housing needs in the city by 2028. Work is underway to identify the sites that will be allocated to accommodate this new development.
2. The draft Core Strategy also establishes sustainable planning principles for the re-use of brownfield land to meet this housing requirement and to mitigate the need to develop greenfield sites.
3. There are 29 sites owned by the Council, covering 45 ha of land, that are identified for development but are located in challenging market locations where there is limited prospect of obtaining viable development through a market-lead approach, which has lead to them laying vacant.
4. The report proposes a Brownfield Land Programme into which these uncommitted sites are allocated and a range of approaches used for disposal and development, comprising:
 - Sale and ringfence of receipts from specific individual sites;
 - Pairing of less viable with more viable sites into a single disposal;
 - Ringfence of receipts from remaining EASEL development sites;

- Co-ordination of disposal and investment activity with the Homes & Communities Agency;
- Alignment of disposal and development proposals with existing housing investment programmes;
- Consideration of institutional investment models.

Recommendations

Executive Board is asked to:

- (i) Approve the establishment of a Brownfield Land Programme based on the principles set out in the report and incorporating those sites listed at Appendix 1;
- (ii) Approve the ring fence of all capital receipts arising from the sale of the sites listed in Appendix 1 to the programme;
- (iii) Approve the incorporation of capital receipts arising from disposal of the remaining EASEL Phase 1 development sites into the Brownfield Land Programme;
- (iv) Note the intention to progress acquisition of two remaining owner-occupied properties on the Askets and subject to the need for these to enable full development, to undertake a marketing exercise for disposal of the site;
- (v) Approve the re-allocation of uncommitted sites from the former Affordable Housing Strategic Partnership to the Brownfield Land Programme;
- (vi) Note the initial potential for institutional investment in the development of rented housing and that further discussion with third parties will be undertaken to establish the potential for this as a route for supporting housing growth in the city.

1 Purpose of this report

- 1.1 This report sets out a proposal for the Council to establish a Brownfield Land Programme through which it could stimulate the market and support development of new housing on its own unallocated brownfield land in areas of the city that currently have limited or no private sector investment interests.

2 Background information

- 2.2 In 2011 the Council undertook an informal consultation with the development sector and community interest groups to establish a range of agreed principles to inform the way in which the city should respond to its housing growth needs. There was a general consensus reached on a number of core principles to stimulate growth and promote sustainability and these were agreed by Executive Board in November 2011 to inform the drafting of the Core Strategy. Included within these was the need to maintain a focus on the regeneration of existing urban areas and the development of brownfield sites.
- 2.3 The Council's draft Core Strategy sets a target of 70,000 net new dwellings to meet the city's housing needs by 2028. This translates to an annual requirement of 3,660 net dwelling per annum from 2012/13 to the end of 2016/17 (18,300) and 4,700 net dwellings per annum from 2017/18 (51,700).
- 2.4 Work has started to identify sites to meet this housing requirement through the Local Development Framework (LDF) site allocations process. Discussions with ward members are underway and site proposals are being fed in by stakeholder groups. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Partnership is also undertaking its annual refresh of land proposed or available for housing development to inform how the housing targets may be met. It is currently anticipated that an 'Issues and Options' paper on the LDF site allocations will be presented to Executive Board in February.
- 2.5 The draft Core Strategy has policies to promote the development of brownfield sites as a sustainable means of meeting these housing needs. Such land is located throughout the existing built up areas of the city and across a range of ownerships – private and public.
- 2.6 The Council currently has around 140 brownfield sites in its ownership, encompassing a variety of land types and assets, covering 150ha of potential development land. These include:
- Land and vacant buildings that have previously been used by services but which have been declared surplus and have no active uses or other service proposals;
 - Land that has been cleared of obsolete or unsustainable housing as part of the Decent Homes and other programmes (including private properties that have been acquired to enable area-clearance);
 - Land or buildings that are currently unused but which are being actively considered for Council development to support new service delivery;

- Vacant land that has been acquired in preparation for other developments or services uses.
- 2.7 The majority of these sites – 77 covering over 65ha – have activities ongoing to promote disposal or to conclude negotiations to sell to third parties for residential, commercial or mixed uses as appropriate to the areas in which they are located and as set out in planning guidance. The expected capital receipts from the sale of these sites have already been earmarked to fund the capital programme.
- 2.8 A further 8 sites have active proposals for new housing from Registered Providers as part of the Affordable Housing Programme; 9 sites are allocated for redevelopment as part of the PFI Housing project; 4 sites are allocated for sale to Bellway Homes for housing development under the EASEL Strategic Development Agreement; and 3 sites are allocated for new schools provision as part of the Basic Needs Programme.
- 2.9 There are 29 sites owned by the Council, covering 45 ha of land, that are identified for development but are located in challenging market locations where there is limited prospect of obtaining viable development through a market-lead approach, which has led to them laying vacant. There are no outstanding Council service requirements in association with these sites. They also have no current expectation of making a contribution to the capital programme. These sites are listed at Appendix 1, with accompanying plans.
- 2.10 The majority of these unallocated sites are located in areas where there is a need for new homes but limited market interest in residential development due to:
- limited frontage/visibility;
 - poor ground conditions or site remediation requirements; and
 - low demand or limited access to mortgage finance from prospective local purchasers.
- 2.11 Where these sites are clustered as at Seacroft, Halton Moor and Middleton, where there are high concentrations of social housing, their current condition has a cumulative and negative impact on local amenity and local residents, business and Ward Members wish to see site improvements or development solutions.
- 2.12 As a landowner and service provider, the Council therefore needs to identify a viable way in which these sites can make a more positive local regeneration contribution, assist efforts to reduce deprivation and assist in diversifying the housing offer and meeting local housing needs.
- 2.13 All of the Council's brownfield sites that have potential for residential development have been put forward to be included in the LDF site allocations process (or have previously been included in the SHLAA).
- 2.14 The proposals set out for brownfield land in this report are intended to maintain a focus on housing development in the existing urban areas, alongside the management of pressures for development on greenfield sites.

- 2.15 The 2011 housing growth consultation prompted consideration of how greenfield and brownfield development sites could be more explicitly linked to promote regeneration. Policy H1 of the Draft Core Strategy provides that in special circumstances, allocated sites may be permitted to be released in advance of their planned phasing, so long as the permitted site delivers infrastructure and housing investment that is needed within Regeneration Priority Areas. In such cases, suitable mechanisms will be agreed to ensure that delivery within the Regeneration Priority Area occurs either before, or in conjunction with the delivery of the permitted site.
- 2.16 There may therefore be scope in due course to explore a delivery link between wider greenfield development proposals and the development of the Council's brownfield sites. However, any formal proposals on this basis will need more detailed consideration in the context of the Council's detailed planning policies and would be subject to a further specific report.
- 2.17 Executive Board Members will note that there is a separate report on the agenda for this meeting relating to the development potential of the East Leeds Extension, a housing allocation at the edge of the city.

3 Main issues

- 3.1 Based on the Council's own surveying advice, the majority of the unallocated sites are likely to have marginal or challenging viability if they were to be marketed individually for sale and development for housing. Informal discussions with development interests over 2011 has confirmed this and indicated that there would be very limited interest in the majority of the Council's sites if marketed individually. Their position and location offer limited viability for residential development without a more substantial offer of support or incentive from the Council as a vendor.
- 3.2 This market view is supported through the experience of Bellway Homes, the Council's partner in the EASEL project, where development of the South Parkway site in Seacroft has been ongoing since 2008 but just over half of the proposed 200 homes have been completed and very few sold on an open market basis without some form of buyer assistance.
- 3.3 Development progress and sales on site would be improved if there was certainty of financial support for prospective purchasers that generally have difficulty obtaining mortgages in this area.
- 3.4 The informal discussions with developers indicate that if the individually unviable sites could be packaged with more attractive sites, more certainty offered to developers and if the Council would be prepared to consider ways in which development could be assisted through an appropriate land sale model and/or assistance for house buyers, there would be potential to deliver new housing across the unallocated sites.
- 3.5 It is also evident that there would be value in establishing a relationship with more than one house builder. This would spread development and sales risks and assist in creating competitive development markets. In terms of outcomes it may also add variety to the type and potentially the tenure of the housing built.

- 3.6 A small number of these are in potentially more attractive locations and may in themselves offer some prospect of interest from purchasers. Whilst these could be marketed and sold individually, this would leave a residual list of poor sites as liabilities with limited prospect of sale or development in their current situation.
- 3.7 There is an opportunity to pursue development across as many sites as possible by managing the use and investment of surplus values from more viable sites creatively to support currently less viable sites.
- 3.8 It is proposed that a Brownfield Land Programme is formally established, into which sites are allocated and receipts ring-fenced to enable the delivery of the following longer term objectives:
- (i) To assist in the delivery of **local regeneration** and improve local amenity
 - (ii) Contribute to **housing growth** and improve housing choice
 - (iii) To assist in reducing development pressure on **greenfield land**
 - (iv) To reduce the Council's **management liabilities** for vacant sites
 - (v) Generate a **net capital receipt** for the Council
- 3.9 The programme would be initially set up and funded through the individual disposal of the highest value sites on the list on an open market, best consideration basis. The two adjoining Askets sites in Seacroft (see attached plan in the Appendix) would be capable of generating a meaningful receipt in their own right. One of the sites has been cleared of housing under the Decent Homes programme, though two remaining owner-occupiers remain on the edge of the other and the Council is currently in negotiations to acquire these. If these acquisitions prove critical to the marketing and disposal of the site and cannot be secured by agreement, the Council may need to consider the use of Compulsory Purchase powers. The site has outline planning permission in place and would be capable of delivering up to 120 new homes.
- 3.10 The ring-fencing of disposal receipts to the programme from the sale and development of this site would establish a fund that could be used for any of a range of activities in support of disposal and development of other sites in the programme. These could include:
- Remediation of other sites prior to disposal;
 - Provision of infrastructure or servicing on other sites prior to disposal;
 - Funding for the Council to directly purchase units on a completed development, for social rent or rent-to-mortgage, to offer some certainty to a development partner on sales or to mitigate development risk
 - Funding to offer equity share loans to prospective purchasers.
- 3.11 However, in view of the market intelligence already obtained there is a need to apply a range of approaches to further disposal and development within the programme to generate and support further market interest.
- 3.12 The proposed programme has several constituent parts, set out in more detail in the following sections of the report:
- Guidance & Marketing
 - Pairing of Sites

- East & South East Leeds (EASEL)
- Joint work with the Homes & Communities Agency
- Alignment with existing Housing Programmes
- Institutional Investment

Guidance & Marketing

- 3.13 A Neighbourhood Framework is currently being drafted for Middleton & Belle Isle and a similar exercise is in the early stages of discussion with ward members for Seacroft. These would set out the wider local regeneration, land use and development aspirations in each of these areas. It is anticipated that public consultation and publication of these will take place over Q3-4 2012/13, following which these documents could be used to assist marketing and discussions with potential developers.
- 3.14 It would be preferable to co-ordinate marketing of sites with agreed area regeneration plans and proposals. It is suggested that discussion around the Neighbourhood Frameworks and potential developer involvement in these, form part of the marketing and disposal exercises. This would demonstrate that there is both a Council commitment to regeneration of these areas and an opportunity for developers to help shape the future of these in support of their investment, alongside local residents, Members and other stakeholders.
- 3.15 In other parts of the city where the Council's sites are located – including Holbeck and Wortley – there are community driven proposals to produce Neighbourhood Plans under the provisions of the Localism Act 2011. These will also provide an opportunity to create a context of certainty for potential developers in which to bring forward investment proposals and engage positively with local stakeholders.
- 3.16 Six of the unallocated sites have outline planning permissions in place for residential development. All other sites require some form of detailed planning guidance to inform their disposal.

Pairing of Sites

- 3.17 This would involve pairing a more viable site together with one that is less viable as part of a single disposal, to enable the values generated on one to offset the otherwise prohibitive development costs and/or lower sales values of another. Effectively there would be a subsidy working between the two sites in favour of achieving the desired housing outcomes within a single development agreement.
- 3.18 Principles will be developed to guide and ensure the most appropriate and deliverable pairings of sites under this approach.
- 3.19 The first call on any value generated would be to offset land and development costs across the paired sites; only once these have been covered to enable development to proceed would any value be returned to the wider brownfield programme for recycling and onward use.
- 3.20 Disposal of paired sites would take place on an open market basis, though the emphasis would be on opportunities for partnership working and exploring innovative development and tenure solutions. The Council would also need to

consider the method of disposal and whether a deferred purchase or profit share arrangement would assist development cash flows and provide a better attraction for developers to purchase and develop the sites.

- 3.21 All viability appraisals would need to be on an open book basis and would require a simple development agreement to ensure build out of both sites in a paired disposal, with an appropriate balance between incentive and control; this would need to ensure the developer is not able to build out the viable site in isolation from the less viable one. A template Heads of Terms could be developed in advance.
- 3.22 Consideration should also be given to porting the affordable housing requirements arising on the more viable sites, to support development on the less viable sites, though this would require support from the Local Planning Authority and from relevant ward members on a case-by-case basis.

East & South East Leeds Regeneration Project (EASEL)

- 3.23 The Council has committed to selling 8 brownfield sites in Gipton & Seacroft to Bellway Homes under the terms of the Phase 1 EASEL Strategic Development Agreement. Four of these sites (at Thorn Walk, Oak Trees, Ambertons in Gipton and Old York Road in Seacroft) are still to be sold, disposal being subject to revised viability checks.
- 3.24 As these are all brownfield sites in priority regeneration areas, it is proposed that these are included within the Brownfield Land Programme and any receipts treated in accord with the principles and delivery approaches described in this report. Previous EASEL land receipts have been recycled back into support measures for development and continued sales on those sites and this principle would therefore be formalised and continued.
- 3.25 Bellway has indicated that it will seek purchase of the next site in the EASEL programme by the end of 2012/13, to develop 50 new homes, which will give rise to a small receipt. The Council and Bellway have also agreed to remove part of a further site in Gipton from the development agreement, to be sold to a third party for a GP surgery. Both of these receipts could be ring fenced to the proposed Brownfield Programme. The remainder of the final three EASEL sites will be revalued following this and it is expected that viable development will not be possible without support for purchasers in the form of equity loans.
- 3.26 If a source for such support cannot be identified, it is likely that the remainder of the EASEL Phase 1 agreement will not be deliverable on current terms and a revision or cancellation of the development agreement required. The remaining EASEL sites would then require solutions as part of the wider Brownfield Programme approach.

Joint Work with the Homes & Communities Agency

- 3.27 The Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) has expressed interest in a co-ordinated approach to site disposals as a means of creating certainty and adding value in the development of its own land assets in the city and in protecting past investments. In particular the HCA is seeking to bring forward disposal of its land to the rear of Seacroft Hospital (a greenfield site) where there is potentially capacity

for up to 600 new homes, subject to further work on the relationship to the adjoining hospital itself.

- 3.28 Discussions with the HCA indicate that it is likely to be some time before development of its land at Seacroft takes place and that there may be significant up-front infrastructure costs. Subject to planning approvals there may be scope for the affordable housing requirement attached to the development of the site to be ported within the ward, which would assist both the development on brownfield sites within the estate areas of Seacroft and the HCA's land itself.
- 3.29 The HCA has indicated that there would be potential to discuss other funding opportunities as part of a co-ordinated approach to development in the Seacroft area. It has already provided funding to the Council to obtain outline planning permission for residential development on the Akets through its Public Land Initiative.
- 3.30 This approach could be complemented by the Council using its potential receipts from sale of the Askets site on the northern edge of Seacroft to support development within the estate, in the context of a Neighbourhood Framework as outlined above.
- 3.31 Proposals are currently being developed to bring forward an Older People's Housing project on a 5.5ha cleared site at South Parkway in Seacroft, which is intended to deliver a mix of older peoples and general needs homes for affordable rent and market sales. Detailed proposals for this project will be brought to the next meeting of the Executive Board, though it is likely that it would attract similar development interests as would be interested in other site opportunities described in this report and co-ordination of marketing will be required to ensure the local housing market is appropriately developed.

Alignment with Existing Housing Programmes

- 3.32 The Affordable Housing Programme, through which HCA funding to Registered Providers (RP's) is confirmed and allocated to sites, already offers a means through which the Council has been able to achieve development on some of its brownfield sites.
- 3.33 In March 2007 the Council's Executive Board approved the establishment of an Affordable Housing Strategic Partnership (AHSP). Sites in Council ownership covering 31 ha (77 acres) of land were identified to be used by the AHSP for the delivery of affordable housing via sale to housing associations. This land has usually been sold at a value equivalent to £5,000 per plot, unless a case can be made for lower or nil consideration on viability grounds.
- 3.34 Between 2008-13 almost 600 new affordable homes have been developed on council land under the Affordable Housing programme, including that set aside for the AHSP.
- 3.35 The AHSP has however now been disbanded and it is proposed that sites that were originally allocated to it and which remain uncommitted are considered for alternative means of housing delivery through the Brownfield Land Programme. The relevant sites are indicated on the list at Appendix 1.

- 3.36 Executive Board in September 2012 approved a separate Council Housing Investment Programme for the delivery of new affordable homes in the city, to be funded through the Housing Revenue Account, New Homes Bonus and Right to Buy receipts. It is estimated that up to 154 new build homes could be delivered through a combination of direct council development, payments to Registered Providers and equity loans to support private sector led developments.
- 3.37 There is scope for alignment and co-ordination of investment through both the HCA Affordable Housing Programme and the Council's Housing Investment Programme with other measures set out in this report to offer a further means through which Council sites can be brought forward for viable development.

Institutional Investment Models

- 3.38 The council has had a number of recent approaches from developers, backed by institutional investors, who are interested in long term investment in rented housing. Models vary, but broadly entail the construction of new dwellings, funded by the investor and a leasing arrangement for a period of say 40 years after which assets revert to the authority. The model works on the basis that the homes would then be leased back to the Council on terms which would provide a regular income stream to the investor and enable the Council (or a managing agent) to let the homes to individual tenants. Rent levels would need to be such that the income can meet the cost of the lease, taking turnover and void levels into account.
- 3.39 Lease costs vary but it is generally assumed that rents will be need to be at market or submarket rates to make the projects viable.
- 3.40 This model could lend itself well to the provision of new housing at scale, supporting the Council's objective of accelerating housing growth. As the council retains the land and takes ownership of the properties at the end of the lease term it could potentially form part of a new strategic approach to delivering new housing in which the council retains its asset.
- 3.41 To minimise longer term financial risk to the Council the location of sites, surrounding infrastructure as well as the quality of the development itself must attract sufficient demand and stability to ensure minimal lettings risk. Given the current situation of most of the Council's brownfield land, it may be that this institutional approach is better suited to later stages of the programme, as and when market confidence and attractiveness of these areas for private tenants is improved.
- 3.42 It is suggested that discussions continue with interested parties to model project examples at no cost or obligation, to further inform the Council's position on this approach.

4 Corporate Considerations

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 4.1.1 Soft market testing has been undertaken with housebuilders in relation to the issues set out in this report. Discussions have also taken place with the HCA about its land in the city and how a co-ordinated approach to disposal and development could be taken forward. The need for improvements and development of the sites

referred to in the report has been subject of ongoing discussions in locality forums and is a key concern of local stakeholders. Consultation has also been undertaken with the Executive Members for Development & Economy and Neighbourhoods, Planning and Support Services. The proposed approach has been informed by these discussions.

- 4.1.2 The Council's approach to brownfield land and realising housing development has been the subject of discussion at the Housing & Regeneration Scrutiny Board, following which the list of all Council brownfield sites has been circulated to all ward members. Regular updates on progress towards disposal and development of sites will be provided to Ward Members, at the request of the Scrutiny Board.
- 4.1.3 Area regeneration proposals and Neighbourhood Frameworks have been discussed with relevant ward members. Public consultation and engagement took place through a series of local drop-in events in November in respect of the Middleton & Belle Isle Neighbourhood Framework. The outcomes of this are being fed into the document and proposals.
- 4.1.4 Detailed proposals for the development of each site and the drafting of planning guidance would be the subject of consultation with local residents and stakeholders and Ward Members as appropriate when brought forward as part of any approved Brownfield Land Programme.

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

- 4.2.1 An Equality Impact Screening has been undertaken. This has indicated that there would be no specific implications for equality groups – the proposed programme would be addressing land predominately in deprived areas and its outcomes would potentially result in an improvement in the external perception of these, greater access to and choice of housing and opportunities for local people in training and employment.

4.3 Council policies and City Priorities

- 4.3.1 The remediation and development of the Council's brownfield sites relates strongly to a range of objectives within the City Priority Plans and Council Business Plan supporting neighbourhood regeneration and housing growth.

4.4 Resources and value for money

- 4.4.1 The Council's brownfield sites are actual or potential liabilities in terms of management and maintenance costs. They detract significantly from the neighbourhoods in which they are located and have a negative impact on the delivery of council and other public services (through health and safety issues and anti-social behaviour).
- 4.4.2 Preparing sites for inclusion in the proposed Brownfield Land Programme would require initial resources to be identified for the completion of Planning Statements and to undertake Stage 1 checks. These could be expected to cost up to £20,000 per site.

- 4.4.3 Initial costs would be funded through existing departmental budgets. However such costs going forward may eventually be covered by the values generated within the programme, if successful.
- 4.4.4 The Programme is predicated on the principle that all values generated are retained and ring-fenced to support the disposal or development of future sites. Delivery of these sites would add to the stretch targets for the delivery of New Homes Bonus. At this stage the application of NHB monies to the programme is not assumed. However, subject to individual site viability and business cases, there may be a need to consider this on a cases by case basis.
- 4.4.5 The majority of the sites proposed for the programme are not in themselves likely to have significant positive land values or currently be capable of generating NHB through development. There is therefore a minimal opportunity cost to adopting this approach to receipts arising from land sales that are made viable through the brownfield programme.
- 4.4.6 Exempt Appendix 2 shows details of the indicative valuations and potential New Homes Bonus arising from development of the initial sites proposed for disposal and ringfence to the programme.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

- 4.5.1 In disposing of land and assets and in considering how development may be supported through use of Council resources, State Aid will need to be avoided. Further detailed advice will be obtained in bringing forward each disposal and in identifying the appropriate use of ring-fenced funds to support the viability of sites. Any procedural constraints affecting the disposals will also have to be addressed (for example the need to advertise the intention to dispose of any land that falls into the definition of open space and to consider any objections).
- 4.5.2 The information in Appendix 2 is exempt from publication under section 10.4, category 3 of the Access to Information Procedure Rules as it relates to the financial and business affairs of the Council, namely the anticipated values attached to sites prior to marketing. The public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information as this could otherwise prejudice an open market disposal exercise. The information could be published following completion of any subsequent disposals, in the public interest.

4.6 Risk Management

- 4.6.1 The principle risk in the proposed Brownfield Land Programme concerns viability and market response. This would be tested through an initial disposal exercise, and a pilot pairing of sites through which values and deliverability can be explored and lessons learnt to be fed into future phases.
- 4.6.2 It is proposed that immediately following the initiation of open market disposal of the Askets in Seacroft a first pairing of brownfield sites is worked up, to pilot the principles set out in the report and to inform how the viability issues may be addressed. This would assume and require some element of capital receipt from the initial sales to support the work. Following this a more detailed programme can be developed.

- 4.6.3 The risks of not testing and pursuing co-ordinated action across the unallocated brownfield sites and leaving development to be market-lead are that these sites remain unimproved and undeveloped. This would lead to further pressure for greenfield sites to meet the city's housing needs.

5 Conclusions

- 5.1 There are significant challenges for the Council in bringing forward development of its brownfield land, much of which is in difficult market locations where there is limited prospect of obtaining viable development through a standard approach to disposals to meet local regeneration needs.
- 5.2 There are a range of approaches to packaging and co-ordinating disposal and development that could be employed within a concerted programme across the city, drawing on values that could be generated on better sites and utilising other investment streams.
- 5.3 There would be some initial resource commitment required to instigate and test the programme. It would also be required to ringfence all values (and potentially costs once sustainable) to ensure sustained deliverability. The proposed programme recommends that the desired outcomes of regeneration, housing growth, improved local amenity and reducing pressure on greenfield locations as a result of developing all the listed sites are a priority for the Council.
- 5.4 It is likely that such an approach would achieve a strong alignment with local aspirations for brownfield sites, though the detail of how values and s106 funds arising may be distributed through the programme as a whole would require detailed discussion and agreement.

6 Recommendations

- 6.5 Executive Board is asked to:
- (i) Approve the establishment of a Brownfield Land Programme based on the principles set out in the report and incorporating those sites listed at Appendix 1;
 - (ii) Approve the ring fence of all capital receipts arising from the sale of the sites listed in Appendix 1 to the programme;
 - (iii) Approve the incorporation of capital receipts arising from disposal of the remaining EASEL Phase 1 development sites into the Brownfield Land Programme;
 - (iv) Note the intention to progress acquisition of two remaining owner-occupied properties on the Askets and subject to the need for these to enable full development, to undertake a marketing exercise for disposal of the site;
 - (v) Approve the re-allocation of uncommitted sites from the former Affordable Housing Strategic Partnership to the Brownfield Land Programme;

- (vi) Note the initial potential for institutional investment in the development of rented housing and that further discussion with third parties will be undertaken to establish the potential for this as a route for supporting housing growth in the city.

7 Background Papers¹

7.1 None

¹ The background documents listed in this section are available to download from the Council's website, unless they contain confidential or exempt information. The list of background documents does not include published works.