REGIONAL LAND FOR AFFORDABLE

HOUSING SURVEY

2006

ANALYSIS REPORT

West Midlands Regional Assembly
March 2007

PART 1 - INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

A decision was taken by the West Midlands Regional Assembly in November 2006 to undertake a land for affordable housing survey for the West Midlands Region.

Up to date information is necessary to help develop the Preferred Option as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) Partial Revision, a review of the current affordable housing policy (CF5) is being undertaken in Phase 2. This will involve revising the target at the regional level and possibly developing sub-regional level targets in line with PPS3. As it stands, the current affordable housing target for the West Midlands Region in the RSS is 6-6,500 per annum, but there are no sub-regional level policy targets.

The Regional Housing Strategy (June 2005) gives an indicative breakdown of affordable and social housing requirements by Housing Market Area 2001 – 2021. These are needs estimates but take account of the published RSS allocations.

This study considers the likely level of affordable housing delivery through the planning system 2001-2026. It provides estimates based on the opinions of local authority planning officers. This study does not attempt to quantify the 'need' for affordable housing up to 2026 (other than picking up what short-term local housing need studies identify), this is being undertaken in a separate parallel study which is expected to deliver later in 2007.

1.2 Methodology

This survey involved a questionnaire being sent to each local authority in the West Midlands Region in order to determine what the potential supply of affordable housing might be up to 2026.

The first part of the survey asked local authorities about their current affordable housing development plan policies including details on local affordable housing targets, thresholds that would trigger a requirement for affordable housing provision and what proportion of affordable housing would be expected to be delivered over a particular threshold.

The second section of the survey asked information about local housing needs surveys, including the level of need identified and the time period that this related to.

The remainder of the survey asked about the estimated levels of delivery of affordable housing between 2001 and 2026. Authorities were asked about; affordable housing completions 2001-2006, commitments as at 2006, any further estimates 2006-2011 over and above commitments and future estimates 2011-2026 based upon the 3 housing options being considered as part of the Phase 2 RSS Revision[1].

---

[1] As set out in 'West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy – Phase Two Revision, Spatial Options, 8th January – 5th March 2007.

Authorities were asked to provide estimates for social rented (e.g. provided by a local authority or RSL at a rent at or below the general market), intermediate (e.g. shared equity) and low cost market housing where the data was available. The guidance notes used the definition for social and intermediate housing as set out in the Draft PPS3 (the final version of PPS3 had not been published at the time the survey was sent out). Authorities were also advised that intermediate housing should include housing delivered through Section 106 agreements by the private sector that remained affordable in perpetuity (i.e. were discounted at first purchase and remained so for subsequent purchases).

It is recognised that Draft PPS3 only considers social rented and intermediate housing as affordable, and excludes low cost market housing. However, the study attempted to collect data for all categories to gain an understanding of the full picture of affordable housing delivery. In the analysis a table is provided which extracts the figures based on the Draft PPS3 definition.

For the period 2006-2011 the survey also asked local authorities to provide information in respect of the likely achievable and the maximum levels of affordable housing numbers that could be delivered through current planning policies. The likely achievable numbers is a realistic level of delivery that takes account of constraints to deliver, e.g. failure to implement policies, political opposition, reluctance of developers. The maximum level of delivery under current planning policies is the level that should be delivered if policies were implemented to the full on all applications within the limit of the authority's housing allocation.

In addition, the survey also required authorities to supply information with regard to the maximum estimated number and/or proportion of affordable housing that may be delivered under a revised policy framework. Authorities were asked if they were likely to be reviewing their policies between now and 2011, and if so, what would be the maximum affordable housing delivery achievable between 2006 – 2011 under a new policy framework.

For the 2011-2026 period authorities were provided with the 3 levels of housing options set out in RSS Options consultation as a per annum rate. Authorities were asked to consider the maximum numbers of affordable housing that they could deliver under each option. Each local authority was invited to comment on any barriers that would be needed to overcome to deliver the levels identified.

The survey also asked local authorities to submit details in respect of affordable housing that has been negotiated through the use of commuted sums for development on other sites. In addition, a question was asked about whether authorities thought they would be able to allocate sites solely for affordable housing in the future, over and above rural exceptions sites.

PART 2 - RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

2.1 Quality of the information

The survey was circulated to 34 local authorities, of which 33 completed and returned the questionnaire – a response rate of 97%.

The overall quality of the returns was good. Taking into account resource constraints and the tight deadline for responses, only Rugby Borough Council didn't return a completed survey in the specified timeframe (however, some figures were received from Rugby after the finalisation of the appendix tables, these have been referred to later in the report). In respect of the general data quality, Stoke-on-Trent City Council's return was not 100% complete. Both Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council and Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council were unable to submit any future estimates beyond 2011.

In addition, some authorities were only able to provide total estimates rather than splits between social rented, intermediate and local cost market housing. This has been indicated in the appendix tables where applicable.

Because of the above data gaps it must be recognised that any totals calculated in the appendix data tables for delivery 2001-2026 will be an undercount. However, despite this, the figures provide a fairly complete picture.

2.2 Current development plan policies

When considering Table 1 of the technical appendix 33% (11) of authorities reported that they had an affordable housing target in their development plan expressed as a number of affordable dwellings to be delivered over a certain time period, e.g. 100 dwellings between 2001 and 2011. 94% (32) stated that they had policies setting out thresholds for a requirement for delivery of affordable housing for individual sites and subsequent proportions that should be delivered on that site, i.e. sites over a threshold of 25 dwellings should deliver 35% of the site as affordable housing.

Quantifiable targets for affordable housing delivery over a set time period obviously vary significantly across the Region and are related to the overall housing requirement.

In respect of the thresholds, the general threshold for affordable housing is as set out in the now superseded Circular 06/98: Planning and Affordable Housing which stipulates that in assessing the suitability of sites for affordable housing, developments of 25 or more dwellings or residential sites of 1 hectare or more should be considered.

There are some interesting exceptions to this, particularly with respect to the more rural parts of the region. For some more rural districts and specific market towns thresholds are lowered to 15 dwellings. The lowest threshold reported by local authorities is 3 dwellings (this applies to villages in North Shropshire). Some policies mention specific thresholds for specific towns, for example in Malvern Hills district Malvern town is specified as having a threshold of 15 dwellings.

In relation to the proportions of total housing to be delivered as affordable on sites above the thresholds identified these vary from 20% to 50%. There is no specific differentiation between rural and urban areas. For example, South Shropshire aims to deliver a proportion of 50% and Birmingham aims to deliver a proportion of 49%.

2.3 Housing needs

Thirty-two local authorities provided details of local housing needs studies. A figure for total housing need plus the years that the housing need figure relates to were provided, this enabled a per annum rate to be calculated. From the details provided it appears that a number of studies are now out of date and may require revision.

Table 2 of the technical appendix shows the variance between identified housing need (through local housing needs surveys) and affordable housing development plan provision. There is a significant difference between the need requirement and development plan provision, the need always being much larger than the plan requirement. The lowest variance of plan provision from housing need is 67% within the Region and the highest variance is 97%

The table also compares the identified housing need with affordable housing completions 2001-2006, again on a per annum basis. The need levels, once again, being much larger than the completion levels. The lowest variance of affordable housing completions from housing need is 68% within the Region and the highest variance is 99%.

It is recognised, however, that there will always be a gap between the level of identified housing need and provision that can be made through the planning system because some need will be met by other means, including through the existing housing stock.

2.4 Affordable housing delivery - social rented, intermediate and low cost market housing

Local authorities were asked to report upon the levels of affordable housing that were likely to be delivered through the planning system between 2001 and 2026. As stated previously in this report, this required consideration of completions, commitments and likely future estimates up to 2026 bearing in mind the 3 Options of housing delivery in the RSS Options Consultation document.

The results of the survey can be seen below and are set out in detail for each local authority in the technical appendix. There are three sets of figures because for the 2006-2011 period local authorities were asked for three estimates including; the likely levels if current policies were delivered bearing in mind likely constraints (political, land issues etc), the delivery level if current policies were maximised (i.e. the level of delivery was maximised on each site that came through), and the maximum delivery if current policies were reviewed (i.e. new policies may have different thresholds/proportions and therefore may increase provision).

The figures for total delivery including social, intermediate and local cost market housing are set out in the table below. Figures excluding low cost market housing (i.e. in accordance with the new PPS3 definition) are set out in the next section (2.5).

Table 1: Estimated delivery levels of social rented, intermediate and low cost market housing.

	Delivery if Likely Future Estimates come forward			**Delivery if Current Policies are Maximised**			**Delivery if Current Policies Reviewed**		
	Option 1: Annual Average 2001-2026	**Option 2: Annual Average 2001 - 2026**	**Option 3: Annual Average 2001 - 2026**	**Option 1: Annual Average 2001 - 2026**	**Option 2: Annual Average 2001 - 2026**	**Option 3: Annual Average 2001 - 2026**	**Option1: Annual Average 2001 - 2026**	**Option2: Annual Average 2001 - 2026**	**Option3: Annual Average 2001 - 2026**
Metropolitan Area Total	***1,936***	***2,121***	***2,381***	***2,031***	***2,215***	***2,476***	***2,031***	***2,215***	***2,476***
Shire and Unitary Authorities Total	***2,050***	***2,426***	***2,656***	***2,098***	***2,473***	***2,704***	***2,107***	***2,482***	***2,713***
WEST MIDLANDS REGION	***3,987***	***4,546***	***5,037***	***4,129***	***4,689***	***5,180***	***4,138***	***4,697***	***5,189***

The Options referred to in this table relate to the amount of affordable housing that can be delivered under the 3 Options set out in the WMRA RSS Options Consultation document (January 2007)

The results show that for the Region as a whole the likely level of delivery for the 2001 to 2026 period under Option 1 could be just under 4,000 affordable housing dwellings per annum, Option 2, 4,500 dwellings and Option 3, around 5,000 dwellings.

Under Option 1 in the shire areas 2,050 affordable houses per annum are expected to come through the planning system, this is 51% of the total for the region. This indicates that there is a greater level of affordable housing to be delivered through the planning system in these areas for the period 2001 to 2026 compared to the Metropolitan areas. Similarly, for Option 2 and Option 3, the expectant level of affordable housing is also slightly higher in the shires than in the Metropolitan areas.

If current policies are maximised for the Region as a whole an extra 3,600 might be delivered between 2006 – 2011 for all of the Options 1, 2 and 3. This breaks down to 2,400 in the Metropolitan areas and 1,200 in the shires. These figures are shown in appendix table 3. Table 1 above shows that when the additional 3,500 is translated into per annum rates this does not make a significant difference to Regional totals for the whole period (2001 – 2026); Option 1 increases to 4,100 per annum, Option 2 to 4,700 per annum and Option 3 to 5,200 per annum.

If current policies are reviewed and new ones are put into place authorities only identified an additional 200 dwellings in total regionally over five years between 2006-2011. This is probably because LDFs are generally in the early stages across the Region and authorities are awaiting the outcome of the RSS revision before local affordable housing policies are reviewed.

Bearing in mind the above data is an undercount because there were data gaps for some authorities in the survey, it has been estimated that there could be an additional 4,600 affordable housing dwellings to be delivered through the planning system over the 2001 to 2026 period for the Region, which equates to 180 per annum. For Sandwell, Nuneaton and Bedworth and Stoke on Trent where data is missing an estimate has been made based on past completion rates. For Rugby, local planning officers have provided the figures.

2.5 Affordable housing delivery - social rented and intermediate housing

The table below shows the level of delivery estimated by local authorities for social rented and intermediate housing only. As indicated earlier, where a split was not provided between social, intermediate and low cost market housing in a return, a total has been used in these figures as a proxy for social and intermediate only. The authorities that did not provide splits for these figures are indicated by footnote 3 in appendix table 4.

Table 2: Estimated delivery levels of social rented and intermediate housing only.

	Delivery if Likely Future Estimates come forward			Delivery if Current Policies are Maximised [1]			Delivery if Current Policies Reviewed [2]		
	Option 1: Annual Average 2001-2026	Option 2: Annual Average 2001 - 2026	Option 3: Annual Average 2001 - 2026	Option 1: Annual Average 2001 - 2026	Option 2: Annual Average 2001 - 2026	Option 3: Annual Average 2001 - 2026	Option1: Annual Average 2001 - 2026	Option2: Annual Average 2001 - 2026	Option3: Annual Average 2001 - 2026
Metropolitan Areas Total	***1,883***	***2,064***	***2,322***	***1,975***	***2,157***	***2,415***	***1,975***	***2,157***	***2,415***
Shire and Unitary Authorities Total	***2,001***	***2,365***	***2,584***	***2,048***	***2,413***	***2,632***	***2,057***	***2,422***	***2,641***
WEST MIDLANDS REGION	***3,883***	***4,429***	***4,906***	***4,024***	***4,569***	***5,047***	***4,035***	***4,578***	***5,056***

The Options referred to in this table relate to the amount of affordable housing that can be delivered under the 3 Options set out in the WMRA RSS Options Consultation document (January 2007)

The figures for social rented and intermediate housing delivery are naturally lower than the figures in Table 1 which also contained low cost market housing. However, at a regional level the difference only amounts to about 100 dwellings per annum 2001-2026. Therefore the likely future estimates 2001-2026 for Option 1 are 3,900, for Option 2, 4,400 and for Option 3, 4,900.

If policies are maximised an extra 3,500 can be found over the period 2006-2011, but this does not significantly increase the annual averages. Likewise, if policies are reviewed the total number only increases by an additional 200. These increases can be seen in appendix table 4.

As discussed in Section 2.4 the above figures are an undercount because of missing data, there could be around an additional 180 dwellings per annum for the Region as a whole.

2.6 Barriers to delivery

The most commonly reported reason for any potential barriers that need to be overcome to achieve the level of delivery concerns the level of infrastructure required to support development. This includes the requirement for a substantial investment in transport networks if there is significant release of greenfield land. Land remediation (and the costs associated with) and improvements in ground conditions are also issues that local authorities consider need to be addressed in order to meet the expected level of housing delivery. Other reasons include; the difficulty with delivering affordable housing through Section 106 agreements on major private market sites on brownfield land; financial resources of the RSL's need to be increased to ensure better delivery of affordable housing; and the general reluctance of developers to provide social rented housing.

2.7 Comparison of expected delivery of social and intermediate affordable housing against past completions

Table 3: Comparison of expected affordable delivery against past affordable housing completions

	Affordable Delivery if Likely Future Estimates come forward			
	Annual Completions 2001 - 2006	Option 1: Annual Average 2001 - 2026	Option 2: Annual Average 2001 - 2026	Option 3: Annual Average 2001 - 2026
Metropolitan Areas Total	***1,299***	***1,883***	***2,064***	***2,322***
Shire and Unitary Authorities Total	***1,252***	***2,001***	***2,365***	***2,584***
WEST MIDLANDS REGION	***2,551***	***3,883***	***4,429***	***4,906***

The Options referred to in this table relate to the amount of affordable housing that can be delivered under the 3 Options set out in the WMRA RSS Options Consultation document (January 2007)

When comparing levels of past completions with the likely future estimates of social and intermediate housing in the survey we see the following general trends:

Option 1: For the Region as a whole the level of delivery will need to increase by 1,300 per annum (52%) above current completions to meet the levels expressed in the survey.

Option 2: For the Region as a whole the level of delivery will need to increase by 73% above current completions to meet the levels expressed in the survey.

Option 3: For the Region as a whole the level of delivery will need to almost double (a 92% increase) above current completions to meet the levels expressed in the survey.

2.8 Percentage of completions built under Section 106 agreements

Table 6 of the technical appendix shows the number of affordable housing completions that are being delivered through Section 106 agreements. Not all authorities returned data on this but for those that did there are some interesting findings.

The percentage of affordable housing completions built through Section 106 agreements varies from between 6% and 100% across the Region. The use of the Section 106 mechanism is widespread throughout the Metropolitan and shire areas. In the Metropolitan area the authority that delivers the highest proportion through S106 agreements is Solihull (68%), the other Metropolitan authorities are delivering much lower levels, e.g. Birmingham 26%. In the shire areas some authorities are reporting 100% delivery through Section 106 mechanisms, e.g. Oswestry, Stafford and Tamworth. The shire authority delivering the lowest reported level is East Staffordshire at 17%. It should be borne in mind though that there may be other shire authorities that deliver a lower level than East Staffordshire but for whatever reason left this question blank on the form.

2.9 Commuted sums

All local authorities were asked as to whether they use commuted sums, the response was mainly in favour of using them. 24 out of the 33 local authorities (73%) negotiate commuted sums for the provision of affordable housing. Authorities indicated that this amounted to a total of £15 million received across the region over a five year period 2001 to 2006. This figure is very significant and could reflect the growing use of commuted sums as a mechanism for off-site delivery.

Table 4: Commuted sums

	Number of Authorities that negotiate commuted sums for the provision of affordable housing	Amount of commuted sums received (01/04/2001 to 31/03/2006) (£)
WEST MIDLANDS REGION	***24***	***15,716,697***

2.10 Sites Solely for affordable housing

Of the local authorities that responded positively to this question, most argued that the allocation of sites solely for affordable housing would be appropriate as it is an approach recognised in PPS 3. As a corollary to this, some authorities add that while this may be deemed permissible under government policy, it may also be viewed as running contrary to the expressed aim as set out in PPS 1 to create mixed and balanced communities. Other comments included; “this already applies in some villages and specific urban areas”; and “possibly something to consider in villages but elsewhere this would be difficult to provide justification for”.

APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE

REGIONAL LAND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING SURVEY 2006

Contact Details:

Name: ………………………………………………………………………………………

Telephone No: …………………………………………………………………………….

E-mail Address: …………………………………………………………………………..

Local Authority: ……………………………………………………………………………

Web-site Address for Local Plan/Unitary Development Plan/LDF:

…………………………………………………………………………………………..………

Please return the completed questionnaire by 6th December to:

David Adams
Research Unit
Development Services Directorate
Staffordshire County Council
Riverway
Stafford
ST16 3TJ

Or via e-mail: david.adams@staffordshire.gov.uk

If you have any queries, please don't hesitate to contact me on:
(01785) 276537

Thank you

1. Development Plan

Please ensure that policies and figures relate to the most up to date development plan. This could be an adopted or emerging plan, as long as the emerging plan has reached the core strategy submission stage.

1.1 Which development plan has been used for the answers in Section 1:

Name of plan………………………………………………………………………………..

Time period it covers……………………………………………………………………….

Status (e.g. adopted, at submission stage)……………………………………………

1.2 What is your Authority's housing target as stated in your Local Plan, Unitary Development Plan or emerging LDF. This should be your total provision figure including affordable and market housing.

Target………………………………………………………………………………………..

Time period it covers……………………………………………………………………….

1.3 Does your Authority have an affordable housing target in your local development plan?

☐ Yes ☐ No

1.4 If yes, please state the number of affordable dwellings and/or the proportion of affordable housing required in the plan and which time period they relate to.

Numbers of Dwellings: ………………………………………………………………..
Dates this relates to: …………………………………………………………………..

Proportion of Affordable Housing (%): ...……………………………………………
Dates this relates to: ………………………………………………………………….

1.5 What threshold would trigger a requirement for affordable housing provision in your plan?

……………………………………………………………………………..……………………..

1.6 What definition of affordable housing are you using in your plan? (please tick appropriate box).

Social Rented ☐

Intermediate Housing ☐

Low Cost Market ☐

Please describe the type of Low Cost Market

…………………………………………………………………………………………………….

If your definition deviates from the categories above then please provide an explanation.

……

……

2. Housing Need

2.1 What level of affordable housing is identified in your Authority's local Housing Need Study?

………………………………………………………………………………………..…………………

2.2 What time period does this figure refer to?

………………………………………………………………………………………..………………..

2.3 Date of Housing Needs Study:

………………………………………………………………………………………..……………….

2.4 Author of Housing Needs Study:

………………………………………………………………………………………..………………

3. Completions of Affordable Housing

3.1 Numbers of affordable dwellings completed over last 5 years (01/04/2001 to 31/03/2006):

	Total affordable dwellings dwellings	Affordable dwellings negotiated through S106
Social Rented	……………………..	………………………
Intermediate Housing	……………………..	………………………
Low cost market	……………………..	………………………
Total	……………………..	………………………

Please describe the type of Low Cost Market

……

3.2 If your Authority considers that one or more of the above categories do not apply to your definition of affordable housing please explain your Authority's position below:

………………………………………………………………………………………..……………

………………………………………………………………………………………..……………

………………………………………………………………………………………..……………

……………………………………………………………………………………..……………

……………………………………………………………………………………..……………

……………………………………………………………………………………..……………

4. Commitments of Affordable Housing

4.1 Numbers of affordable dwellings identified as existing commitments as at April 2006, where permission has been granted:

Social Rented	……………………………….
Intermediate Housing	……………………………….
Low Cost Market	……………………………….
Total	…………………….

Please describe the type of Low Cost Market

……………………………………………………………………………..…………………………

4.2 Numbers of affordable dwellings identified as existing commitments as at April 2006, where permission has not yet been granted:

Social Rented	……………………………….
Intermediate Housing	……………………………….
Low Cost Market	……………………………….
Total	…………………….

Please describe the type of Low Cost Market

……………………………………………………………………………..…………………………..

5. Future Estimates: 2006-2011
There should be no duplication between this section and the previous commitments section.

5.1 Maximum estimated numbers of affordable housing that should be delivered through your Authority's current policies through the planning system (01/04/2006 to 31/03/2011):

Social Rented	……………………………….
Intermediate Housing	……………………………….
Low Cost Market	……………………………….
Total	…………………….

Please describe the type of Low Cost Market

……………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………

5.2 Likely achievable numbers of affordable housing delivered through your Authority's current policies through the planning system (01/04/2006 to 31/03/2011):

Social Rented ……………………………….

Intermediate Housing ……………………………….

Low Cost Market ……………………………….

Total …………………….

Please describe the type of Low Cost Market

……………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………

5.3 Is your Authority reviewing your existing affordable housing policies in your development plan?

☐ Yes ☐ No

5.4 If yes, what would the maximum estimated number and/or proportion of affordable housing be under the revised policy framework 2006 – 2011 (01/04/2006 – 31/03/2011)?

Numbers of Dwellings:

Social Rented ……………………………….

Intermediate Housing ……………………………….

Low Cost Market ……………………………….

Total …………………….

Please describe the type of Low Cost Market

……………………………………………………………………………………..…………………………...

Proportion of Affordable Housing (%): ……………………………….

Definition that this proportion relates to: ……………………………….

……

5.5 What would the likely threshold be that would trigger a requirement for affordable housing provision?

……………………………………………………………………………………..……………..

6. Future Estimates: 2011-2026

6.1 Looking at the period post-2011, do you envisage your Authority continuing to negotiate for affordable housing (e.g. through the single housing pot or Section 106 Agreements)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

6.2 If Yes, please consider the RSS housing options for your authority as set out in Appendix 1. What are the maximum annual numbers/proportions of affordable houses that your authority can deliver under the three options through the planning system 2011-2026. Please be realistic but fairly visionary in your response.

	per annum rate	proportion of total completions
Option 1:		
Social Rented	………………………………	
Intermediate Housing	…………………….	
Low Cost Market	……………………	
Total	………………………………	………………………………
Option 2:		
Social Rented	………………………………	
Intermediate Housing	…………………….	
Low Cost Market	……………………	
Total	………………………………	………………………………
Option 3:		
Social Rented	………………………………	
Intermediate Housing	…………………….	
Low Cost Market	……………………	
Total	………………………………	………………………………

6.3 Are there any barriers that would need to be overcome to achieve the above levels of delivery between 2011 and 2026?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………

………

7. Commuted Sums

Please ensure that there is no duplication between affordable housing completions achieved through commuted sums and numbers of affordable housing completions in Question 3.

Some Local Authorities have negotiated affordable housing through the use of commuted sums for development on other sites. Could you please tell us of your use of this mechanism by answering the following questions:

7.1 Does your Authority negotiate commuted sums for the provision of affordable housing?

☐ Yes ☐ No

7.2 If yes, please state the amount (£s) of commuted sums received (01/04/2001 to 31/03/2006):

…………………………………………………………………………………..………………….

7.3 Number of dwellings completed through commuted sums (01/04/2001 to 31/03/2006):

……………………………………………………………………………………..…………

Social Rented ……………………………….

Intermediate Housing ……………………………….

Low Cost Market ……………………………….

Total ……………………………….

Please describe the type of Low Cost Market

…………………………………………………………………………..……………………………

8. Additional questions

8.1 Do you think that you would be able to allocate sites solely for affordable housing in your LDD? This would be sites over and above rural exceptions sites and could be larger sites within villages, market towns and larger urban areas.

………

………

………

Appendix 1: RSS Housing Options Annual Build Rates (gross) 2001 – 2026

Source: Extracted from WMRSS Phase Two Revision Spatial Options 8th January – 5th March 2007

	Annual Build Rate [1] 2001-2005	Option 1 Dwellings 2001-2026	Option 2 Dwellings 2001-2026	Option 3 Dwellings 2001-2026
Birmingham	3,016	2,832	3,344	3,680
Coventry	716	760	976	1,760
Black Country	**2,452**	**3,176** [3]	**3,996** [4]	**4,268** [5]
Solihull	537	440	600	720
Metropolitan Area Total	**6,721**	**7,208**	**8,916**	**10,428**
Shropshire	**1,148**	**992**	**1,164**	**1,164**
Bridgnorth	148	172	128	128
North Shropshire	272	156	280	280
Oswestry	221	116	168	168
Shrewsbury and Atcham	250	432	388	388
South Shropshire	256	116	200	200
Telford and Wrekin	**694**	**960**	**1,200**	**1,440**
Staffordshire	**2,813**	**2,052**	**2,716**	**3,116**
Cannock Chase	427	240	280	280
East Staffordshire	266	308	600 [2]	600 [2]
Lichfield	580	260	440	640
Newcastle-under-Lyme	207	288	300	300
South Staffordshire	248	200	200	200
Stafford	615	380	516	516
Staffordshire Moorlands	246	220	220	220
Tamworth	224	156	160	360 [2]
Stoke-on-Trent	**721**	**600**	**840**	**840**
Warwickshire	**2,586**	**1,560**	**2,100**	**2,700**
North Warwickshire	132	124	156	156
Nuneaton	572	400	524	624
Rugby	403	284	524	924 [2]
Stratford-upon-Avon	640	288	372	372
Warwick	840	464	524	624
Worcestershire	**2,101**	**1,244**	**1,892**	**2,492**
Bromsgrove	521	152	188	288
Malvern Hills	240	144	252	252
Redditch	306	172	328 [2]	528 [2]
Worcester	209	288	472 [2]	672 [2]
Wychavon	453	304	464	564
Wyre Forest	372	184	188	188
Herefordshire	**588**	**640**	**820**	**820**
Shire and Unitary Authorities	**10,649**	**8,048**	**10,732**	**12,572**
Major Urban Areas [6]	7,648	8,096	10,056	11,568
Other Areas	9,722	7,160	9,592	11,432
WEST MIDLANDS REGION	**17,369**	**15,256**	**19,648**	**23,000**

Notes:

[1] Taken from the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy Annual Monitoring Reports 2001-2005.

[2] To accommodate housing growth based at this centre may imply development in neighbouring districts.

[3] Detailed distribution of this provision would be determined through a Black Country Joint Core Strategy. Indicative figures at present are:

Dudley:	840	Sandwell:	944
Walsall:	696	Wolverhampton:	696

[4] Detailed distribution of this provision would be determined through a Black Country Joint Core Strategy. Indicative figures at present are:

Dudley:	952	Sandwell:	1,396
Walsall:	840	Wolverhampton:	808

[5] Detailed distribution of this provision would be determined through a Black Country Joint Core Strategy. Indicative figures at present are:

Dudley:	1,016	Sandwell:	1,456
Walsall:	896	Wolverhampton:	900

[6] MUAs include Metropolitan districts plus Stoke-on-Trent and Newcastle under Lyme.

[7] Totals may not add due to rounding.

APPENDIX 2: QUESTIONNAIRE GUIDANCE NOTES

Regional Land for Affordable Housing Survey 2006: Guidance Notes

The purpose of this questionnaire is to update the 2004 survey of local authorities in terms of how much affordable housing can be delivered through the planning system. There are also some additional questions in relation to issues that need to be addressed by the RSS review.

The questionnaire is essentially a technical exercise. The only question that may demand an interpretation of the figures in the light of local politics is 5.2. All other questions are intended to be relatively straightforward. For more detailed guidance on individual questions please see below:

No.	Question	Guidance
	Contact Details	
	Web-Site Address for Development Plan	If your Local Plan or Unitary Development Plan (UDP) is available on your web-site could you please include the web-site address e.g. http://www.stratford.gov.uk/planning/planning-693.cfm
1	**Local Plan**	
1.1	Development plan details	Please state the full name of the development plan, the time period it covers and the status of the plan (e.g. adopted, at submission stage etc) that the figures in section 1 refer to. The plan should be either an adopted local plan/UDP or emerging LDF as long as it has reached the submission stage of the core strategy.
1.2	Housing target	Please state your housing target as defined in the most up to date Development Plan and the dates that the target relates to.
1.3	Affordable housing target	Please refer to the most up to date Development Plan as defined in 1.1.
1.4	Number and/or Proportion (%) of affordable dwellings required in the development plan.	Please supply both numbers of dwellings and the proportion of affordable housing sought in Local Plan/UDP/emerging LDF policies if possible. Alternatively, if only one is known either the numbers or the proportions would be acceptable. If your Authority prescribes more than one proportion please list the different proportions and when they would be applied.
1.5	Threshold	Size of development (i.e. number of dwellings) above which negotiations would commence in order to provide an element of affordable housing on the site.
1.6	Definition	Please tick the appropriate boxes and provide explanations as required. Definitions of each type of affordable housing are as follows (consistent with Draft PPS3): **Social Rented Housing:** Rented housing owned by local authorities and registered social landlords for which guideline rents are determined through the national rent regime, set out in the 'Guide to Social Rent Reforms' published in March 2001.

		Also, rented housing owned by other persons and provided under equivalent rental arrangements to the above, as agreed with the local authority or funded with grant from the housing corporation, as provided for in the Housing Act 2004. **Intermediate Housing:** Housing at prices or rents above those of social-rent but below market prices or rents. This can include shared equity products (for example HomeBuy) and intermediate rents (i.e. rent above social rented level but below market rents). Intermediate housing differs from low cost market housing (which Government does not consider to be affordable housing). For the purposes of this survey low cost market housing delivered by developers through Section 106 agreements (without the aid of a public grant) at a discounted price which stays discounted in perpetuity should be counted as intermediate housing. **Low cost market housing:** Examples: Low cost market housing delivered at a discount by developers through a S106 agreement, which does not remain discounted in perpetuity. Low cost market housing which is regarded as cheap housing (e.g. small terraces) but is actually sold at market price.
2	**Housing Need**	
2.1	Level of affordable housing identified in Housing Need Study	Please supply total of affordable housing identified, not annual figures.
2.2	Time period of Housing Needs study	Please supply the actual dates that the figure in 2.1 relates to. If, for example, it relates to a 3-year period please give the years e.g. 2001-2004.
2.3	Date of Housing Needs study	Date when the Housing Needs study was produced.
2.4	Author of Housing Needs study	Name of the consultants who produced the study or alternatively the name of the authority if it was carried out in-house.
3	**Completions of Affordable Housing**	
3.1	Numbers of affordable dwellings completed (01/04/2001 to 31/03/2006)	Please include all affordable housing completions **except those achieved through commuted sums** and ensure that there is no duplication between any of the 3 categories (of Social, Intermediate and Low Cost Market). If your Authority does not consider a particular category to be affordable (e.g. Low Cost is still so expensive that it is not truly affordable) please still fill in the numbers of dwellings built, but fill in 3.2 to state what your authority considers to be affordable. Please refer to the definitions as set out in 1.6. Please include a total figure in the space supplied.
3.2	Definition of Affordable Housing	The categories refer to **Social Rented Housing**, **Intermediate**, **Low Cost Market.** If your Authority does not consider one or more of these categories to truly reflect your Authority's definition of affordability then please explain your reasons.
4	**Commitments of Affordable Housing**	

4.1	Affordable commitments where permission has been granted	If the affordable housing is dependent on a Section 106 agreement being signed, do not include it until the agreement has been finalized. Please include figures broken down by the three categories, where this data is available, and a total figure. Definitions for the three categories are the same as for question 1.6.
4.2	Affordable commitments where permission has not yet been granted	This question relates to all affordable housing where there is no planning permission yet and where the Section 106 agreement has not been signed yet. This will include estimated numbers of affordable housing to be provided on allocated sites, but please only include allocations in **adopted** plans. Please include figures broken down by the three categories, where this data is available, and a total figure. Definitions for the three categories are the same as for question 1.6.
5	**Future Estimates: 2006-2011**	
5.1	Maximum estimated numbers of affordable housing (2006-2011)	This question is designed to determine how many affordable dwellings should be provided if your Authority's current affordable housing policies were implemented to the full on all applications within the limit of your Authority's housing allocation. Please include figures broken down by the three categories, where this data is available, and a total figure. Definitions for the three categories are the same as for question 1.6.
5.2	Likely achievable numbers of affordable housing (2004-2011)	This question requires your Authority to take into account any obstacles that may arise to prevent your Authority from delivering the affordable housing policies e.g. failure to implement policies; political opposition; reluctance of developers etc. Please include figures broken down by the three categories, where this data is available, and a total figure. Definitions for the three categories are the same as for question 1.6.
5.3	Reviewing existing affordable housing policies	Only answer 'Yes' if your Authority intends to review the affordable housing policies between now and 2011. For example, if your Authority is about to embark on a review of your Local Plan/UDP in the next few years.
5.4	Revised maximum estimated numbers or proportion of affordable housing (2006-2011)	Only complete 5.4 if the answer to 5.3 is 'Yes'. This question allows you to put forward revised figures 2006 – 2011 if affordable housing policies are expected to change. Numbers of dwellings would be preferable, but if only the proportion is known then that would be adequate. If your Authority prescribes more than one proportion please list the different proportions and when they would be applied. Please ensure that we can calculate the % increase or decrease in estimated figures between 5.1 and 5.4. Please include figures broken down by the three categories, where this data is available, and a total figure. Definitions for the three categories are the same as for question 1.6.
5.5	Threshold	Size of development (i.e. number of dwellings) above which

		negotiations would commence in order to provide an element of affordable housing on the site.
6	**Future Estimates: 2011-2026**	
6.1	Negotiating for affordable housing	The single housing pot is money that is made available to Local Authorities from the Regional Housing Board. Section 106 agreement is a legal agreement between Local Authorities and developers to ensure that developers make provision for affordable housing within their housing development.
6.2	Estimated number or proportion of affordable housing under the proposed RSS housing options	Please consider the maximum annual numbers/proportions of affordable houses that your authority can deliver under the three RSS Housing Options between 2011 and 2026 (set out in Appendix 1). Numbers should be expressed as a per annum rate, in terms of what on average can realistically be delivered per year between 2011 and 2026. Proportions should relate to the whole period. Proportions are a percentage of the build rate set out in the RSS Options One to Three in Appendix 1. Categories are detailed as in 1.6. Please try and breakdown the figures by 3 categories, but if this is not possible a total will suffice.
6.3	Barriers to overcome	What barriers might need to be overcome to achieve the response in 6.3, examples might include a different policy framework at the regional level, improved negotiations on S106 agreements.
7	**Commuted Sums**	
7.1	Negotiate commuted sums	Is this a mechanism your Authority makes use of?
7.2	Amount of commuted sums received (01/04/2001 to 31/03/2006	In the event that developers do not directly provide affordable housing within their own development they may provide the finances for affordable housing to be built elsewhere. The amount of commuted sums is specified in the Section 106 agreement.
7.3	Numbers of dwellings completed through commuted sums (01/04/2001 to 01/03/2004)	This money ought to be spent on building other affordable dwellings elsewhere within your Authority. Please only list the number of dwellings **completed** during this time period.
8	**Additional Questions**	
8.1	Sites solely for affordable housing.	Do you think that you would be able to allocate sites solely for affordable housing in your LDD's? This would be sites over and above rural exception sites and could be larger sites within villages, market towns and larger urban areas.

Contact List

For any further assistance in completing the questionnaire please contact any of the members of the steering group:

David Adams Staffordshire County Council (01785 276537)
david.adams@staffordshire.gov.uk

Amanda Turner Staffordshire County Council (01785 277356)
amanda.turner@staffordshire.gov.uk