

North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT: VOLUME 1



ROGER TYM & PARTNERS
Planners and Development Economists

Main Report
February 2009

ROGER TYM & PARTNERS

3 Museum Square
Leicester
LE1 6UF

t 0116 249 3970
f 0116 249 3971
e leicester@tymconsult.com
w www.tymconsult.com

This document is formatted for double-sided printing.

Foreword

This document is the first Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) for North Northamptonshire. The SHLAA considers the potential supply of housing for a range of settlements in North Northamptonshire over a 20 year period from a base date of April 2008. The SHLAA is a technical study of housing potential, working on the best available information at a point in time; this means it is not necessarily fully inclusive.

Between April 2008 and the publication of the final report, it is likely that some circumstances will have changed such as, for instance, resolutions to grant planning permission on particular sites. The SHLAA will be updated annually to ensure that the assumptions within it and the estimates of supply are as up to date as possible.

The SHLAA forms part of the LDF evidence base, along with a range of other technical studies. It does not in any way prejudice decisions to be taken by the Joint Planning Committee or by individual district/borough planning authorities, in relation to preferred directions of growth, site identification in Development Plan Documents (DPDs) or the determination of planning applications.

The planning authorities will use the SHLAA as a starting point for their consideration of which sites to bring forward as allocations in the site specific DPDs. Considerable further work will be required in order to ensure that the identification of sites in such Plans is based on sound and up to date information.

If you have more up to date information that you feel will be relevant to the first annual SHLAA update, and would help in analysing the full potential of any site, please contact the North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit on (tel) 01536 274974.

North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit

Glossary

Abbreviation

AAP	Area Action Plan
AMR	Annual Monitoring Report
CFS	Call for Sites
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
CLG	Communities and Local Government
CSS	Core Spatial Strategy
DPH	Dwellings per hectare
ECA	Environment Character Assessment
JPU	Joint Planning Unit
LDDs	Local Development Documents
LDF	Local Development Framework
LPA	Local Planning Authority
LSH	Lambert Smith Hampton
MKSM	Milton Keynes and South Midlands
NLUD	National Land Use Database
OWCS	Outline Water Cycle Strategy
PDL	Previously Developed Land
RNRP	River Nene Regional Park
RSS	Regional Spatial Strategy
SHLAA	Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment
SOS	Secretary of State
SSP	Site Specific Proposals
SUEs	Sustainable Urban Extensions
WwCS	Wastewater Capacity Study

CONTENTS

1	PURPOSE OF THE STUDY, STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT AND STRUCTURE OF OUR REPORT	1
	Purpose of the Study	1
	Stakeholder Involvement	1
	Structure of Our Report.....	2
2	THE REQUIREMENTS OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL POLICY	5
	Planning Policy Statement 1 (January 2005): Delivering Sustainable Development.....	5
	Planning Policy Statement 3 (November 2006): Housing	5
	Planning Policy Statement 12 (June 2008): Local Spatial Planning.....	6
	SHLAA Practice Guidance (July 2007)	7
	Regional Policy Context.....	9
	Summary	10
3	LOCAL POLICY CONTEXT	11
	North Northamptonshire Local Development Framework	11
	Local Development Documents for Corby, East Northamptonshire, Kettering and Wellingborough.....	13
	Other Relevant Technical Studies	15
	Key Messages from Our Review of the Local Policy Context	16
4	METHODOLOGY AND DATA SOURCES	17
	Parameters	17
	Sources of Potential Housing Sites.....	19
	The Sites Database	20
5	HOUSING COMMITMENTS, DEMOLITIONS, AND UNDER- OR OVER-SUPPLY AGAINST CSS TARGETS SINCE THE CSS BASE DATE	29
	Housing Commitments	29
	Consideration of Under-Provision Against the CSS Housing Requirements Since the Base Date of the CSS, Taking Into Account Demolitions.....	33
6	HOUSING YIELD ASSESSMENT	41
	Approach to Identified Sites	41
	Assessment of Whether There is a Need to Make a Small Site Allowance.....	43
	Site Yield by Category Band	44
7	TOTAL HOUSING YIELD, SITE CATEGORISATION & CONTRIBUTION FROM THE SUSTAINABLE URBAN EXTENSIONS	49
	Introduction	49
	Adequacy of Housing Provision	49
	Contribution from the Sustainable Urban Extensions.....	56
8	SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS	59
	Introduction	59
	Key Strategic Policy Issues.....	59
	Study Parameters and Technical Issues.....	60
	Housing Yield Assessment and Site Categorisation	60
	Sustainable Urban Extensions and Other 'Broad Locations'	62

1 PURPOSE OF THE STUDY, STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT AND STRUCTURE OF OUR REPORT

Purpose of the Study

- 1.1 In February 2008, Roger Tym & Partners was commissioned by the North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit (JPU) to undertake a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) across North Northamptonshire, which is the area covered by Corby, East Northamptonshire, Kettering and Wellingborough Councils. The purpose of the study is to identify sufficient 'deliverable' sites to meet each Council's 5 year dwelling targets, and further 'developable' sites to meet 10, 15 and 20 year dwelling targets, as required by PPS3.
- 1.2 As well as sites which already had planning permission for housing at the study base date (1 April 2008), we have assessed almost 600 specific sites in terms of their 'suitability', 'availability' and 'achievability' for housing development, in accordance with PPS3 and the CLG's SHLAA Practice Guidance of July 2007¹. The Northampton office of Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH) was engaged as a sub-consultant to advise on 'achievability' considerations.
- 1.3 The outputs from the SHLAA study will provide each Council with information on a range of potential housing sites - covering both greenfield and previously developed land - and an indication of how their respective dwelling targets could potentially be met. This evidence can then be used to inform the Councils' Site Allocations DPDs.
- 1.4 **It is important to emphasise that the SHLAA is a technical study to inform decisions on allocating sites. A site's inclusion in the SHLAA does not in itself determine whether a site should be allocated for housing development in the relevant Council's land allocations DPD, and it does not guarantee planning permission for housing development.**

Stakeholder Involvement

- 1.5 Reflecting advice in the Guidance that stakeholders should be engaged in the SHLAA process from the outset, we have undertaken a wide range of consultation exercises to inform the study, as detailed below.

Stakeholder Seminars

- 1.6 An initial stakeholder event was held on Monday 17 March 2008 at the JPU's offices in Corby, attended by officers from the four North Northamptonshire Councils and a range of external stakeholders including landowners, developers, housebuilders, planning consultants and agents. The purpose of the event was to brief stakeholders on the study objectives and describe our approach to the study and technical inputs/assumptions, in order to ensure that the study procedure/outputs are consistent with other SHLAA studies that are being undertaken elsewhere in the sub-region, and to share and pool information and intelligence on housing delivery and achievability issues.
- 1.7 We presented our emerging study findings to a similar audience on Tuesday 16 December, this time at the Rushden & Diamonds Conference Centre in Irthlingborough. Our study findings were generally well-received by attendees, who made several useful comments and observations, which we have taken on board in drafting our report.

¹ Hereafter referred to as 'the Guidance'.

Consultation with Strategic Public Sector Bodies and Utilities Providers

- 1.8 Early in the study we consulted with a range of strategic public sector bodies such as the Environment Agency, English Partnerships, the Highways Agency and Natural England in order to identify any particular constraints that may have a bearing on the delivery of housing in the study area. We used the information gained from these consultations to inform our work.
- 1.9 We have also liaised closely with utilities providers, to establish whether there are any significant utilities capacity issues in the study area that we should be aware of.

Consultations with Local Estate Agents and the River Nene Regional Park

- 1.10 LSH consulted with a range of local estate agents early in the study with a view to identifying any particular, locally specific housing-related issues in any parts of the study area. LSH used the intelligence gained from these consultations when it assessed the 'achievability' of sites. It is important to emphasise at the outset that LSH's achievability assessments, and the study generally, have been undertaken as if we are operating in normal market conditions.
- 1.11 In order to assess the potential impacts on landscape, heritage and biodiversity associated with housing development, we have made use of the extensive Environment Character Assessment (ECA) work that was undertaken by the River Nene Regional Park (RNRP) to inform the North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (CSS), and subsequent updates of the ECA work which the RNRP undertook to inform this SHLAA study.

Call for Sites

- 1.12 We undertook a 'call for sites' (CFS) exercise between February and April 2008. Information on potential housing sites was requested from an extensive list of consultees, including: landowners, housebuilders, developers, planning consultants, architects, agents and housing associations. The CFS invitation letter is provided as Appendix 1. The CFS was also publicised in the local press and on the internet².

Liaison with the JPU

- 1.13 As well as the consultations outlined above, we have also liaised closely with the client steering group throughout the study.
- 1.14 All of the very useful and informative dialogue described above - both with Council and JPU officers as well as the various stakeholders - has informed our work and has helped to ensure that the study outputs are as robust as possible. We submitted our draft final report and associated volumes/other outputs to the JPU in December 2008. In finalising our outputs we have taken account of the very constructive feedback that we received following extensive checking of the draft study outputs by the Borough/District Councils and the JPU.

Structure of Our Report

- 1.15 Following this introduction, the remainder of our report is structured as follows:
- Section 2 contains a review of the national and regional planning policy contexts, as well as the Practice Guidance which dictates how SHLAAs should be undertaken.
 - Section 3 provides a review of the local planning policy context.
 - Section 4 provides details of our methodology, including the study parameters and the sources of data used to identify potential housing sites. This section also

² <http://www.northantset.co.uk/news/Homes-target-is-revealed.3849417.jp>

provides details of our sites database, which contains comprehensive details for each site that we assessed in the study.

- Section 5 sets out details of housing 'commitments' in the four North Northamptonshire Council areas - that is, sites within the study area that already benefit from planning permission for residential use - and assesses whether there has been an under- or over-supply against the CSS dwelling targets since April 2001.
- Section 6 contains details of how we categorised the sites that we assessed, and then sets out the number of sites in each category band and their potential combined yield.
- Section 7 then sets out the potential that could contribute to housing supply over the next 20 years, from sites with planning permission and other sites identified in the SHLAA as potentially suitable for housing.
- Section 8 then summarises the main findings from the SHLAA.

1.16 Our overall study outputs are as follows:

- Volume 1 - 'Main Report';
- Volume 2 - 'Appendices to the Main Report'³, which contains the following:
 - Appendix 1 - Call for Sites Invitation Letter
 - Appendix 2 - Criteria Used to Identify Settlements and Broad Locations for Conducting a Search for Sites, and Plan Showing the Agreed Settlements/Broad Locations
 - Appendix 3 - Assessment Factors and Criteria Used to Assess Sites' Housing Potential
 - Appendix 4 - Schedule of Category 1 Sites
 - Appendix 5 - Schedule of Category 2 Sites
 - Appendix 6 - Schedule of Category 3 Sites
 - Appendix 7 - Spatial Distribution of Category 1, Category 2 and Category 3 Sites
 - Appendix 8 - Plan Showing the Location of the Sustainable Urban Extensions
- the Microsoft Access Sites Database, which contains details of the 577 sites that we visited and assessed; and
- a MapInfo GIS layer which contains digitised polygons for the 577 sites in our Sites Database for which we have identified a theoretical yield.

³ Any references in our report to 'Appendices' relate to the Appendices that are contained in Volume 2.

2 THE REQUIREMENTS OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL POLICY

Planning Policy Statement 1 (January 2005): Delivering Sustainable Development

- 2.1 PPS1 sets out overarching strategic planning policies, including the contribution that the planning system can make to the delivery of sustainable development, which is the core principle underpinning planning.
- 2.2 A key objective of PPS1 is to ensure that development supports existing communities and contributes to the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities. Paragraph 27 sets out the general approach to delivering sustainable development; planning authorities should seek to:
- bring forward sufficient land of a suitable quality in appropriate locations to meet the expected needs for housing;
 - reduce the need to travel and encourage accessible public transport provision to secure more sustainable patterns of transport development; and
 - promote the use of suitably located vacant and underused previously developed land (PDL) in order to achieve Government targets.

Planning Policy Statement 3 (November 2006): Housing

- 2.3 PPS3 replaced the previous PPG3 as the statement of the national planning policy framework for delivering the Government's housing objectives. PPS3 establishes the requirement for LPAs to undertake SHLAAs which replace the housing capacity studies required under PPG3. It specifies in Annex C that a SHLAA should:
- *'Assess the likely level of housing that could be provided if unimplemented planning permissions were brought into development.*
 - *Assess land availability by identifying buildings or areas of land (including previously developed and greenfield land) that have development potential for housing, including within mixed use developments.*
 - *Assess the potential level of housing that can be provided on identified land.*
 - *Where appropriate, evaluate past trends in windfall land coming forward for development and estimate the likely future implementation rate.*
 - *Identify constraints that might make a particular site unavailable and/or unviable for development.*
 - *Identify sustainability issues and physical constraints that might make a site unsuitable for development.*
 - *Identify what action could be taken to overcome constraints on particular sites.'*
- 2.4 PPS3 states that LPAs should set out in Local Development Documents (LDDs) their policies and strategies for delivering the level of housing provision set out in the RSS, including identifying broad locations and specific sites that will enable continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years from the date of adoption.
- 2.5 One of the key differences between PPS3 and PPG3 is that windfall allowances should no longer be included in the first 10 years of land supply in LDFs, unless there are *'genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites being identified'* (PPS3 paragraph 59). This places greater emphasis on the need to identify sites which can be confidently allocated for housing in LDFs.

- 2.6 PPS3 reiterates the previous PPG3 policy that the priority for development should be PDL - in particular vacant and derelict sites and buildings - and it requires LPAs to ensure that sufficient, suitable land is available to achieve their PDL delivery objectives. However, unlike housing capacity studies under PPG3, SHLAAs are required to consider the potential of greenfield sites to deliver housing, as well as PDL.
- 2.7 PPS3 states that LDDs should include a local PDL target and trajectory, and strategies for bringing PDL into housing use. Where appropriate, the trajectory could be divided up to reflect the contribution expected from different categories of PDL - for example, vacant and derelict sites - in order to deliver the spatial vision for the area in the most sustainable way. In developing their PDL strategies, LPAs are advised (in paragraph 44) that they:
- 'should consider a range of incentives or interventions that could help to ensure that previously developed land is developed in line with the trajectory/ies. This should include:*
- *planning to address obstacles to the development of vacant and derelict sites and buildings, for example, use of compulsory purchase powers where that would help resolve land ownership or assembly issues.*
 - *considering whether sites that are currently allocated for industrial or commercial use could be more appropriately re-allocated for housing development.*
 - *encouraging innovative housing schemes that make effective use of public sector previously-developed land.'*
- 2.8 The content of PPS3, as summarised above, has clear implications for the information to be included and assessed in a SHLAA.

Planning Policy Statement 12 (June 2008): Local Spatial Planning

- 2.9 This study will form part of the evidence base upon which the four Councils will draw in developing various DPDs, in particular those relating to allocations of land. The North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (CSS) was adopted in June 2008 and so we do not consider it necessary to provide a detailed review of the advice in Section 4 of PPS12 relating to the nature of core strategies and their preparation.
- 2.10 For the purposes of this report, we summarise the requirements regarding 'other' DPDs, which will include the DPDs relating to site specific allocations and policies.
- Requirements of PPS12 for 'Other' DPDs*
- 2.11 Paragraph 5.3 of PPS12 explains that LPAs may prepare other DPDs to provide additional detail which would not be suitable in a core strategy, and which requires the status of a development plan. For instance, if it is necessary to allocate further sites - over and above the strategic sites which can be allocated in a core strategy - then a DPD must be used to allocate these sites.
- Test of Soundness for 'Other' DPDs*
- 2.12 Paragraph 5.2 of PPS12 introduces a new test of 'soundness' for 'other' DPDs, as follows:

'To be "sound" a DPD should be justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

"Justified" means that the document must be:

- *founded on a robust and credible evidence base*
- *the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives*

“Effective” means that the document must be:

- *deliverable*
- *flexible*
- *able to be monitored*

2.13 The soundness test for DPDs is the same as the soundness test for core strategies, as specified by paragraph 4.52 of PPS12. Of key relevance to the SHLAA study is the greater emphasis placed by PPS12 on the need for core strategies and DPDs to be: *‘...the most appropriate, when considered against the reasonable alternatives’*. (Paragraph 4.38 of PPS12, our emphasis)

SHLAA Practice Guidance (July 2007)

- 2.14 Practice Guidance for undertaking SHLAAs was published by Communities and Local Government (CLG) in July 2007⁴. It supersedes the advice in the previous guidance entitled ‘Tapping the Potential’⁵, which related to housing capacity studies.
- 2.15 In paragraph 1, the Guidance states that SHLAAs are *‘a key component of the evidence base to support the delivery of sufficient land for housing to meet the community’s need for more homes’*. The Guidance emphasises that a SHLAA is significantly different from a housing capacity study, and if a recent capacity study has been carried out, further work will be needed to fulfill the requirements of the SHLAA.
- 2.16 The Guidance states that the primary role of the SHLAA is to:
- identify sites with potential for housing;
 - assess their housing potential; and
 - assess when they are likely to be developed.
- 2.17 A SHLAA should aim to identify as many sites with housing potential in and around as many settlements as possible in the study area. The study area should preferably be a sub-regional housing market area, but may be an LPA area, where necessary. As a minimum, the SHLAA should aim to identify sufficient specific sites for at least the first 10 years of a plan, from the anticipated date of its adoption, and ideally for longer than the whole 15 year plan period⁶. Where it is not possible to identify sufficient sites, the SHLAA should provide the evidence base to support judgements around whether broad locations should be identified and/or whether there are *‘genuine local circumstances’* that mean a windfall allowance may be justified in the first 10 years of the plan⁷.
- 2.18 Paragraph 8 makes it clear that whilst the assessment is an important evidence source to inform plan-making, it does not in itself determine whether a site should be allocated for housing development. The Guidance also states that the SHLAA should be kept up to date as part of the Annual Monitoring Report exercise, so as to support the updating of the housing trajectory and the five-year supply of specific deliverable sites.
- 2.19 The Guidance provides details on the methodology for a SHLAA which has eight main stages, and two further optional stages covering broad locations and windfalls. The stages are as follows:
- Stage 1: Planning the Assessment;
 - Stage 2: Determining which sources of sites will be included in the Assessment;

⁴ Hereafter referred to simply as ‘the Guidance’.

⁵ DETR, December 2000.

⁶ The CLG consultation document ‘Streamlining Local Development Frameworks’ (November 2007) suggests extending the lifespan of LDF Core Strategies from 10 to 15 years. This will increase compatibility with the requirements of PPS3, which directs LPAs to identify broad locations and specific sites on which to deliver housing for at least 15 years.

⁷ The term *‘genuine local circumstances’* used in paragraphs 7 and 50 of the Guidance is the same term that is used in paragraph 59 of PPS3.

- Stage 3: Desktop review of existing information;
 - Stage 4: Determining which sites and areas will be surveyed;
 - Stage 5: Carrying out the survey;
 - Stage 6: Estimating the housing potential of each site;
 - Stage 7: Assessing when and whether sites are likely to be developed;
 - Stage 8: Review of the Assessment;
 - Stage 9: Identifying and assessing the housing potential of broad locations (when necessary); and
 - Stage 10: Determining the housing potential of windfalls (where justified).
- 2.20 Stage 2 lists the sources of sites with potential for housing, which consist of sites currently in the planning process as well as those that are not in the planning process, namely:
- allocated employment or other land uses which are no longer required for those uses;
 - existing housing allocations, which have not yet been implemented;
 - unimplemented/outstanding planning permissions for housing; and
 - planning permissions for housing that are under construction.
- 2.21 Stage 7 assesses when and whether sites are likely to be developed. Central to this is the consideration of whether sites are suitable, deliverable and developable for housing. Suitability embraces policy restrictions, physical problems/limitations (for instance access, infrastructure, flood risk, ground conditions and contamination), potential impacts (upon the landscape and conservation) and the environmental conditions which would be experienced by prospective residents.
- 2.22 Availability considers, *'on best information available'* (paragraph 39 of the Guidance), whether there are any legal or ownership problems, such as multiple ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies or operational requirements of landowners. Achievability is essentially a judgment about the economic viability of a site. It will be affected by market factors, cost factors (including site preparation costs relating to any physical constraints) and delivery factors (including phasing and build-out rates, which mostly concerns larger sites).
- 2.23 Stage 10 relates to determining the housing potential of windfall sites, where an allowance can be justified. Any allowance for windfalls should be based on an estimate of the amount of housing that could be delivered in the area on land that has not been identified in the list of deliverable/developable sites, or as part of broad locations for housing development. One method to estimate potential from each source is by calculating the average annual completion rate from the source, taking care to avoid double counting sites which are already included in the assessment, and coming to an informed view as to:
- whether the annual rate is likely to increase or decrease;
 - whether the pattern of redevelopment is likely to remain the same, grow or decline; and
 - whether current market conditions are likely to stay the same, worsen or improve in the future.
- 2.24 We cover the SHLAA methodology in greater detail in subsequent sections of our report.

Regional Policy Context

Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands - The East Midlands Regional Plan

- 2.25 The Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) for the East Midlands was published in March 2005, following a partial revision of previous regional guidance - Regional Planning Guidance for the East Midlands (RPG8) - which was adopted in January 2002. The RSS is currently under review, and in September 2006 the Draft RSS was published in two parts - Part 1: 'Regional Strategy', and Part 2: 'Sub-Regional Strategies'. In July 2008, the Secretary of State (SoS) published her Proposed Changes to the draft RSS.
- 2.26 The overall Spatial Strategy is dealt with in Section 2 of the Proposed Changes. Policy 3 ('Concentrating Development in Urban Areas') states that growth should be distributed on the basis of a defined four-tier settlement hierarchy. Thus, it is made clear that the Region's five Principal Urban Areas of Derby, Leicester, Lincoln, Northampton and Nottingham should be the primary focus of new development. At the next tier in the Policy 3 hierarchy, the three Growth Towns of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough are also identified for '*significant levels of new development*'. Various Sub-Regional Centres - as listed in the third tier of the hierarchy - are identified for '*appropriate development of a lesser scale*'. Policy 3 then acknowledges that the '*development needs of other settlements and rural areas should also be provided for*'.
- 2.27 North Northamptonshire is identified as being within the 'Southern Sub-area'. Policy 11 ('Development within the Southern Sub-area') states that the '*regeneration of Corby should be supported by a level of new housing development that will significantly reduce the need for in-commuting*' and that the roles of Kettering and Wellingborough should be '*significantly strengthened*'. Importantly, Policy 11 also states that '*the roles of the small towns in the Sub-area should be retained...*' and that '*the quality of villages should not be downgraded by inappropriate growth*'.
- 2.28 Section 3 of the emerging RSS emphasises that the roles of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough as Growth Towns should be strengthened through '*urban intensification and planned and sustainable urban extensions*'. Policy 13 sets out regional housing provision figures for the period 2001 to 2026; it is important to note that in the Proposed Changes document, the SoS did not alter the average annual rate for each of the four local authorities in North Northamptonshire for the period to 2021. We return to this issue in Section 3 of our report.
- 2.29 The SoS also proposed (Policy 13) that the housing provision figures set out in the RSS should be '*minima*'. Thus, in line with the '*plan, monitor, manage*' approach which underpins PPS3, the SoS lays the foundations for a more flexible approach to housing provision at the local level, by allowing the annual housing figures to be exceeded.
- 2.30 North Northamptonshire is covered by the Milton Keynes and South Midlands (MKSM) Sub-Regional Strategy, which is dealt with by Policy SRS 1 in the emerging RSS. The Secretary of State's proposed changes do not alter the role of the Growth Towns as Policy SRS 1 states that the '*majority of development in Northamptonshire should be concentrated at the Northampton Implementation Area and the neighbouring growth towns of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough*'. Beyond these main urban centres, Policy SRS 1 states that development should be focused at the smaller towns of Desborough, Rothwell, Burton Latimer, Rushden, Higham Ferrers and Irthlingborough, and at the rural service centres such as Oundle, Raunds and Thrapston.
- 2.31 It is important, for the purposes of the SHLAA, to note the content of paragraph 4.1.1 of the Proposed Changes, which states:
- 'The Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy...remains largely unaltered by this review of the Regional Plan except for two alterations relating to housing provision. Housing provision figures for North Northamptonshire districts were not revised except for adding figures for the period 2021-26...Apart from these additions*

the MKSM SRS is unchanged and Part 1 of the Strategy and Part 2 (Northamptonshire) will be reproduced in full in the final version of the RSS. The housing figures will all be revised in a subsequent RSS review.'

- 2.32 Thus, the Secretary of State did not take the opportunity to update the housing provision figures in the Proposed Changes, other than to add figures for the period 2021-26. The latest housing figures for North Northamptonshire as prescribed by the emerging RSS are therefore as follows:

**Table 2.1 East Midlands RSS Average Annual Housing Provision Figures
(as set out in Policy 13 of the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes, July 2008)**

LPA	2001-2006	2006-2011	2011-2016	2016-2026	Total Provision (2001-2026)
Corby	560	680	1,060	1,060	22,100
Kettering	550	810	630	630	16,250
East Northamptonshire	520	520	420	420	11,500
Wellingborough	595	595	685	685	16,225
North Northamptonshire	2,225	2,605	2,795	2,795	66,075

- 2.33 It is anticipated that the final version of the East Midlands Regional Plan will be published early in 2009.

Summary

- 2.34 Sustainable development is the core principle underpinning planning, and national planning policy guidance/statements emphasise the Government's objective of ensuring the delivery of more sustainable patterns of development. To this end, LPAs are required to identify in their LDDs sufficient, suitable land in appropriate locations to enable the continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years from the date of adoption, and are charged with promoting the reuse of vacant and underused PDL.
- 2.35 SHLAA studies are an important evidence source to inform plan-making, by identifying whether there are sufficient specific sites (both greenfield and PDL) that are capable of meeting the LPA's housing requirements. The Practice Guidance makes clear, though, that the SHLAA will not in itself determine whether a site should be allocated for housing development.
- 2.36 The Government's core objective of ensuring more sustainable patterns of development is reflected in regional planning policy, which seeks to concentrate most new development within the five Principal Urban Areas and the three Growth Towns of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough. Indeed, the emerging RSS seeks to strengthen the roles of these Growth Towns through '*urban intensification and planned and sustainable urban extensions*'. Beyond these urban centres, the MKSM Sub-Regional Strategy states that development should be focused at the smaller towns of Desborough, Rothwell, Burton Latimer, Rushden, Higham Ferrers and Irthlingborough, and at the rural service centres such as Oundle, Raunds and Thrapston.

3 LOCAL POLICY CONTEXT

North Northamptonshire Local Development Framework

North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (June 2008)

- 3.1 The North Northamptonshire Core Spatial Strategy (CSS) was adopted in June 2008, and covers the period to 31 March 2021. Policy 1 of the CSS ('Strengthening the Network of Settlements') states:

'...development will be principally directed towards the urban core, focused at the three Growth Towns of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough. The smaller towns of Burton Latimer, Desborough, Higham Ferrers, Irthlingborough, Rothwell and Rushden will provide secondary focal points for development within the urban core... [In addition] New sustainable urban extensions to the growth towns will provide major locations for housing and employment growth and reinforce the roles of these settlements....

Development in the rural north east will be mainly directed to a rural service spine comprising the Rural Service Centres of Oundle, Raunds and Thrapston, with a secondary focus at the Local Service Centre of King's Cliffe...

In the remaining rural area development will take place within village boundaries...development adjoining village boundaries will only be justified where it involves the re-use of buildings or, in exceptional circumstances, if it can be clearly demonstrated that it is required in order to meet local needs for employment, housing or services.'

- 3.2 CSS Policy 9 ('Distribution and Location of Development') states that: '*New building development in the open countryside outside the Sustainable Urban Extensions will be strictly controlled.*'
- 3.3 CSS Policy 10 ('Distribution of Housing') confirms that: '*New housing will be focused at the three Growth Towns, with modest growth at the Smaller Towns and Rural Service Centres, limited development in the villages and restricted development in the open countryside.*'
- 3.4 The CSS Key Diagram (Figure 10) illustrates the location of the SUEs, and CSS Policy 16 seeks to achieve a minimum housing density of 35 dwellings per hectare at the SUEs.
- 3.5 The average annual housing provision figures for the period 2001 to 2021 as set out in Table 3 of the CSS are summarised in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1 Average Annual Housing Provision Figures 2001-2021, as Prescribed by the Adopted Core Spatial Strategy

District	2001-06	2006-11	2011-16	2016-21
Corby	298	929	955	1,178
East Northamptonshire	565	428	500	387
Kettering	471	642	774	733
Wellingborough	304	532	883	841
North Northamptonshire Total	1,638	2,531	3,112	3,139

- 3.6 As we explained in Section 2, although the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes to the RSS was published in July 2008 following the adoption of the CSS in June 2008, the housing provision figures for the period 2001-21 as set out in the Proposed Changes are the same as the figures in the Draft RSS (September 2006). We therefore agreed with the JPU that, for this study, we would use the distribution set out in the adopted CSS to 2021 - which is more up to date than the distribution set out in the RSS to 2021 - and that we would use the RSS distribution for the 2021-26 period.

- 3.7 The resultant dwelling targets for each LPA area, for the five 5-year periods between 2001 and 2026, are shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Housing Provision Figures for each 5-Year Period Between 2001 and 2026

LPA	2001-06	2006-11	2011-16	2016-21	2021-26	Total
Corby	1,490	4,645	4,775	5,890	5,300	22,100
East Northamptonshire	2,825	2,140	2,500	1,935	2,100	11,500
Kettering	2,355	3,210	3,870	3,665	3,150	16,250
Wellingborough	1,520	2,660	4,415	4,205	3,425	16,225
North Northamptonshire Total for Period	8,190	12,655	15,560	15,695	13,975	66,075

* Based on the figures in Table 3 of the adopted CSS for the 2001-21 period, and the figures prescribed by Policy 13 of the emerging RSS for the 2021-26 period

- 3.8 As well as specifying district-level housing targets, Table 5 of the CSS also identifies 'indicative housing requirements' for various named settlements. However, CSS Table 5 only disaggregates the district-wide housing requirement figures to the settlement level in terms of the overall 2001-21 requirements, and so the CSS does not specify housing requirements at the settlement level for the four 5-year periods 2001-06, 2006-11, 2011-16 and 2016-21.
- 3.9 Thus, to identify dwelling targets for each District/Borough across each of the forthcoming 5-year periods, we have applied the relevant average annual housing provision rates from Table 3 of the adopted CSS for the period to 2021, and from Policy 13 of the emerging RSS for the post-2021 period. The example below shows how we derived the dwelling targets for East Northamptonshire:
- **First 5-year period from the 1 April 2008 study base date, (i.e. 2008-2013):** 2,284 dwellings [i.e. (428 x 3) + (500 x 2), from Table 3 of the adopted CSS];
 - **Second 5-year period (i.e. 2013-2018):** 2,274 dwellings [i.e. (500 x 3) + (387 x 2), from Table 3 of the adopted CSS];
 - **Third 5-year period (i.e. 2018-2023):** 2,001 dwellings [i.e. (387 x 3) + (420 x 2), from Table 3 of the adopted CSS up to 2021 and then from Policy 13 of the emerging RSS for the post-2021 period]; and
 - **Fourth 5-year period (i.e. 2023-2028):** 2,100 dwellings [i.e. 420 x 5, from Policy 13 of the emerging RSS].
- 3.10 Table 3.3 shows the dwelling targets for each District/Borough across each of the forthcoming 5-year periods.

Table 3.3 Corby, East Northamptonshire, Kettering and Wellingborough 5, 10, 15 and 20-Year Dwelling Targets

LPA	Dwg Reqt, 1st 5 Yrs	Dwg Reqt, 2nd 5 Yrs	Dwg Reqt, 3rd 5 Yrs	Dwg Reqt, 4th 5 Yrs	20-Yr Dwg Reqt
Corby Borough	4,697	5,221	5,654	5,300	20,872
East Northamptonshire District	2,284	2,274	2,001	2,100	8,659
Kettering Borough	3,474	3,788	3,459	3,150	13,871
Wellingborough Borough	3,362	4,331	3,893	3,425	15,011
North Northamptonshire Total	13,817	15,641	15,007	13,975	58,413

Local Development Documents for Corby, East Northamptonshire, Kettering and Wellingborough

- 3.11 A wide range of issues and options papers, draft SPDs, and so on, have been prepared across North Northamptonshire. Below, we focus on those that are of most relevance to the SHLAA study.

Corby Borough Council - LDF for Corby: Issues and Options (September 2005)

- 3.12 The Corby LDF Issues and Options paper set out six aims for the new LDF, one of which is *'to achieve growth in housing, skills and jobs to make Corby a better place in which to live and work'*. The Paper confirmed that outline planning permission had been granted for 5,100 dwellings at Priors Hall, which will form one of the SUEs. The Paper also identified a potential need for a further 4,000 dwellings over the period to 2021 - in addition to the previous RSS requirement for 16,800 dwellings⁸ - which could be carried forward as a further urban extension to Corby.

Corby Borough Council - Site Specific Proposals DPD: Preferred Options (May 2006)

- 3.13 The draft Site Specific Proposals (SSP) DPD identified a residual requirement of approximately 3,862 units from the RSS requirement of 16,800 dwellings by 2021. Policy H3 considered options for major urban extensions to Corby, and stated that *'the preferred option...is to allocate land in the north east of Corby for an initial urban extension. Land to the west of Corby will then be released for a second urban extension prior to 2021 as required'*. It was noted that whilst consultation on potential urban extensions for Corby had revealed a preference for smaller-scale development on the edge of the urban area, a critical mass of between 4,000 and 6,000 units *'would be required to ensure that other facilities and infrastructure are provided as part of a sustainable development'*.

East Northamptonshire Council - Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan: Submission (January 2008)

- 3.14 The submission version of the Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan identifies sites for housing development⁹, as well as employment, recreation and other land uses.
- 3.15 Policy 1 ('Settlement Roles') identifies a four-tier hierarchy of settlements for the area:
- Tier 1 'Rural Service Centres' - Oundle and Thrapston;
 - Tier 2 'Local Service Centres' - King's Cliffe;
 - Tier 3 'Smaller Service Centres' - Nassington and Warmington; and
 - Tier 4 'Network Villages' - Category 'A' and Category 'B' villages as defined in the Plan.
- 3.16 The Plan also details policies in respect of the second Rural Service Centre, Thrapston, and states that the land to the south of Thrapston bounded by the A14 is the most sustainable location for new residential development, with potential to accommodate approximately 685 units as well as additional local facilities.

⁸ This forecast took account of existing commitments; results of the Borough's urban capacity study; anticipated increases in residential development in Corby town centre; windfall sites; and an increase in density at Oakley Vale, as well as the aforementioned permission at Priors Hall.

⁹ The Plan notes that Priors Hall, the sustainable urban extension to the Corby urban area, crosses the boundary into East Northamptonshire District and the Plan Area, and that the District Council is yet to grant planning permission for the parts of the scheme within its District boundaries, which includes 700 dwellings, commercial development, a local centre and a primary school.

- 3.17 Regarding the smaller settlements in the District, Policy KCF2 identifies land at Willow Lane/Wood Road in King's Cliffe for the development of between 145 and 150 dwellings, and the Plan advocates modest extensions to the Smaller Service Centres of Nassington and Warmington.

East Northamptonshire Council - Three Towns Plan: Preferred Options (September 2006)

- 3.18 The Preferred Options consultation draft of the Three Towns Plan, which focuses on the three urban centres of Rushden, Higham Ferrers and Irthlingborough and the surrounding rural hinterland, seeks to make a range of greenfield allocations adjacent to the 'Three Towns' in order to accommodate identified housing needs. The North Northamptonshire Joint CSS, which was adopted since the publication of this Preferred Options Paper, maintains that '*regeneration and modest growth*' should be encouraged in these 'Smaller Towns', which will serve as secondary focal points within the urban core.

East Northamptonshire Council - Raunds Area Plan: Preferred Options (January 2007)

- 3.19 The emerging Raunds Area Plan identifies a preference for urban extensions to the north-east and north-west of the town. The document notes that although priority will be given to development on previously developed land within the existing boundary, most new residential development will take place on greenfield extensions to the town.

Kettering Borough Council - Kettering Town Centre and Kettering Urban Extension Area Action Plan: Issues and Options (September 2006)

- 3.20 The first part of the Issues and Options version of the AAP set out the Council's vision for the development of Kettering town centre, and the second part discussed the urban extension to the east of Kettering as identified in the CSS. The AAP confirms that of the 13,100 dwellings which Kettering Borough is required to provide over the period to 2021, some 7,061 dwellings are accounted for through completed dwellings, and identified/allocated development sites. Thus, at the time of publication, the AAP identified a need to accommodate a further 6,039 dwellings over the period to 2021.

Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan: Preferred Options (August 2008)

- 3.21 During August 2008, consultation took place on the Preferred Options for the Kettering Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP). Section 9 of the AAP sets out Preferred Policy Direction KTC 13, which seeks to make '*significant provision for residential units within the plan period*', and points out that preferred sites could accommodate approximately 1,650 dwellings, of which 1,300 will be delivered by 2021. The majority of new dwellings are envisaged to be provided within a new Residential Quarter, where developments of over 15 dwellings are expected to provide at least 30 per cent of units as affordable.

Borough Council of Wellingborough - Site Specific Proposals & Wellingborough Town Centre Area Action Plan: Issues and Options (February 2006)

- 3.22 This joint Issues and Options consultation document covered two DPDs, namely Site Specific Proposals and the Wellingborough Town Centre AAP. The Site Specific Proposals set out issues and options in respect of individual sites and locations across the Borough, whilst the Town Centre AAP focused on enhancing the role of Wellingborough town centre. The Paper identified a number of Spatial Objectives, and sought to '*provide for 12,800 new dwellings between 2001 and 2021*', in line with the provisions of the adopted CSS.

Borough Council of Wellingborough - Town Centre Area Action Plan: Submission Version (June 2008)

- 3.23 The Borough Council of Wellingborough submitted its Town Centre AAP to the Secretary of State in June 2008. The AAP sets out a vision to '*enhance town centre living with new housing opportunities*', and as such policy WTC13 ('Housing') seeks to provide approximately 850 new homes in the town centre as part of a mixed use development.

Other Relevant Technical Studies

A14 Steering Group Report (January 2007)

- 3.24 The A14 Joint Working, multi-agency Steering Group was formed in 2006, and is chaired by the North Northamptonshire Development Company. The Group published a report for submission to the Transport Minister in January 2007 regarding the impact of the growth rates for North Northamptonshire on the A14. The A14 route is described as '*crucial*' to North Northamptonshire '*both in terms of facilitating internal connectivity and in terms of linkages to other destinations and networks*', including forming part of the Trans-European Transport Network linking the M6, M1 and A1 corridors.
- 3.25 A key issue in terms of local-level traffic is identified in the Kettering area. The report states that the Kettering bypass is amongst the most congested parts of the A14 due to the presence of a number of '*closely-spaced grade separated junctions with other major road corridors (A43, A509, A6), some of which 'share' parts of the existing bypass...much of the congestion problem around Kettering is caused by local traffic hopping on and off the A14*'. These capacity issues are described as a major constraint to growth and as such '*a solution is required that allows the housing and economic growth to take place within the constraints of the local road network and what can reasonably be expected in terms of further investment in it*'.
- 3.26 The report states that the A14 Steering Group has reached 'broad agreement' on a Preferred Option to address the capacity issues on the A14. Proposed measures include the implementation of the Kettering Transport Strategy, '*a co-ordinated package of schemes required for modal shift and to facilitate increased development in the town centre*', and a number of measures to alleviate existing congestion problems in the short to medium term, including the introduction of a new junction to serve the urban extension to the east of Kettering.

WSP - North Northamptonshire Utilities Study (October 2005) and Corby Utilities Study (2004)

- 3.27 In Table 5.2 ('Deliverability of Utilities - Residential Sites') of its North Northamptonshire Utilities Study (2005), which covered East Northamptonshire District and the Boroughs of Kettering and Wellingborough, and Table 9.1 of its Corby Utilities Study (2004), WSP assigned a score of between 1 and 5 for the following utilities: electric supply, gas supply, water supply, surface water, foul water and phone/cable provision.
- 3.28 In the 2004 and 2005 studies, WSP considered only some of the settlements that we have covered in this SHLAA study and so there were large gaps in the information (from our perspective). Therefore, the JPU contacted the various utilities providers and asked them to fill in the missing information and update the existing 2004/2005 data. The only utility for which the JPU was unable to obtain data was electricity. Further details of our approach are provided in Appendix 3.

Halcrow Group - North Northamptonshire Water Cycle Strategy Wastewater Capacity Study: Interim Findings (September 2007)

- 3.29 The Wastewater Capacity Study (WwCS) was commissioned as part of the Water Cycle Strategy for North Northamptonshire, specifically to address the wastewater

capacity issues identified in the Outline Water Cycle Strategy (OWCS) published in January 2007. The OWCS had found that *'the Broadholme Wastewater Treatment Works and its sewer catchment were at or near capacity in many areas with limited ability to accept additional development. It was estimated that additional capacity was unlikely to be made available until 2013. This scenario was at odds with the rate and timing of growth proposed in the CSS'*.

- 3.30 The WwCS report identifies a 'preferred technical solution' to the capacity issues, which *'involves expansion of Broadholme WwTW along with the construction of three new pumping stations and rising mains. The pumping stations would be located north of Kettering; at the proposed East Kettering development site and west of Wellingborough. These could be constructed in parallel with the progression of the major development sites and there is a possibility that developer funding could be sought to facilitate delivery'*. A detailed development and infrastructure timeline confirms that *'the proposed solution can facilitate the development rates proposed in the CSS'*, with work ongoing towards refining the proposed solution.

Key Messages from Our Review of the Local Policy Context

- 3.31 The North Northamptonshire CSS was adopted in June 2008. The CSS principally directs development towards the three Growth Towns of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough, with more modest levels of development to be focused at the smaller towns of Burton Latimer, Desborough, Higham Ferrers, Irthlingborough, Rothwell and Rushden, and in the rural service spine comprising the settlements of Oundle, Raunds and Thrapston, with a secondary focus on King's Cliffe.
- 3.32 In addition, five new Sustainable Urban Extensions to the Growth Towns will provide major locations for housing and employment growth. CSS Policy 16 requires a minimum housing density of 35 dwellings per hectare at the SUEs.
- 3.33 Thus, North Northamptonshire already benefits from an adopted CSS, which clearly defines the directions for future growth. The CSS therefore provides many of the parameters for the SHLAA study.

4 METHODOLOGY AND DATA SOURCES

Parameters

Study Area

- 4.1 The SHLAA study covers the whole of North Northamptonshire. This includes the three Boroughs of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough and the District of East Northamptonshire.

Settlements and Sustainable Urban Extensions Where We Conducted a Search for Sites

- 4.2 In order to identify new sites, over and above outstanding permissions, we needed to identify the settlements within North Northamptonshire which offer the most realistic potential for housing in sustainable locations. The adopted CSS was the starting point for this.
- 4.3 Details of the criteria that we used to select the settlements and SUEs for the search for sites are set out in Appendix 2. The agreed list of 40 existing settlements and the five SUEs where we conducted the search for sites is as listed below and depicted graphically on the plan at the rear of Appendix 2:
- the three 'Growth Towns', where development is principally directed to by the adopted CSS¹⁰;
 - six 'Smaller Towns' which are identified by the CSS as secondary focal points for development within North Northamptonshire's 'urban core', to complement development at the Growth Towns¹¹;
 - four 'Rural Service Centres', which the CSS identifies for more modest levels of development outside of the main urban centres¹²;
 - some 27 'Other Settlements with a Range of Services' (where local service and community facilities provision could be adequate to support limited sustainable housing growth in principle)¹³; and
 - the five SUEs that are identified in the CSS¹⁴.
- 4.4 Early in the process, the JPU wrote to a wide range of agents, landowners, developers, land users and members/representatives of the local community who may have interests in the area. The JPU invited the submission of details for any site considered capable of supporting housing development within/adjacent to any of the 40 study area settlements, or the five SUEs.
- 4.5 A key objective of the CSS is to locate development in the main urban areas - particularly the Growth Towns of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough - so as to support urban renaissance, regeneration, recycling of land and sustainable patterns of travel. The CSS makes clear that there is only limited potential for housing elsewhere, and only where it is necessary for meeting local needs in existing villages.

¹⁰ Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough.

¹¹ Burton Latimer, Desborough, Higham Ferrers, Irthlingborough, Rothwell, and Rushden.

¹² Oundle, Raunds and Thrapston. King's Cliffe is identified in the CSS as having 'a secondary although strategic role to play in the rural north east' and so we have also treated it as a Rural Service Centre.

¹³ For the purposes of this study we have treated the following as 'Other Settlements with a Range of Services' (these settlements have good provision of community facilities and local services): Aldwincle, Barnwell, Bozeat, Brigstock, Broughton, Bulwick, Cottingham/Middleton, Earls Barton, Easton on the Hill, Finedon, Geddington, Great Doddington, Gretton, Irchester, Little Addington, Mawsley, Nassington, Pytchley, Ringstead, Stanion, Stanwick, Titchmarsh, Warmington, Weldon, Wilbarston/Stoke Albany, Wollaston, and Woodford.

¹⁴ North East Corby, West Corby, Kettering East, Wellingborough East and North West Wellingborough.

Accordingly, the JPU's letter made clear that for some of the smaller settlements, sites would only be considered if they are within the defined village boundaries. For the remaining study area settlements, sites were considered both within and adjoining existing development boundaries.

- 4.6 Thus, our approach to the search for sites was extensive, and was based primarily on the adopted CSS. This extensive approach was necessary in order to fully assess the potential to achieve the four Councils' housing targets, and it is consistent with paragraph 7 of the Guidance which states that a SHLAA study should *'aim to identify as many sites with housing potential in and around as many settlements as possible in the study area'*.

Time Horizon

- 4.7 LPAs are required, by paragraph 53 of PPS3, to set out in LDDs their policies and strategies for delivering the level of housing provision required by the approved RSS, or the emerging RSS if the approved RSS is being reviewed. As we explained in Sections 2 and 3, the housing figures set out in the CSS for the period to 2021¹⁵ are more up-to-date than the figures in the emerging RSS and so in the North Northamptonshire case we consider that it is more appropriate to work to the housing figures in the CSS for the period to 2021. LPAs are also required by paragraph 53 to *'identify broad locations and specific sites that will enable continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years from the date of adoption.'* (Our emphasis).
- 4.8 Paragraph 54 of PPS3 states that LPAs should *'identify sufficient specific deliverable sites to deliver housing in the first five years'* from adoption of the relevant LDD. Paragraph 55 further states that LPAs should also *'identify a further supply of specific, developable sites for years 6-10 and, where possible, for years 11-15. Where it is not possible to identify specific sites for years 11-15, broad locations for future growth should be indicated.'*
- 4.9 The requirements of paragraphs 53 to 55 of PPS3 are carried through into the Guidance, paragraph 5 of which requires LPAs to *'identify specific, deliverable sites for the first five years of a plan that are ready for development.'* Paragraph 7 of the Guidance further states that a SHLAA should *'as a minimum...aim to identify sufficient specific sites for at least the first 10 years of a plan, from the anticipated date of its adoption.'*
- 4.10 Thus, both PPS3 and the Guidance require LPAs to identify sites from the date of adoption of the relevant DPD. However, adoption of the four Councils' Site Allocations DPDs is some time off, and adoption of the various DPDs will occur at different times¹⁶. We have therefore necessarily used the study base date of 1 April 2008 as the starting point in assessing the 5 year land supply, rather than the adoption date of the four Councils' DPDs.
- 4.11 In accordance with the Guidance, the SHLAA should be regularly kept up-to-date as part of the Annual Monitoring Report exercise, so as to support the updating of the housing trajectory and the rolling 5-year supply of specific deliverable sites.

Minimum Site Size Threshold

- 4.12 Analysis of National Land Use Database (NLUD) returns made prior to 2003 demonstrated that a 0.25ha size threshold would reduce the total number of sites by 50-60 per cent, while only reducing the total PDL land area by 3-4 per cent. Accordingly, a 0.25ha threshold was introduced to NLUD in 2003 (this applies across

¹⁵ 52,100 dwellings for the period 2001-2021.

¹⁶ Adoption of Corby's DPD is scheduled for Winter 2010; consultation on the Kettering DPD is scheduled for early 2009; of the three Area Plans detailing land allocations in East Northamptonshire, only one is expected to be adopted in the near future (Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan, Summer 2009) - this is owing to timetable slippage. Wellingborough is currently at preferred options stage and so the adoption date will clearly be some time off.

all of England except London, where a threshold of 0.1ha applies). English Partnerships' 0.25ha threshold had the desired effect; the number of sites returned by local authorities post-2003 decreased considerably but this had only a minimal effect on the total land area.

- 4.13 Accordingly in SHLAAs, we typically suggest a site size threshold of 0.25ha, with sites above this size typically being able to accommodate 10 or more dwellings. Thus, for the purposes of this study, it was agreed with the JPU that we would apply a minimum sites size threshold of 0.25ha.

Sources of Potential Housing Sites

- 4.14 PPS3 sets a clear expectation that the supply of land for housing should be based upon specific sites and, where necessary, broad locations. The main tool used in the assessment was therefore our Microsoft Access database of sites with a recognisable opportunity for residential development. The database is used to store all the data gathered in the study and is coded to automatically assign each site to one of three 'Category' bands (corresponding to 'most deliverable', 'moderately deliverable' and 'least deliverable') based on the site's performance against pre-agreed assessment criteria (as described in Section 5 of our report). The database also generates a theoretical dwelling yield for each site.
- 4.15 Figure 4 of the Guidance provides a list of possible sources for identifying potential housing sites. The list includes sites that are already in the planning process as well as sites that are not currently in the planning process. In the early stages of the study we compiled an initial list of potential housing sites, drawing upon the sources listed in Figure 4, but broadening it slightly to include other sources.
- 4.16 The sources that we used to identify the initial list of sites are specified below. These sources are in addition to unimplemented/outstanding residential planning permissions, which are considered as a potential source of supply, irrespective of where the sites are located in the four local authority areas (details of the supply from extant permissions are provided in Section 5 of our report):
- sites identified from previous urban capacity studies;
 - surplus employment sites;
 - sites identified from Housing Land Availability assessments;
 - the latest NLUD submissions;
 - sites identified through the 'call for sites' exercise;
 - sites identified in Local Development Documents;
 - strategic CSS representation sites; and
 - other sites brought to our attention by the Councils.
- 4.17 Our initial list of potential housing sites - compiled from the sources listed above - contained well over 1,000 sites, although at that stage there was a significant amount of duplication (that is, sites that had been identified from multiple sources). We then removed: all duplicates; sites below the minimum site size threshold of 0.25ha; sites considered to have no realistic prospects for housing; and sites that are more than 100m from the existing boundaries of the settlements where we agreed to conduct the search for sites, as well as sites that are outside of the five proposed Sustainable Urban Extensions (as named in the adopted CSS). At this stage, sites which fell within important policy designations were not excluded; potential impacts were considered later in the study.

The Sites Database

- 4.18 After applying the various filters described above, the initial list of potential housing sites was reduced to 608. We visited each of these 608 sites and, with a few exceptions as detailed below, we assessed their potential for housing and the number of dwellings that could theoretically be provided at each site, taking into account the findings from our site visits. Some of the 608 sites had extant planning permission at the study base date, or were already developed/under construction and were consequently not assigned a yield; similarly, a nil yield was assigned for those sites where no net dwelling gain was possible. A theoretical yield was identified for the remaining 577 sites.
- 4.19 The 577 sites for which we identified a theoretical yield are distributed across the study area and include sites located within the urban area as well as sites in more peripheral locations. The list includes both greenfield and PDL sites. Appropriate consideration has been given to important policy designations and to the location of sites, as detailed later in our report.
- 4.20 As noted previously, the contribution to the housing supply of sites with planning permission is assessed through separate analysis (as detailed in Section 5 of our report). These 'committed' sites therefore do not feature in our database, although because the study has a base date of 1 April 2008, it is important to note that some of the sites in the database might have since been granted planning permission for residential use in the intervening period. This issue will be addressed through the first annual update of the study.
- 4.21 Each of the 577 sites is represented as a 'polygon' (i.e. an area with boundaries) on an OS base map in our MapInfo GIS. For each site a unique identifier was created and more detailed information on each of the 577 sites is contained in the associated Microsoft Access sites database, which is split into five parts as detailed below.

Database Reference Fields

- 4.22 For each site, basic reference details and other factual information are always visible at the top of the database, whether Part 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 of the database is selected. The standard reference fields are specified in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1 Sites Database - Reference Fields

Data Field	Form of Data/Possible Options
RTP unique ref	Sequential site numbering system, providing each site with a unique reference.
Source ref (if available)	Taken direct from Council or other sources.
Source type	Options are: aspirational sites; CBC identified sites; Call For Sites; consultation responses to RNOTP submission plan; Council housing availability data; ENDC identified sites; Housing Land Availability 2007; KBC identified sites; Local Plan sites; new proposal map; NLUD; RLA sites; Rural Capacity Study; Rural North, Oundle and Thrapston Plan; Strategic CSS representations; Three Towns Plan - Preferred Options (Higham Ferrers, Irthlingborough & Rushden); Urban Capacity Study 2006; WBC identified sites; Wellingborough East Development Framework; and other.
Other source types (if available)	Other source(s) of site, only applicable if the site was identified through multiple sources. Same options as for 'source type'.
Grid reference	Easting and northing of the site centroid, generated by GIS
Site name & address	Site name (where applicable) and approximate address, based on the site's geographic location. Generated from GIS or entered manually if a Call for Sites submission.
General information/other comments	Free-text box which contains other relevant information and findings from site visits.

Database Part 1 - Site Details and Planning Status

- 4.23 The first part of the database contains a range of contextual and factual information about the sites (gross site area, land type, and so on), much of which was collected as a desk-based exercise and using GIS. This part of the database also contains our 'Overall Site Categorisation' rating for each site (1, 2 or 3). Details of how we categorised sites are provided later in our report.
- 4.24 Our assessment of any permanent features that would be likely to affect the site's potential for housing development, based on the findings/observations from our site visits, is provided in the first part of the database.
- 4.25 The full list of fields/information contained within Part 1 of the database is shown in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2 Information Contained in Part 1 of the Sites Database

Topic	Data Field	Form of Data/Possible Responses
Site Details	Site area in hectares (gross)	Automatically created using GIS by measuring the area of land within the site polygon
	Land type	Greenfield or previously developed land
	Current land use	Options are: agriculture & related incl. forestry; community services; minerals; open space; industry & business; other*; recreation & leisure; residential; retail; transport); and utilities & infrastructure [*if 'other' is selected, details of the current land use are provided in a second free-text box].
	Surrounding land use	Options are: agriculture & related incl. forestry; community services; minerals; open space; industry & business; other; recreation & leisure; residential; retail; transport); or utilities & infrastructure
	Character of surrounding area	As assessed on site
	Other relevant site details	As assessed on site

Database Part 2 - 'Suitability' Information

- 4.26 The second part of the database provides details of any physical or bad neighbour constraints which might affect the site's potential for housing development, as well as our initial assessment of whether the site is suitable for housing only, or housing as part of a mixed-use development¹⁷.

Table 4.3 Information Contained in Part 2 of the Sites Database

Data Field	Form of Data/Possible Options
Access infrastructure	On-site assessment of whether extensive new access infrastructure would be required in order to facilitate housing development
Drainage infrastructure	On-site assessment of whether extensive new drainage infrastructure would be required in order to facilitate housing development
Ground condition constraints	On-site assessment of whether extensive ground treatment is likely to be required in order to facilitate housing development
Bad neighbour constraints	As assessed on site. Possible responses are 'none'; potential for 'mitigation'; or 'major constraints'
Mixed-use potential	Initial assessment of whether the site is suitable for housing only, or housing as part of a mix of uses

Database Part 3 - 'Availability' Information

- 4.27 In Part 3 of the database, we provide details of anything which we consider might affect availability, reflecting our observations from the site visits. We also identify whether the site is immediately available, and if not, whether it could be made available within 5 years. For a site to achieve an overall Category 1 rating, it would have to be capable of being made available within 5 years.

¹⁷ We return to this issue later in our report.

Database Part 4 - Yield Assessment

- 4.28 For each identified site it was necessary to estimate the potential housing yield. In order to do this, we applied a series of factors as detailed below. The differing percentages for each factor have been derived using our experience of previous developments in similar areas, and were agreed in advance with our client.
- 4.29 For a small number of sites a yield figure was entered manually instead. The main example of this relates to call for sites submissions, which often specify the number of dwellings that the developer intends to provide at the site. With these sites, if the number of dwellings proposed would result in a development density that is appropriate in the local context, then we have inserted the yield figure manually.
- (i) Gross site area*
- 4.30 Where two or more sites contain areas that overlap, the common area of land is only considered as part of one site and is discounted from any others to avoid double counting. The gross site area specified in the database is the area within the digitised site polygon after this process was completed, measured using GIS.
- (ii) Permanent features factor*
- 4.31 A factor was then applied to represent the percentage of the gross site area likely to be available for housing after account has been taken of any special site specific capacity constraints relating (for example) to site shape, topography, obstructions to development (e.g. substations) or water bodies. Site constraints, and the appropriate percentage reduction, were assessed on a site by site basis for all 577 sites.
- (iii) Gross to net factor*
- 4.32 A gross to net factor was applied to the residual site area following application of the permanent features factor. The gross to net factor takes account of any requirements to provide supporting facilities on the site. We have adopted the most up-to-date advice on net density, namely that contained in Annex B of PPS3 which states that net dwelling density is calculated by:
- '...including only those site areas which will be developed for housing and directly associated uses, including access roads within the site, private garden space, car parking areas, incidental open space and landscaping and children's play areas, where these are provided.'*
- 4.33 For the largest sites (above 10ha), the gross to net factor that we applied was 50 per cent, to allow for significant additional infrastructure such as schools, community facilities, roads, green spaces and so on. For sites of between 0.4ha and 10ha, the amount of additional infrastructure required will be much less, and so a greater proportion of the site can be allocated to housing. Consequently, we have applied a less severe ratio for sites with a gross area of between 0.4ha and 10ha. For sites up to 0.4ha, the amount of additional infrastructure that is required is assumed to be negligible. This is because these sites should be capable of utilising existing infrastructure, and also because smaller sites will not generate a need for significant new supporting infrastructure. For sites with a gross area up to 0.4ha, we have therefore applied a gross to net factor of 100 per cent. Table 4.4 below sets out the specific gross to net ratios that we used.
- 4.34 It should be noted that, in reality, each site would be considered individually as and when it is taken forward for allocation or proposed for development. Nevertheless, the gross to net ratios that we applied for the purposes of our yield assessment are as set out in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 Gross to Net Ratios

Gross Site Area (ha)	Percentage Net
Up to 0.4ha	100%
0.4ha to 2ha	90%
2ha to 10ha	75%
Over 10ha	50%

(iv) Mixed use factor

- 4.35 A mixed use factor was applied to sites most likely to be developed for mixed uses, to indicate the notional proportion of the net site's total capacity which is assumed to generate residential use, regardless of whether the mix of uses is horizontal or vertical. The majority of the sites that this factor applies to are located in the Town Centres of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough and were identified through a combination of our site visits and officer knowledge.
- 4.36 The mixed use factor that we applied was 50 per cent in most cases. For those sites which are situated either within 100m of the defined Town Centres of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough or within 50m of any Primary Shopping Area in East Northamptonshire, the factor we applied was 75 per cent. In addition, there have been instances when the promoter of a site has specified a mixed use factor. In these cases we have applied the ratio derived from the proposed mix of uses. It is also possible, through the database, to apply other mixed use factors (25 per cent and 90 per cent). Whilst we have not applied these factors to any of the 577 sites in the database, the Councils might prefer to apply one of these alternative factors to specific sites in future updates of the study, which is why we have incorporated this functionality into the database.
- 4.37 Again, each site would need to be considered in more detail on a case-by-case basis as and when it came forward for development. These sites will need a mixed use policy rather than a housing allocation and a separate employment allocation. In any event, as we indicated above, most of the sites in the database have been treated as pure housing sites.

(v) Density assumptions

Policy guidance

- 4.38 Paragraph 46 of PPS3 states that LPAs should develop housing density policies having regard to:
- the spatial vision and strategy for housing development in their area, including the level of housing demand and need and the availability of suitable land in the area;
 - the current and future level and capacity of infrastructure, services and facilities such as public and private amenity space, in particular green and open space;
 - the desirability of using land efficiently and reducing, and adapting to, the impacts of climate change;
 - the current and future levels of accessibility, particularly public transport accessibility;
 - the characteristics of the area, including the current and proposed mix of uses; and
 - the desirability of achieving high quality, well-designed housing.
- 4.39 Paragraph 47 of PPS3 states that while LPAs may wish to set out a range of densities across the plan area, 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) net should be taken as a national indicative minimum to guide policy development and decision-making, until local

density policies are in place. Densities below this minimum will need to be justified according to such factors as those listed above.

- 4.40 The Milton Keynes-South Midlands (MKSM) Sub-Regional Strategy was published in March 2005 with the purpose of providing a clear, agreed sub regional strategy for the period 2001-2021, and a long term vision for the sub-region towards the year 2031, as part of the Government's Sustainable Communities Plan. The Strategy states that, as a key requirement of building sustainable communities, development should be of a *'sufficient size, scale and density...and of the right layout to support basic amenities in neighbourhoods and minimise the use of resources (including land)'*.
- 4.41 The North Northamptonshire Joint Planning Committee formally adopted the CSS on 12 June 2008. The CSS forms part of the Local Development Framework for North Northamptonshire and sets out the spatial vision, objectives and policies for managing development across the North Northamptonshire area.
- 4.42 In accordance with PPS3, which allows flexibility in residential densities, Policy 16 of the CSS provides guidance on how masterplans should make provision for *'variations in housing density with an overall minimum net density of 35 dph.'* In addition to this, the relevant Councils should ensure that *'new housing development should also achieve the most efficient use of land where appropriate through higher densities that respect the character of surrounding neighbourhoods.'*
- Analysis of density trends & assumptions for the SHLAA study
- 4.43 In order to meet the aims of sustainable growth it is important to ensure that new development, particularly in urban areas and at public transport nodes, is constructed at densities which reflect the immediate surroundings.
- 4.44 With the above proviso in mind, analysis of the Councils' supplied data indicates that recently completed schemes have achieved a wide range of densities with the majority of completions taking place at over 50 dph and high average densities across North Northamptonshire. Thus the aspiration should be to meet the minimum net density of 35 dph, recommended by Policy 16 of the CSS, in all parts of the study area.
- 4.45 Further analysis of statistics published in the relevant AMRs allows us to differentiate, in some cases, between rural and urban densities. The trends which emerge from this analysis indicate a clear gap between densities achieved in urban settlements and those achieved in the more rural areas.
- 4.46 With this in mind, we consider that there may be an opportunity in the larger towns of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough to achieve densities in excess of 70 dph, particularly on the more central sites. Thus, close to the centre of these towns, our view is that an achievable target would be in the order of 100 dph.
- 4.47 In the smaller towns outlined in the CSS, a more achievable target would be in the order of around 50-70 dph and no less than 35 dph. This reflects the smaller nature of these settlements and the range of key local services on offer.
- 4.48 Finally, in the rural service centres highlighted in the CSS and in other rural and peripheral locations, the density of new development should be in the region of 35-50 dph. This reflects the more rural character of these areas.
- 4.49 In order to promote sustainable development, public transport should also be taken into account when determining housing densities. This is in line with Policy 16 of the CSS which states that *'higher densities will be sought particularly in the locations most accessible by foot, cycle and public transport'*. Consequently, for sites close to a

railway station - or sites which have good access to key services by public transport¹⁸ - the aspiration should be to achieve higher density development.

- 4.50 Taking into account these factors, the density assumptions that we used in assessing housing potential are set out in the following table:

Table 4.5 Density Rates Applied in the SHLAA Study

Site Location Characteristics	Density (net dph)
Within the Town Centres of Corby, Kettering or Wellingborough	100
Within 400m of Corby, Kettering or Wellingborough Town Centres or within the defined town centres of the Smaller Towns	70
Between 400m and 800m from the Town Centres of the Growth Towns or within 800m of the defined town centres of the Smaller Towns, or within 800m of a railway station	60
More than 800m from the Town Centres of the Growth Towns or Smaller Towns, and more than 800m from a railway station, and with an average accessibility score of over 2.5	50
More than 800m from the Town Centres of the Growth Towns or Smaller Towns, and more than 800m from a railway station, and with an average accessibility score of 2.5 or under	35

- 4.51 The housing capacity of any identified site is then calculated by:

Gross site area x permanent features factor x gross to net factor x mixed use factor x density

- 4.52 At the bottom of the fourth part of the Access sites database are two fields entitled 'Net residual site area available for housing (ha)' and 'yield'; these figures are the residual area and theoretical housing yield after the factors described above have been applied.
- 4.53 In practice, the Councils will have to undertake more detailed work on the densities that are achievable at any given site, as and when it is brought forward for development. Furthermore, our guideline capacities for very large sites must be treated with caution as we can not foresee the mix of uses that these broad locations might be called on to accommodate. Nevertheless we consider that the consistent framework shown in the table above is appropriate for the purposes of this strategic assessment.

Database Part 5 - GIS-Based Information

- 4.54 Part 5 of the Access database contains scores for each site against a total of 13 assessment factors and criteria - consistent with the factors and criteria referred to on pages 16 and 17 of the Guidance - under the headings 'suitability', 'availability' and 'achievability'. The specific assessment factors and criteria, and the potential scores that could be assigned under each, are contained in full at Appendix 3.

¹⁸ An assessment of accessibility to various key services was undertaken by Northamptonshire County Council using its 'Accession' software. This measures the time taken to get by public transport from any given postcode in the study area to a GP, a hospital, a post-16 educational establishment and a main town centre at various times of the week (peak, off-peak and weekend), allowing a maximum 400m walk. A score of 4 implies the service can be reached within 15 minutes; 3 implies a time of within half an hour; 2 implies a journey time of 30-45 minutes; 1 a journey of longer than this; and 0 that the journey cannot be made using public transport. We collated these scores to give an average score between 0 and 4 which we have used to inform our development density estimates as described.

- 4.55 The criteria are a combination of those for which a score can be generated automatically using GIS (such as whether the site is within a particular Flood Risk Zone) and those for which we had to apply our professional judgement (for instance, in relation to the extent of physical constraints affecting the site). A score of between 0 and 5 was possible under each assessment criterion, whereby a major constraint and/or severe adverse impact scores 0 (minimum), and a significant positive feature or absence of adverse impact scores 5 (maximum). The use of a common scoring base ensures that, as far as possible, the scoring of sites is transparent and easily understood. Moreover, it highlights any potentially unacceptable aspect of the development of an individual site, irrespective of that site's overall assessment rating. Thus, the maximum score that a site could achieve is 65 (i.e. 13 criteria x 5).
- 4.56 It is therefore possible to compare individual sites' performance relative to other sites in terms of their overall 'score' out of 65. However, we caution against prioritising sites using a simple scoring approach. Indeed, whilst paragraph 83 of the draft version of the SHLAA Guidance suggested that SHLAAs could '*develop an indicative rank of sites*' this was not carried through into the final version of the Practice Guidance. Thus, whilst the GIS-based site assessment provides a good indication of each site's performance against a broad range of important measures, we consider that a supplementary assessment is still necessary to ensure that certain 'core' constraints are taken into full account. The information contained in Part 5 of the database is thus important, but it only forms the first step in our site categorisation exercise (full details of which are contained in Section 6 of our report).

5 HOUSING COMMITMENTS, DEMOLITIONS, AND UNDER- OR OVER-SUPPLY AGAINST CSS TARGETS SINCE THE CSS BASE DATE

Housing Commitments

What Are Housing Commitments?

- 5.1 Housing 'commitments' comprise dwellings with full or outline planning permission. Each Council supplied a schedule of commitments at the study base date (1 April 2008) to inform our assessment of housing land availability in the present study. It is reasonable to assume that not all of the commitments in the schedule will be implemented and so we consider that there is a need to apply a non-implementation rate (any failure of specific commitments to be taken up can be dealt with through routine monitoring and supply management). We return to this issue, below.
- 5.2 If there were any outline permissions for large numbers of dwellings (i.e. over 100) where no dwellings were completed or under construction at the base date, then care would have to be taken because implementation of these permissions may potentially extend beyond five years. Housing production on such sites would need to be carefully monitored and sufficient appropriate allocations would need to be included in the LDF to allow for the possibility that they may not generate their full supply within the first five years. Indeed, commitments data supplied by each Council show that there were a few such cases. At the study base date there was one extant outline consent for 208 dwellings in Kettering; in Corby two extant permissions exist for 4,400 dwellings (the Priors Hall SUE)¹⁹ and 1,018 dwellings (at Little Stanion) respectively (the latter is currently the subject of a number of undetermined reserved matters applications); and in Wellingborough outline planning permission exists for the first 3,200 dwellings at the Wellingborough East SUE.
- 5.3 Because the latest comprehensive data on residential commitments supplied by each Council relate to a base date of 1 April 2008, it should be noted that some of the residential planning permissions at the study's base date may now be partly or fully completed. This is unavoidable, however, and can be dealt with when the study is updated.
- 5.4 We also considered any Local Plan housing allocations which had not been implemented at the study base date, but only if they were within or adjacent to one of the 40 study settlements or one of the five SUEs and if they were yet to receive planning permission at the base date (in which case they would be covered by our analysis of commitments, as detailed below).

Commitments at the Study Base Date

- 5.5 Table 5.1 provides a summary of commitments for each LPA disaggregated to settlement level. In total there was extant permission for 13,740 dwellings across North Northamptonshire as of 1 April 2008, of which 7,088 were in Corby, 1,103 were in East Northamptonshire, 1,634 were in Kettering, and 3,915 were in Wellingborough. We assume that the number of dwellings built will be as given in the latest permission, although it is possible that these will be superseded by further approvals on the same sites.

¹⁹ The Priors Hall SUE is expected to deliver 5,100 dwellings. Outline planning permission for 4,400 dwellings has been granted for the part of the SUE that is within Corby Borough. The remaining 700 dwellings will be situated on land that is actually in East Northamptonshire (this element does not yet have planning permission), although MKSM Northamptonshire Policy 1 in the emerging RSS stipulates that cross boundary sites count against the provision for the main authority, and so they will not count as part of East Northamptonshire's supply.

Table 5.1 Housing Commitments in North Northamptonshire at the Study Base Date (1 April 2008)

LPA & SETTLEMENT	SOURCE OF SUPPLY				
	Number of Dwellings with Permission Due to Expire by 01.04.09	Number of Dwellings with Unimplemented Outline Permission at Study Base Date	Number of Dwellings with Unimplemented Detailed Permission at Study Base Date	Dwellings Remaining on Sites Where Construction is Underway But Not Complete at Study Base Date	Total Number of Dwellings Still to be Built at Study Base Date
Corby Growth Town	2	4,400	142	1,471	6,015
Corby Rural	1	1,023	27	22	1,073
<i>Corby Borough Total</i>	3	5,423	169	1,493	7,088
Rushden	31	74	433	79	617
Higham Ferrers	24	24	20	18	86
Irthlingborough	3	17	40	37	97
Raunds	2	2	47	15	66
Thrapston	0	2	42	23	67
Oundle	0	0	27	9	36
East Northamptonshire Rural	17	21	59	37	134
<i>East Northamptonshire District Total</i>	77	140	668	218	1,103
Kettering Growth Town	89	38	226	215	568
Burton Latimer	2	224	8	33	267
Desborough	2	15	252	70	339
Rothwell	18	0	181	70	269
Kettering Rural	2	27	93	69	191
<i>Kettering Borough Total</i>	113	304	760	457	1,634
Wellingborough Growth Town	65	3,246	163	221	3,695
Wellingborough Rural	34	23	113	50	220
<i>Wellingborough Borough Total</i>	99	3,269	276	271	3,915
NORTH NORTHAMPTONSHIRE TOTAL	292	9,836	1,873	2,439	14,440

Allowance for Non-Implementation

5.6 It is reasonable to assume that not all of the residential commitments will be implemented, particularly given the current downturn in the market. In order to ensure a robust approach, we therefore consider that there is a need to make an allowance for non-implementation of a proportion of the planning permissions. Applying a 'non-implementation rate' will ensure that the four Councils' housing supply is not over-reliant on extant planning permissions, which may not all progress in practice. We therefore agreed the following approach with the JPU:

- Sites with full planning permission that were under construction at the study base date of 1 April 2008: **no non-implementation rate** has been applied.²⁰
- Sites with full or outline permission where construction had not commenced at the base date: **5 per cent non-implementation rate** to reflect the number of dwellings likely to come forward from these sources.²¹

²⁰ These sites are anticipated to be completed in accordance with the planning permission. Hence, no non-implementation rate has been applied.

²¹ For these sites, a non-implementation rate of 5 per cent is consistent with the JPU 'lapse rate' used in the Housing Background Paper (2005) to inform the CSS.

- Sites with planning permission for residential development that is due to expire prior to 1 April 2009 (but where development had not commenced at the study base date): **20 per cent non-implementation rate** to reflect the likelihood that some planning permissions will lapse.²²

5.7 We have applied the approach described above to the total outstanding housing supply for each LPA, as set out in Tables 5.2a to 5.2d below. Summary Table 5.3 then shows that the total realistic housing supply at 1 April 2008 from residential commitments in North Northamptonshire stood at 13,131 dwellings. This is broken down as follows: 6,808 in Corby; 1,047 in East Northamptonshire; 1,558 in Kettering; and 3,718 in Wellingborough.

**Table 5.2a Corby - Realistic Housing Supply at 1 April 2008
(Taking into Account a Non-Implementation Rate)²³**

Source of Supply	No. of Dwellings Still to be Built at the Base Date	No. of Dwellings Likely to be Built (assuming a non-implementation rate where appropriate)
Sites with Full Planning Permission (under-construction) ¹	1,493	1,493
Sites with Full Planning Permission (not yet commenced) ²	169	161
Sites with Outline Planning Permission ³	5,423	5,152
Dwellings with permission due to expire by 1 April 2009 ⁴	3	2
Total	7,088	6,808

**Table 5.2b East Northamptonshire - Realistic Housing Supply at 1 April 2008
(Taking into Account a Non-Implementation Rate)²⁴**

Source of Supply	No. of Dwellings Still to be Built at the Base Date	No. of Dwellings Likely to be Built (assuming a non-implementation rate where appropriate)
Sites with Full Planning Permission (under-construction) ¹	218	218
Sites with Full Planning Permission (not yet commenced) ²	692	657
Sites with Outline Planning Permission ³	116	110
Dwellings with permission due to expire by 1 April 2009 ⁴	77	62
Total	1,103	1,047

²² For these sites a non-implementation rate of 20 per cent is considered to be a realistic estimate of the likely implementation of these permissions, based on our previous experience and prevailing market conditions.

²³ Figures in the Table have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

²⁴ Figures in the Table have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

**Table 5.2c Kettering - Realistic Housing Supply at 1 April 2008
(Taking into Account a Non-Implementation Rate)²⁵**

Source of Supply	No. of Dwellings Still to be Built at the Base Date	No. of Dwellings Likely to be Built (assuming a non-implementation rate where appropriate)
Sites with Full Planning Permission (under-construction) ¹	457	457
Sites with Full Planning Permission (not yet commenced) ²	760	722
Sites with Outline Planning Permission ³	304	289
Dwellings with permission due to expire by 1 April 2009 ⁴	113	90
Total	1,634	1,558

**Table 5.2d Wellingborough - Realistic Housing Supply at 1 April 2008
(Taking into Account a Non-Implementation Rate)²⁶**

Source of Supply	No. of Dwellings Still to be Built at the Base Date	No. of Dwellings Likely to be Built (assuming a non-implementation rate where appropriate)
Sites with Full Planning Permission (under-construction) ¹	271	271
Sites with Full Planning Permission (not yet commenced) ²	276	262
Sites with Outline Planning Permission ³	3,269	3,106
Dwellings with permission due to expire by 1 April 2009 ⁴	99	79
Total	3,915	3,718

Notes to Tables 5a to 5d

¹ No non-implementation rate applied - all dwellings are assumed to come forward in line with the permission.

² 5 per cent non-implementation rate applied.

³ 5 per cent non-implementation rate applied.

⁴ 20 per cent non-implementation rate applied to reflect the fact that the permission on these sites is due to expire shortly.

**Table 5.3 Summary of Total Supply at 1 April 2008
(Taking into Account a Non-Implementation Rate)**

LPA	Total No. of Dwellings Likely to be Built (assuming a non-implementation rate where appropriate)
Corby Borough	6,808
East Northamptonshire District	1,047
Kettering Borough	1,558
Wellingborough Borough	3,718
Total for North Northamptonshire	13,131

²⁵ Figures in the Table have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

²⁶ Figures in the Table have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

Consideration of Under-Provision Against the CSS Housing Requirements Since the Base Date of the CSS, Taking Into Account Demolitions

- 5.8 The study will need to take account of any under-provision against the CSS housing requirements since the base date of the CSS (2001). This is because paragraph 5(i) of the CLG's advice note entitled 'Demonstrating a 5 Year Supply of Deliverable Sites' (12 April 2007)²⁷ states that in order to identify the level of housing provision to be delivered over the following 5 years, LPAs should use provision figures in adopted development plans, '*adjusted to reflect the level of housing that has already been delivered*'.
- 5.9 Completions data and clearance figures supplied by each LPA have been used to establish the number of net additional dwellings that have been delivered in each Borough/District over the period 1 April 2001 to 31 March 2008. This is illustrated in Tables 5.4a to 5.4d²⁸ below. Against the targets set out in the adopted CSS, there has been a shortfall of 448 dwellings across North Northamptonshire vis-à-vis the seven-year requirement of 13,252 dwellings (based on the average annual housing provision rates between 2001 and 2008 set out in Table 3 of the adopted CSS).
- 5.10 However, it is important to note that the housing supply position varies significantly between each of the four LPA areas. East Northamptonshire and Kettering both have an 'over-provision' (of 184 and 478 dwellings respectively) against CSS targets between 2001 and 2008, while Corby and Wellingborough exhibit a shortfall. Corby has the most substantial shortfall (of 914 dwellings), while Wellingborough currently has a moderate shortfall of 196 dwellings against adopted CSS targets since 2001.
- 5.11 We have not made any allowance for the 'over-provision' of dwellings that occurred between 2001 and 2008 in East Northamptonshire and Kettering. This reflects experience from appeals contested on the 5-year supply issue which suggest that any under-supply must be carried forward, but that over-provision cannot. The reasons for this are two-fold:
- i) the 5-year supply should look forward rather than backwards - the emphasis is on future provision; and
 - ii) the targets against which any 'over-provision' may have occurred are now proposed by the SoS to be 'minima', and therefore exceeding these targets may in future be irrelevant.
- 5.12 For information purposes, Tables 5.4a to 5.4d illustrate the degree of under- or over-provision that occurred between 2001 and 2008 vis-à-vis the CSS targets, and Table 5 summarises the position in terms of the shortfall or over-provision of dwellings in each LPA area and across North Northamptonshire.

²⁷ http://www.planning-inspectorate.gov.uk/pins/advice_for_insp/advice_produced_by_dclg.htm

²⁸ Please note that in each table a minus figure indicates a shortfall, whereas positive figures indicate that the CSS target was exceeded.

Table 5.4a Corby - Under-provision vis-à-vis Housing Requirements Arising Between the Base Date of the Adopted CSS (1 April 2001) and the SHLAA Study Base Date (1 April 2008)

Year	Gross Dwg Completions	Total Demolitions	Net Dwg Completions	CSS Dwgs/Yr Target	Shortfall or Surplus Against the CSS's Dwgs/yr Target
2001-02	96	0	96	298	-202
2002-03	184	0	184	298	-114
2003-04	422	0	422	298	+124
2004-05	293	0	293	298	-5
2005-06	466	97	369	298	+71
2006-07	607	34	573	929	-356
2007-08	666	169	497	929	-432
Total	2,734	300	2,434	3,348	-914

Table 5.4b East Northamptonshire - Over-provision vis-à-vis Dwelling Requirements Arising Between the Base Date of the Adopted CSS (1 April 2001) and the SHLAA Study Base Date (1 April 2008)

Year	Gross Dwg Completions	Total Demolitions	Net Dwg Completions	CSS Dwgs/Yr Target	Shortfall or Surplus Against the CSS's Dwgs/yr Target
2001-02	472	5	467	565	-98
2002-03	610	4	606	565	+41
2003-04	486	4	482	565	-83
2004-05	568	41	609	565	+44
2005-06	651	10	661	565	+96
2006-07	548	44	504	428	+76
2007-08	539	3	536	428	+108
Totals	3,874	111	3,865	3,681	+184

Table 5.4c Kettering - Over-provision vis-à-vis Dwelling Requirements Arising Between the Base Date of the Adopted CSS (1 April 2001) and the SHLAA Study Base Date (1 April 2008)¹

Year	Gross Dwg Completions	Total Demolitions	Net Dwg Completions	CSS Dwgs/Yr Target	Shortfall or Surplus Against the CSS's Dwgs/yr Target
2001-02	572	0	572	471	+101
2002-03	572	0	572	471	+101
2003-04	572	0	572	471	+101
2004-05	572	0	572	471	+101
2005-06	572	0	572	471	+101
2006-07	572	0	572	642	-70
2007-08	685	0	685	642	+43
Total	4,117	0	4,117	3,639	+478

¹ As reported in its 2006/07 AMR, Kettering Borough Council undertook a detailed re-examination of completion figures since April 2001. This process included site surveys of the number of completions at the larger sites within the Borough. The work found a higher number of completions than previously reported by the Council but it was not possible to apportion these 'extra' completions to specific years. Therefore, the total completions figure for 2001-07 has been 'annualised' to give an annual completion rate of 572 (572x6 years = 3,432 total completions 2001-07). This is reflected in the net dwelling completions column above.

Table 5.4d Wellingborough - Under-provision vis-à-vis Dwelling Requirements Arising Between the Base Date of the Adopted CSS (1 April 2001) and the SHLAA Study Base Date (1 April 2008)

Year	Gross Dwg Completions	Total Demolitions	Net Dwg Completions	CSS Dwgs/Yr Target	Shortfall or Surplus Against the CSS's Dwgs/yr Target
2001-02	345	39	306	304	+2
2002-03	180	5	175	304	-129
2003-04	283	3	280	304	-24
2004-05	415	0	415	304	+111
2005-06	357	12	345	304	+41
2006-07	403	11	392	532	-140
2007-08	488	13	475	532	-57
Totals	2,471	83	2,388	2,584	-196

Table 5.5 Summary of Under- or Over-Provision Against the CSS Dwelling Requirements Between 2001 and 2008

LPA	Total CSS Dwelling Target Between 2001 and 2008	Total Net Dwelling Completions Between 2001 and 2008	Shortfall or Surplus Against the Total CSS Dwelling Target Between 2001 and 2008
Corby Borough	3,348	2,434	-914
East Northamptonshire District	3,681	3,865	+184
Kettering Borough	3,639	4,117	+478
Wellingborough Borough	2,584	2,388	-196
Total for North Northamptonshire	13,252	12,804	-448

Resultant 5, 10, 15 and 20-Year Dwelling Requirements Based on Adopted CSS Targets (Adjusted to Reflect Any Under-Provision Since 2001 and Allowing for Planned/Likely Demolitions Where Appropriate)

Corby Borough

- 5.13 There has been a substantial shortfall of 914 dwellings in Corby against the adopted CSS targets since 2001. The Council advised that in order to address this shortfall within the CSS plan period (i.e. by 2021), it will be necessary to apportion the 914 dwellings over the first three 5-year periods, in the following staggered manner:
- 10 per cent of the dwelling shortfall in the first 5-year period (i.e. 2008-2013) - equating to 91 dwellings of the 914-dwelling shortfall;
 - 30 per cent of the dwelling shortfall in the second 5-year period (i.e. 2013-2018) - equating to 274 dwellings of the 914-dwelling shortfall; and
 - 60 per cent of the shortfall in the third 5-year period (i.e. 2018-2023) - equating to 549 dwellings of the 914 shortfall.²⁹
- 5.14 Corby Borough Council has advised that 81 demolitions are planned to take place between 2008 and 2009, and that data on projected levels of clearance beyond 2009 are not available. Demolitions data for the past 7 years indicate an average of 43 demolitions per annum; however, the Council confirmed that this figure has been

²⁹ Please note that the third 5-year period in the SHLAA runs until 2023. Thus, in order to address the dwelling shortfall in Corby within the CSS plan period the Council should seek to ensure that the outstanding shortfall of 549 dwellings that are remaining at the start of the third 5-year period are implemented by 2021 (i.e. two years before the end of the third 5-year SHLAA period).

inflated by recent regeneration work at Finland Way, Lincoln Way and Arran Way, and that outside these areas no demolitions have occurred in the Borough. Given that no further demolitions are committed (over and above the 81 planned for 2008-2009), and the historically low rate of demolition outside the regeneration areas, we do not consider it appropriate to include an allowance for clearance after 2009 for the purpose of this SHLAA. It should be noted, however, that in the longer term, future demolitions may be necessary in order to improve the environmental quality of regeneration areas in the emerging LDF.

- 5.15 As such, we have apportioned the 81 planned demolitions to the first 5-year period, and we have not made an allowance for the subsequent study periods. The resultant 5, 10, 15 and 20-year dwelling requirements for Corby are set out in Table 5.6a below.

Table 5.6a Corby Borough 5, 10, 15 and 20-year Dwelling Requirements Based on CSS/RSS Targets (adjusted to reflect under-provision since 2001 and allowing for planned/likely demolitions)³⁰

First 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2008-2013)	Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001, and Planned/Likely Demolitions ³¹	Total 5-Year Dwelling Requirement
4,697	172	4,869
Second 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2013-2018)	Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001, and Planned/Likely Demolitions	Total 10-Year Dwelling Requirement
5,221	274	5,495
Third 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2018-2023)	Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001, and Planned/Likely Demolitions	Total 15-Year Dwelling Requirement
5,654	549	6,203
Fourth 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2023-2028)	Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001, and Planned/Likely Demolitions	Total 20-Year Dwelling Requirement
5,300	0	5,300
Dwelling Requirement (2008-2028)	Total Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001, and Planned/Likely Demolitions (2008-2028)	Total Dwelling Requirement 2008-2028
20,872	995	21,867

³⁰ Refer to Table 3.3 for an explanation of how Corby Borough's 5, 10, 15 and 20 year dwelling requirements have been calculated.

³¹ Refer to paragraphs 5.13-5.15 for an explanation of how Corby Borough's 'Allowance' has been calculated.

East Northamptonshire District

- 5.16 There has been an over-supply of 184 dwellings in East Northamptonshire against the adopted CSS targets since 2001, although for the reasons given above, we do not make an allowance for this in Table 5.6b. The District Council confirmed that projected demolitions data are not currently available; as such, we have applied an allowance for demolitions for each of the four 5-year periods based on the average rate of 16 demolitions per annum since 2001. The resultant 5, 10, 15 and 20-year dwelling requirements are set out in Table 5.6b.

Table 5.6b East Northamptonshire District 5, 10, 15 and 20-year Dwelling Requirements Based on CSS/RSS Targets (adjusted to allow for likely demolitions)³²

First 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2008-2013)	Allowance for Likely Demolitions	Total 5-Year Dwelling Requirement
2,284	80	2,364
Second 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2013-2018)	Allowance for Likely Demolitions	Total 10-Year Dwelling Requirement
2,274	80	2,354
Third 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2018-2023)	Allowance for Likely Demolitions	Total 15-Year Dwelling Requirement
2,001	80	2,081
Fourth 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2023-2028)	Allowance for Likely Demolitions	Total 20-Year Dwelling Requirement
2,100	80	2,180
Dwelling Requirement (2008-2028)	Total Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001, and Planned/Likely Demolitions (2008-2028)	Total Dwelling Requirement 2008-2028
8,659	320	8,979

³² Refer to Table 3.3 for an explanation of how East Northamptonshire District's 5, 10, 15 and 20 year dwelling requirements have been calculated.

Kettering Borough

- 5.17 In Kettering there was an over-provision of 478 dwellings against the adopted CSS targets between 2001 and 2008, but as with East Northamptonshire we do not consider it appropriate to carry this forward. Furthermore, Kettering Borough Council confirmed that there have been no or negligible demolitions since 2001, and that it expects this to remain the case over the four 5-year study periods. As such we do not consider it necessary to make an allowance for demolitions. The resultant 5, 10, 15 and 20-year dwelling requirements are set out in Table 5.6c below.

Table 5.6c Kettering Borough 5, 10, 15 and 20-year Dwelling Requirements Based on CSS/RSS Targets³³

First 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2008-2013)	Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001	Total 5-Year Dwelling Requirement
3,474	-	3,474
Second 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2013-2018)	Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001	Total 10-Year Dwelling Requirement
3,788	-	3,788
Third 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2018-2023)	Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001	Total 15-Year Dwelling Requirement
3,459	-	3,459
Fourth 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2023-2028)	Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001	Total 20-Year Dwelling Requirement
3,150	-	3,150
Dwelling Requirement (2008-2028)	Total Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001, and Planned/Likely Demolitions (2008-2028)	Total Dwelling Requirement 2008-2028
13,871	-	13,871

³³ Refer to Table 3.3 for an explanation of how Kettering Borough's 5, 10, 15 and 20 year dwelling requirements have been calculated.

Borough of Wellingborough

- 5.18 There has been a shortfall of 196 dwellings in Wellingborough against the adopted CSS targets from 2001 to 2008. In order to make up for this shortfall within the CSS plan period (i.e. by 2021), it will be necessary to apportion the 196 dwellings over the first two 5-year periods. Thus, it was agreed through discussions with the JPU and the Borough Council that the shortfall should be apportioned as follows:
- 50 per cent of the dwelling shortfall in the first 5-year period (i.e. 2008-2013) - equating to 98 dwellings of the 196 shortfall; and
 - 50 per cent of the dwelling shortfall in the second 5-year period (i.e. 2013-2018) - equating to 98 dwellings of the 196 shortfall.

- 5.19 The Borough Council confirmed that projected demolitions data are not currently available; as such, we have applied an allowance for demolitions for each of the four 5-year periods based on the average rate of 11 demolitions per annum since 2001. The resultant 5, 10, 15 and 20-year dwelling requirements are set out in Table 5.6d below.

Table 5.6d Borough of Wellingborough 5, 10, 15 and 20-year Dwelling Requirements Based on CSS/RSS Targets (adjusted to reflect under-provision since 2001 and allowing for likely demolitions)³⁴

First 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2008-2013)	Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001, and Likely Demolitions ³⁵	Total 5-Year Dwelling Requirement
3,362	153	3,515
Second 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2013-2018)	Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001, and Likely Demolitions	Total 10-Year Dwelling Requirement
4,331	153	4,484
Third 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2018-2023)	Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001, and Likely Demolitions	Total 15-Year Dwelling Requirement
3,893	55	3,948
Fourth 5 Years		
Dwelling Requirement (2023-2028)	Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001, and Likely Demolitions	Total 20-Year Dwelling Requirement
3,425	55	3,480
Dwelling Requirement (2008-2028)	Total Allowance for Under-Provision Since 2001, and Planned/Likely Demolitions (2008-2028)	Total Dwelling Requirement 2008-2028
15,011	416	15,427

- 5.20 The figures contained in the third column of Tables 5.6a to 5.6d are those that we work to in Sections 6 and 7 of our report, when assessing whether there are sufficient sites to meet the dwelling targets in each Borough/District.

³⁴ Refer to Table 3.3 for an explanation of how the Borough of Wellingborough's 5, 10, 15 and 20 year dwelling requirements have been calculated.

³⁵ Refer to paragraphs 5.18-5.19 for an explanation of how the Borough of Wellingborough's 'Allowance' has been calculated.

6 HOUSING YIELD ASSESSMENT

Approach to Identified Sites

- 6.1 The assessment of housing potential from the sites identified in the database combines the calculation of theoretical dwelling yields for individual sites with the prioritisation of those sites in terms of their likelihood of coming forward for development.
- 6.2 The database has been carefully checked to ensure it does not include any site duplication. As we explained in Section 4 of our report, the database does not contain sites which have planning permission for residential development. Planning permissions therefore do not contribute to the housing yield total provided by the database, as all residential commitment sites are dealt with separately in the assessment (see Section 5 of our report for details).
- 6.3 All of the sites in the database are theoretically suitable for residential development. However, some of them are nevertheless subject to significant constraints which might restrict their likelihood of being brought forward as application sites, the likelihood of them being approved and the likelihood of them achieving their fully assessed capacity (yield) if they were to be approved. These factors will also affect whether it would be appropriate to allocate them in the LDF.
- 6.4 We subjected all of the sites in the database to a comprehensive GIS-based site assessment, as detailed in Section 4 of our report, scoring each site against 13 assessment criteria in order to derive an initial overall score (out of 65) for each site. The 13 assessment criteria measures are closely related to the 'suitability', 'availability' and 'achievability' criteria referred to on pages 16 and 17 of the Practice Guidance. Our GIS-based site assessment thus provides a good indication of each site's performance against a broad number of important measures, and forms the first step in our site categorisation exercise.
- 6.5 Sites which obtain a score of 51 out of 65 or above in the initial assessment clearly perform well and are affected by the fewest constraints (scoring 0 or 1 in no more than one of the assessment criteria). Accordingly, we initially placed these sites into Category 1. Sites achieving overall scores of between 41 and 50 out of 65 perform moderately well against the assessment criteria, facing more significant constraints than the best-scoring sites but which still appear to be achievable/deliverable, and so we initially rated these sites as Category 2. Sites achieving low overall scores, of below 41 out of 65, perform least well against the assessment criteria, facing at least three significant constraints; therefore, in our initial categorisation exercise, these sites were initially placed into Category 3.
- 6.6 As we explained in Section 4, although the GIS-based site assessment provides a good indication of each site's performance against a broad number of important measures, it is still necessary to undertake a supplementary assessment of the sites to ensure that certain 'core' constraints are fully taken into account.
- 6.7 Thus, we ordered the various core constraints - relating to bad neighbours, availability, biodiversity, flood risk and achievability³⁶ - and considered which are most easily overcome and which are more likely to prevent a site from coming forward. In the case of the latter, this is not to say that the constraint could not be overcome, rather that it is likely to delay the site coming forward until such time as it is possible, or worthwhile, to overcome the constraint.
- 6.8 Our approach to site categorisation is set out in the table at the rear of the Site Assessment Criteria Note, which is presented in Appendix 3. Each site was placed

³⁶ There is no Green Belt or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty in North Northamptonshire to take account of.

initially into Category 1, 2 or 3 on the basis of its overall score in the GIS-based site assessment. However, if a site is affected by additional constraints of the types listed in the table at the rear of Appendix 3, these will tend to downgrade its categorisation as indicated. The overall categorisation of a site therefore depends on the particular combination of constraints affecting it.

- 6.9 We have reflected the clear sequential approach in PPS25 in our categorisation of sites. Flood Risk Zones 1 and 2 are both acceptable locations for housing³⁷ but under the sequential approach, Zone 1 is preferable to Zone 2. Accordingly, we have placed Flood Zone 1 sites into Category 1 and Flood Zone 2 sites into Category 2. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) - undertaken across the whole of North Northamptonshire, incorporating assessments undertaken at the individual LPA level - was completed in June 2007. From the supplied data we are unable to distinguish between Flood Risk Zone 3a (where development can be acceptable, provided a PPS25 'Exception Test' is passed) and Zone 3b ('the Functional Floodplain', which is not suitable for housing). Thus, for the purposes of our assessment, we have necessarily had to treat all sites within Zone 3 in the same way (that is, we have given them all a score of 0 under this criterion), although it is possible that some of these sites might fall within Zone 3b, where housing development is effectively ruled out by PPS25. Under the PPS25 sequential approach, Flood Zone 3a sites are the least preferred location for housing development and so we have given a Category 3 rating to any sites which are deemed to be within Flood Zone 3a, even if they are not subject to any other constraints.
- 6.10 PPS3 gives clear priority to housing on PDL rather than on greenfield sites³⁸. Nevertheless, greenfield and brownfield development can be regarded as complementary and the contribution of both will be required in order to meet projected demand in the long-term, given the scale of the housing challenge in North Northamptonshire. Indeed, this is acknowledged in paragraph 3.64 of the CSS, which sets a target for 30 per cent of new dwellings to be built on PDL. We have therefore not made PDL/greenfield status a criterion for placing sites into Category bands, but have separately identified the theoretical yield from PDL and greenfield sites to allow us to examine their respective roles in meeting overall housing requirements.
- 6.11 We also considered bad neighbour constraints in our categorisation exercise. Whilst these constraints are unlikely to prevent a site coming forward for development, they nevertheless require mitigation, which may affect the availability of a site for residential development. Sites facing bad neighbour constraints have thus been downgraded to Category 2 or 3, depending on the degree of constraint.
- 6.12 It is important to emphasise that for a site to achieve a Category 1 rating, it would need to be suitable, and available (or capable of being made available) within 5 years, and achievable.
- 6.13 The placing of a site into Categories 1, 2 and 3 is intended to give a useful indication of the deliverability and potential timing of a site's development, and therefore its suitability for inclusion as an allocation in the LDF. Sites in Category 1 have minimal constraints - which can relate to policy restrictions on the site's location, physical difficulties, availability, and/or achievability - and are considered to be available for delivery within the first five years. These sites are clear candidates for allocation. Sites in Category 2 have a limited level of constraints such that they are likely to be available for delivery after the first five years. These sites may be suitable for allocation, depending on their individual circumstances and on specific measures being proposed to overcome their constraints. Sites in Category 3 have more significant constraints; for these sites to be considered appropriate for development or

³⁷ See Table D.3 of PPS25.

³⁸ See para 36 of PPS3.

for allocation it would have to be clearly demonstrated that the significant constraints could be overcome in order to make them deliverable.

- 6.14 However, the inclusion of a site in a higher Category band should not be taken to represent a recommendation that it should be allocated in the LDF, as our categorisation process does not take account of all the policy considerations that are relevant in selecting sites for allocation. Equally, it should not be concluded that a site assigned to a lower Category band cannot come forward, or that it cannot be allocated for development. Rather, it would need to be demonstrated that the site's constraints could be overcome in order to secure its deliverability.

Assessment of Whether There is a Need to Make a Small Site Allowance

- 6.15 Paragraph 59 of PPS3 states that windfalls '*should not be included in the first 10 years of land supply unless Local Planning Authorities can provide robust evidence of genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites being identified. In these circumstances, an allowance should be included but should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends.*'
- 6.16 Where there is evidence of a high and consistent proportion of new dwellings generated on small sites, a case could be made for adopting a small site allowance as an element of the total housing requirement for the Borough or District. There is a clearly recognised risk that, if developments on small sites (including, for instance, subdivisions of large houses) - which are sure to occur, regardless of how thorough the SHLAA is - are not taken into account, then this could lead to over-allocation of greenfield land, which would be counter to PPS3. Based on information supplied by the four Councils we have therefore assessed the level of production on sites below 0.25ha (the study's minimum site size threshold) in recent years.
- 6.17 The findings from our analysis are provided below. In each Borough/District apart from Corby, the annual average number of dwelling completions on PDL sites below 0.25ha in recent years is significant enough to provide a firm justification for making a small site allowance. Nevertheless, paragraph 54 of PPS3 states that the supply for the first five years should be based on '*specific deliverable sites*'. Accordingly, we have not made a small site allowance for the first 5-year period in any LPA area.
- 6.18 In consultation with the JPU, it was agreed that we would make a small site allowance for the subsequent 5-year periods (except for Corby, where the recent rate of completions on small sites does not justify a small sites allowance). The use of small site allowances in the second, third and fourth 5-year study periods will make the SHLAA more realistic and robust, particularly as we applied a minimum site size threshold in the study (which, by definition, means that we have not considered any specific sites below 0.25ha in size).

Corby Borough

- 6.19 Corby Borough Council provided data on levels of production on PDL sites below the study site size threshold of 0.25ha over the period 2005/06 to 2007/08. The data show that only 40 dwellings were completed on PDL sites below 0.25ha in the Borough, equating to a three-year average of around 13 dwellings per annum (dpa). As noted above, we do not consider that this level of supply from small sites justifies making a small site allowance in Corby.

East Northamptonshire District

- 6.20 Data provided by East Northamptonshire Council show that between 2002 and 2008, 792 dwellings were completed on PDL sites below 0.25ha, equating to an average of 132 dpa. The six-year annual average completion rate would translate to 5-, 10-, 15-

and 20-year small site allowances of 660, 1,320, 1,980, and 2,640 dwellings, respectively.

- 6.21 However, given the current downturn with the housing market, and because the supply from small sites cannot continue indefinitely, we consider that it is sensible to apply a more cautious small site allowance. Accordingly, we derived a 5-year small-site allowance for East Northamptonshire by halving the past trends-derived figure of 660 dwellings referred to above. This gives a small site allowance of 330 dwellings for each of the second, third and fourth 5-year periods. As discussed above, we do not consider it appropriate to make a small site allowance for the first 5-year period.

Kettering Borough

- 6.22 Data provided by Kettering Borough Council show that between 2002 and 2008, a total of 503 dwellings were completed on PDL sites below 0.25ha, equating to an average of 84 dpa. The six-year annual average completion rate would translate to 5-, 10-, 15- and 20-year small sites allowances of 420, 840, 1,260, and 1,680 dwellings, respectively. Following the same approach that we took for East Northamptonshire, we adopted a small site allowance of 210 dwellings for each of the second, third and fourth 5-year periods in Kettering.

Borough of Wellingborough

- 6.23 Data provided by Wellingborough Borough Council show that between 2002 and 2008, 575 dwellings were completed on PDL sites below 0.25ha, equating to an average of 96 dpa. The six-year annual average completion rate would therefore translate to 5-, 10-, 15- and 20-year small sites allowances of 480, 960, 1,440, and 1,920 dwellings, respectively. Again, we have halved these rates to provide a cautious small site allowance of 240 dwellings for each of the second, third and fourth 5-year periods in Wellingborough.

Site Yield by Category Band

- 6.24 The following tables suffixed 'a' detail, for each Council, the number of sites apportioned across Category bands 1-3 and their potential combined yields. Sites within each Category band are further classified (suffixed 'b' in the tables) according to their gross site area into those below and those above 10 ha. This is because the database includes some large sites where a decision to allocate or approve development would have to be based on wider policy considerations than is the case with smaller sites. These considerations are likely to include the broad sustainability of the total development pattern, and strategic transport and other infrastructure capacity. Before such large sites could be proposed for allocation they would also require careful attention to their size, capacity and boundaries, which would be beyond the remit of this strategic study. These large sites are best considered as 'broad locations' in the terminology of the Guidance³⁹. The tables do not include the sites within and adjacent to the SUEs, which are assessed separately in Section 7 of our report.

Corby Borough

- 6.25 Table 6.1a shows that Category 1 sites in Corby offer a potential yield of around 4,650 dwellings, 40 per cent of which is on PDL. Category 2 sites offer a yield of around 3,400 dwellings, almost all of which is on greenfield land. The theoretical supply from Category 3 sites is approximately 10,550 dwellings, but again only a small proportion (just over 10 per cent) is on PDL.

³⁹ 'Broad locations' are defined in the Guidance as "areas where housing development is considered feasible and will be encouraged, but where specific sites cannot yet be identified". Two types of broad location are given as examples in the Guidance: (a) those within and adjoining settlements - for example, areas where housing development is or could be encouraged, and small extensions to settlements; and (b) those outside settlements - for example, major urban extensions, growth points, growth areas, new free-standing settlements and eco-towns.

Table 6.1a Summary Yield Schedule from Categorised Sites, Corby Borough

	TOTAL YIELD	Dwelling Yield From PDL Sites			Dwelling Yield From GF Sites		
		Sites up to 10ha Gross	Sites Over 10ha Gross	Total	Sites up to 10ha Gross	Sites Over 10ha Gross	Total
Category 1	4,639	1,518	320	1,838	2,801	0	2,801
Category 2	3,392	209	0	209	983	2,200	3,183
Category 3	10,561	851	412	1,263	2,246	7,052	9,298
	18,592	2,578	732	3,310	6,030	9,252	15,282

- 6.26 Table 6.1b shows that of the 160 sites in Corby that we assessed, 10 have a site area above 10 ha, offering a combined yield of just under 10,000 dwellings. One of these 'broad locations' is in Category 1, a PDL site offering a relatively modest yield of 320 dwellings. The two broad locations that are rated as Category 2 offer potential for 2,200 dwellings. The remaining seven broad locations in Category 3 offer a combined yield of just under 7,500 dwellings, most of which comes from greenfield sites.

Table 6.1b Detailed Yield Schedule from Categorised Sites, Corby Borough

Category	Site area	Total		PDL		GF	
		Dwgs	No. Sites	Dwgs	No. Sites	Dwgs	No. Sites
1a	< 10 ha	4,319	73	1,518	22	2,801	51
1b	> 10 ha	320	1	320	1	0	0
2a	< 10 ha	1,192	19	209	6	983	13
2b	> 10 ha	2,200	2	0	0	2,200	2
3a	< 10 ha	3,097	58	851	22	2,246	36
3b	> 10 ha	7,464	7	412	1	7,052	6
TOTALS		18,592	160	3,310	52	15,282	108

East Northamptonshire District

- 6.27 Table 6.2a shows that Category 1 sites in East Northamptonshire offer a modest potential yield of just over 1,000 dwellings, over 90 per cent of which is from sites in Rushden (562 dwellings) or Irthlingborough (399 dwellings); there is very little Category 1 supply from other locations in the District. Category 2 sites offer a greater theoretical yield of around 7,600 dwellings. The potential supply from Category 3 sites is greater still at almost 10,000 dwellings. The vast majority of yield in Category bands 2 and 3 is from greenfield sites.

Table 6.2a Summary Yield Schedule from Categorised Sites, East Northamptonshire District

	TOTAL YIELD	Dwelling Yield From PDL Sites			Dwelling Yield From GF Sites		
		Sites up to 10ha Gross	Sites Over 10ha Gross	Total	Sites up to 10ha Gross	Sites Over 10ha Gross	Total
Category 1	1,002	889	0	889	113	0	113
Category 2	7,597	1,016	470	1,486	2,777	3,334	6,111
Category 3	9,872	869	0	869	1,460	7,543	9,003
	18,471	2,774	470	3,244	4,350	10,877	15,227

- 6.28 Table 6.2b shows that of the 166 sites that we assessed in East Northamptonshire, 15 can be described as 'broad locations', offering a combined yield of around 11,350 dwellings. None of the 15 broad locations are in Category 1 but five, offering a potential yield of around 3,800 dwellings, are in Category 2. All 10 of the broad locations that are rated as Category 3 are greenfield sites. Together these sites offer potential for over 7,500 dwellings.

Table 6.2b Detailed Yield Schedule from Categorised Sites, East Northamptonshire District

Category	Site area	Total		PDL		GF	
		Dwgs	No. Sites	Dwgs	No. Sites	Dwgs	No. Sites
1a	< 10 ha	1,002	22	889	20	113	2
1b	> 10 ha	0	0	0	0	0	0
2a	< 10 ha	3,793	62	1,016	25	2,777	37
2b	> 10 ha	3,804	5	470	1	3,334	4
3a	< 10 ha	2,329	67	869	36	1,460	31
3b	> 10 ha	7,543	10	0	0	7,543	10
TOTALS		18,471	166	3,244	82	15,227	84

Kettering Borough

- 6.29 Category 1 sites in Kettering offer a potential yield of just under 2,000 dwellings, as shown by Table 6.3a. Just under half of the Category 1 supply is from PDL sites. Category 2 sites offer a considerably greater yield of around 14,900 dwellings, almost all of which is on greenfield land. Most of the theoretical supply from Category 3 sites, which offer potential for approximately 8,600 dwellings, is also from greenfield sites.

Table 6.3a Summary Yield Schedule from Categorised Sites, Kettering Borough

	TOTAL YIELD	Dwelling Yield From PDL Sites			Dwelling Yield From GF Sites		
		Sites up to 10ha Gross	Sites Over 10ha Gross	Total	Sites up to 10ha Gross	Sites Over 10ha Gross	Total
Category 1	1,966	952	0	952	554	460	1,014
Category 2	14,896	425	0	425	4,026	10,445	14,471
Category 3	8,574	313	0	313	380	7,881	8,261
	25,436	1,690	0	1,690	4,960	18,786	23,746

- 6.30 Table 6.3b shows that of the 111 sites in Kettering that we assessed, 19 are 'broad locations', offering a combined yield of about 18,800 dwellings. Only one of these broad locations is in Category 1, a greenfield site offering a yield of 460 dwellings. In contrast, there are 11 broad locations in Category 2, offering a substantial combined yield of about 10,450 dwellings, which comes exclusively from greenfield sites. All of the seven broad locations that are rated as Category 3, which offer potential for about 7,900 dwellings, are also greenfield sites.

Table 6.3b Detailed Yield Schedule from Categorised Sites, Kettering Borough

Category	Site area	Total		PDL		GF	
		Dwgs	No. Sites	Dwgs	No. Sites	Dwgs	No. Sites
1a	< 10 ha	1,506	27	952	21	554	6
1b	> 10 ha	460	1	0	0	460	1
2a	< 10 ha	4,451	51	425	11	4,026	40
2b	> 10 ha	10,445	11	0	0	10,445	11
3a	< 10 ha	693	14	313	7	380	7
3b	> 10 ha	7,881	7	0	0	7,881	7
TOTALS		25,436	111	1,690	39	23,746	72

Borough of Wellingborough

- 6.31 Table 6.4a shows that Category 1 sites in Wellingborough offer a potential yield of around 1,950 dwellings, over half of which comes from PDL sites. Category 2 sites offer a theoretical yield of around 7,400 dwellings, the vast majority of which is from greenfield sites. Category 3 sites collectively offer potential for about 14,000 dwellings, again mostly on greenfield land.

Table 6.4a Summary Yield Schedule from Categorised Sites, Borough of Wellingborough

	TOTAL YIELD	Dwelling Yield From PDL Sites			Dwelling Yield From GF Sites		
		Sites up to 10ha Gross	Sites Over 10ha Gross	Total	Sites up to 10ha Gross	Sites Over 10ha Gross	Total
Category 1	1,962	1,194	0	1,194	768	0	768
Category 2	7,379	520	0	520	3,000	3,859	6,859
Category 3	13,993	511	0	511	1,569	11,913	13,482
	23,334	2,225	0	2,225	5,337	15,772	21,109

- 6.32 Table 6.4b shows that 16 of the 120 sites that we assessed in Wellingborough can be described as 'broad locations', offering a combined yield of around 15,800 dwellings. None of the 16 broad locations are in Category 1. The broad locations are all on greenfield land, including five within Category 2 and 11 in Category 3, the latter tranche offering a theoretical yield of around 11,900 dwellings.

Table 6.4b Detailed Yield Schedule from Categorisation Sites, Borough of Wellingborough

Category	Site area	Total		PDL		GF	
		Dwgs	No. Sites	Dwgs	No. Sites	Dwgs	No. Sites
1a	< 10 ha	1,962	32	1,194	22	768	10
1b	> 10 ha	0	0	0	0	0	0
2a	< 10 ha	3,520	45	520	14	3,000	31
2b	> 10 ha	3,859	5	0	0	3,859	5
3a	< 10 ha	2,080	27	511	14	1,569	13
3b	> 10 ha	11,913	11	0	0	11,913	11
TOTALS		23,334	120	2,225	50	21,109	70

Categorisation Schedules and Plans

- 6.33 Categorisation schedules are set out in Appendices 4, 5 and 6, and detail the Category rating (1, 2 or 3) for all 577 of the sites in the study. These Appendices also provide brief address details, the gross site area and the theoretical housing yield (after allowance has been made for any site-specific physical constraints) for each site.
- 6.34 The plans in Appendix 7 show, in schematic terms, the spatial distribution of Category 1, Category 2 and Category 3 sites, both at the North Northamptonshire level and also for each LPA area. The plans show that the vast majority of Category 1 sites are located within or immediately adjacent to the urban area. Some of the Category 2 sites are also located within existing settlement boundaries although in a significant number of cases, development of the Category 2 sites would represent an expansion of the urban area. The plan in Appendix 7 also shows that most of the Category 3 sites are located outside of the urban area, although not exclusively; for instance, a significant number of the sites in Corby that are located within the urban area have been rated as Category 3.

7 TOTAL HOUSING YIELD, SITE CATEGORISATION & CONTRIBUTION FROM THE SUSTAINABLE URBAN EXTENSIONS

Introduction

- 7.1 In this section, we assess the identified potential that could contribute to housing supply over the next 20 years (which we then summarise in Tables 7.2 to 7.5). The elements of potential housing supply comprise:
- i) sites with planning permission;
 - ii) a small site allowance (for the second, third and fourth 5-year periods⁴⁰); and
 - iii) sites identified in this assessment as potentially suitable for housing.
- 7.2 Of the identified sites in (iii) above, those in Category 3 should be considered to represent real potential only when it has been demonstrated that the significant constraints affecting these sites - which could relate to physical, availability or achievability factors, or a combination thereof - can be mitigated or overcome to make them deliverable.

Adequacy of Housing Provision

Approach

- 7.3 We have assessed the adequacy of the identified potential housing supply for meeting the dwelling requirements over 5-year periods from April 2008. As we explained in Section 5, we have adjusted the dwelling requirements to reflect any under-supply against the dwelling requirements between the base date of the adopted CSS (1 April 2001) and the study base date (1 April 2008). Furthermore, because the dwelling requirements are net of clearance replacement, it is necessary to make an allowance for anticipated demolitions, and this is taken into account in Tables 7.2 to 7.5 below.
- 7.4 The components of potential housing supply are also set out in Tables 7.2 to 7.5, and are referenced as follows:
- PP = dwellings still to be completed at 1 April 2008 with outstanding planning permission at that date⁴¹;
 - SS = small site allowance (as defined in Section 6), numbered SS1 for the second 5-year period, SS2 for the third 5-year period, and SS3 for the fourth 5-year period;
 - C1, C2, C3 = potential of sites in Category bands 1, 2 and 3 respectively, suffixed 'a' for identified sites and 'b' for broad locations (i.e. over 10 ha); and
 - SUE-PHA1, SUE-PHA2 and SUE-PHA3 = first, second and third phases of supply from sites within Strategic Urban Extensions (not including those sites for which planning permission has already been granted, which are included within the 'PP' figures).
- 7.5 In order to determine the figures for SUE-PHA1, SUE-PHA2 and SUE-PHA3, we have taken into account the targets for dwellings to be supplied within the various SUEs, and their expected start dates as illustrated by Figure 13 of the adopted CSS. In no case

⁴⁰ Refer to paragraphs 6.19 - 6.23 for further explanation of each LPA's small-site allowance.

⁴¹ As we explained in Section 5, we have applied a non-implementation rate of 5 per cent to all outstanding residential planning permissions that had not been commenced at the study base date, and we applied a 20 per cent non-implementation rate to all planning permissions that are due to expire by 1 April 2009. This is taken into account in Tables 7.2 to 7.5.

have we assumed a greater supply from the SUEs than is specified in CSS Figure 13. Our assumptions in relation to the SUEs are summarised in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1 Assumed Phasing for the SUEs

SUE	Anticipated Start Date			TOTAL	Comments
	First 5 Years (2008-2013)	Second 5 Years (2013-2018)	Third 5 Years (2018-2023)		
North East Corby	0	350	350	700	This SUE already has outline planning permission for the 4400 dwellings that will fall within Corby Borough, which are covered by the planning permission figures. Some 700 dwellings will fall within the boundary of East Northamptonshire but have not yet been granted permission - however, as this is an SUE to Corby, these figures will be included in the figures for Corby BC.
West Corby	0	2000	2000	4000	Delivery is expected to start after 2011 - therefore we cannot rely on any supply for the first five year period. There is a plentiful potential supply (the SUE could easily supply far more than the CSS target). The expected delivery has been split 50/50 between the next two periods to reflect phased delivery.
Total for Corby	0	2350	2350	4700	
Kettering East	750	1725	1725	4200	Targets can be met easily using sites identified in the SHLAA. The JPU informed us that 750 units are expected to be delivered within the first five years; remaining supply has been split evenly between the second and third five-year periods.
Total for Kettering	750	1725	1725	4200	
Wellingborough East	0	0	1150	1150	Planning permission has already been granted for 3,200 dwellings. It can be assumed that the remaining 1,150 dwellings will come forward in the third five-year period.
North West Wellingborough	0	1150	1150	2300	Delivery is expected to start after 2011 - therefore we cannot rely on any supply for the first five year period. There is a plentiful potential supply (the SUE could easily supply far more than the CSS target). The expected delivery has been split 50/50 between the next two periods to reflect phased delivery.
Total for Wellingborough	0	1150	2300	3450	

- 7.6 Tables 7.2 to 7.5 detail the composition of potential housing supply across the 5-, 10-, 15- and 20-year study periods. Within each period, the yield from a combination of components is compared with the dwelling target for the period. Where a combination is sufficient to meet the target, the yield and the number of additional identified sites which make up the yield is highlighted in green. Otherwise the yield and number of sites are left without colour. It is therefore immediately apparent to what extent the potential housing supply for a period is sufficient to meet the target.
- 7.7 The approach described above is adopted for both the total yield and the yield on PDL. It should be noted, however, that the yields for the latter include dwellings from planning permissions on greenfield as well as PDL sites. In treating PDL separately from greenfield yield, it is immediately apparent from the table whether and to what extent it is likely to be necessary to call on additional greenfield land to meet the RSS requirement, which is important because maximising the use of PDL is a key policy aim of PPS3.
- 7.8 As we made clear in Section 6, our site categorisation does not take account of all the policy considerations that are relevant in selecting sites for allocation, which are likely to include the broad sustainability of the total development pattern, and strategic transport and other infrastructure capacity. Thus, we have not undertaken any analysis to consider whether the Category 1 supply, as indicated in Tables 7.2 to 7.5,

is in the right place to meet strategic policy objectives. Similarly, we have not considered whether it would be better to remove the obstacles affecting Category 2 PDL and bring these sites forward in advance of Category 1 greenfield sites in order to limit encroachment into open countryside. These issues are beyond the scope of a SHLAA and will need to be considered through the LDF preparation process.

Yield Assessment

Corby Borough

- 7.9 Table 7.2 indicates that the number of dwellings with outstanding planning permission at the study base date (having made an allowance for non-implementation) can easily meet the Borough's dwelling requirement for the first five years, of 4,869 net additional dwellings. The figure of around 6,800 dwellings from extant planning permissions includes the outline permission for 4,400 dwellings at Priors Hall (the North East Corby SUE). We acknowledge that not all of these dwellings will be built in the first 5-year period, and it is possible that full implementation of some of the other larger permissions might not occur within the first 5-year period. Nevertheless, as Table 7.2 shows, even if the existing planning permission sites in Corby take more than 5 years to be fully implemented, there is plenty of capacity from Category 1a sites to meet any temporary shortfall.
- 7.10 There is a need to make provision for a further 5,496 dwellings to cover the 10-year period. Planning permissions for this period are not sufficient but the target can be reached by using some of the 73 Category 1a sites (that is, sites in Category band 1 which are 10 ha or less in size), which could yield 4,319 dwellings as shown by Table 6.1b. The 10-year target cannot be reached from PDL sites, even if the more constrained PDL sites within Category bands 2 and 3 are considered. The same is true for the third and fourth 5-year periods.
- 7.11 Allocations in the LDF need to be increased by a further 6,202 dwellings to cover the 15-year dwelling target. It is reasonable to assume, however, that over the 15-year period, all of the expected supply from the SUEs will have come forward. Thus, the target can be met from the SUEs, in combination with the 74 Category 1 sites and the 19 Category 2a sites.
- 7.12 The entire supply from the SUEs, together with all Category 1 and Category 2 sites, will fall slightly short of the 20-year dwelling requirement of 21,867 dwellings. Therefore, it will be necessary to allocate some of the Category 3 sites - assuming that the significant constraints affecting these sites are overcome by then - or alternatively by extending the SUEs.

Table 7.2 Adequacy of Cumulative Housing Potential in Corby Borough, Forthcoming 5-, 10-, 15- and 20-year Periods⁴²

Period	Component	Total		PDL	
		Yield	Additional Sites (i)	Yield (ii)	Additional Sites (i)
First 5 years	pp	6,808	0	6,808	0
	PP+C1a	11,127	51	8,326	22
	Dwelling Target (iii)	4,869		4,869	22
First 10 years	PP+C1a	11,127	73	8,326	22
	PP+C1a+C1b	11,447	74	8,646	23
	Dwelling Target (iii)	10,365		10,365	
First 15 years	PP+C1a	11,127	73	8,326	22
	PP+C1a+C1b	11,447	74	8,646	23
	PP+C1a+C2a	12,319	92	8,535	92
	PP+C1a+C1b+SUE_PHA1	13,797	79	8,646	23
	PP+C1a+C1b+C2a+SUE_PHA1	14,989	98	8,855	29
	PP+C1a+C1b+C2a+SUE_PHA1+SUE_PHA2	17,339	102	8,855	29
	PP+C1+C2+C3	25,400	160	10,118	52
	Dwelling Target (iii)	16,567		16,567	
First 20 years	PP+C1a	11,127	73	8,326	22
	PP+C1a+C1b	11,447	74	8,646	23
	PP+C1a+C1b+SUE_PHA1	13,797	79	10,996	23
	PP+C1a+C1b+SUE_PHA1+SUE_PHA2	16,147	83	13,346	23
	PP+C1a+C1b+All SUEs+C2a	17,339	102	13,555	29
	PP+C1+All SUEs+C2a+C2b	19,539	104	13,555	29
	PP+C1+C2+C3+All SUEs	30,100	169	10,118	52
	Dwelling Target (iii)	21,867		21,867	

Notes:

(i) "Additional" = sites additional to those with planning permission

(ii) PDL yield includes dwellings from planning permissions on greenfield land as well as PDL sites, as these greenfield sites will also contribute to the dwelling requirements even if all other future development were to be on PDL sites.

(iii) The 'Dwelling Target' figure incorporates an allowance for likely demolitions in the Borough, as well as an allowance for under-provision against the CSS requirements which arose between the base date of the CSS (2001) and the SHLAA study base date (1 April 2008).

(iv) Note that outline planning permission has already been granted for 4,400 dwellings at the North East Corby SUE ('Priors Hall') - consequently these dwellings are included in the PP figures rather than the SUE figures.

(v) The yield figures for the first and second phases of the Corby SUEs amount to 2,350 ('SUE_PHA1') and 2,350 ('SUE_PHA2'), respectively.

East Northamptonshire District

- 7.13 Sites with outstanding planning permission are not sufficient to meet the dwelling requirement for the first five years, as shown by Table 7.3. However, the target can be achieved with the use of all of the Category 1a sites together with a small proportion of the Category 2a sites. It is also possible to meet the 5-year target without allocating any further greenfield sites by using a combination of the Category 1a and 2a sites on PDL.
- 7.14 There is a need to make provision for a further 2,354 dwellings to cover the 10-year period. The target can be reached through a combination of Category 1a and Category 2a sites, when considered together with the small site allowance for this period. It is not possible to meet the 10-year target without allocating greenfield sites, and it follows therefore that the 15- and 20-year targets will also require the allocation of greenfield sites.

⁴² Green cells denote where a combination of components is sufficient to meet the LPA dwelling target (refer to paragraph 7.6. for further information).

- 7.15 Provision for a further 2,081 dwellings needs to be made to cover the 15-year period. In order to reach this target, it will be necessary to allocate a combination of Category 1, Category 2a and Category 2b sites.
- 7.16 Allocations in the LDF need to be increased by a further 2,180 dwellings to cover the 20-year period. Again, this target can be reached from a combination of Category 1, Category 2a and Category 2b sites.

Table 7.3 Adequacy of Cumulative Housing Potential in East Northamptonshire District, Forthcoming 5-, 10-, 15- and 20-year Periods⁴³

Period	Component	Total		PDL	
		Yield	Additional Sites (i)	Yield (ii)	Additional Sites (i)
First 5 years	PP	1,047	0	1,047	0
	PP+C1a	2,049	22	1,936	20
	PP+C1a+C2a	5,842	84	2,406	45
	Dwelling Target (iii)	2,364		2,364	
First 10 years	PP+SS1	1,377	0	1,377	0
	PP+SS1+C1a	2,379	22	2,266	20
	PP+SS1+C1a+C2a	6,172	84	3,282	45
	Dwelling Target (iii)	4,718		4,718	
First 15 years	PP+SS2	1,707	0	1,707	0
	PP+SS2+C1a	2,709	22	2,596	20
	PP+SS2+C1a+C2a	6,502	84	3,612	45
	PP+SS2+C1a+C2a+C2b	10,306	89	4,082	46
	Dwelling Target (iii)	6,799		6,799	
First 20 years	PP+SS3	2,037	0	2,037	0
	PP+SS3+C1a	3,039	22	2,926	20
	PP+SS3+C1a+C2a	6,832	84	3,942	45
	PP+SS3+C1a+C2a+C2b	10,636	84	4,412	45
	Dwelling Target (iii)	8,979		8,979	
Notes:					
<i>(i) "Additional" = sites additional to those with planning permission</i>					
<i>(ii) The purpose of the PDL yield column is to indicate the yield which can be achieved without granting further permissions on greenfield sites. As planning permission has already been granted for some greenfield sites, the figures in the PDL yield column will include some dwellings from extant planning permissions on greenfield land.</i>					
<i>(iii) The 'Dwelling Requirement' figure incorporates an allowance for likely demolitions in the District</i>					

Kettering Borough

- 7.17 Table 7.4 indicates that extant planning permissions together with all of the Category 1a sites will be required in order to meet Kettering Borough's dwelling requirement for the first five years of 3,474 dwellings, as well as that part of the supply from the SUEs which can be expected to come forward within the first 5 years. The Borough's 5-year dwelling target cannot be reached solely from PDL sites, even if all of the more constrained Category 2 and Category 3 PDL sites are used; the same applies to the 10-, 15- and 20-year periods.
- 7.18 Allocations for a further 3,788 dwellings need to be made in the LDF to cover the second 5-year period. The target can be achieved from a combination of Category 1a and Category 2a sites when considered together with the SUE-PHA1 and SUE-PHA2 sites, which it is reasonable to assume can be brought forward within 10 years.

⁴³ Green cells denote where a combination of components is sufficient to meet the LPA dwelling target (refer to paragraph 7.6. for further information).

- 7.19 Allocations in the LDF need to be increased by a further 3,459 dwellings to cover the 15-year period. The target can be met by a combination of Category 1 and Category 2a sites together with the SUE-PHA1, SUE-PHA2 and SUE-PHA3 sites (this would account for the entire allocation of the SUE for Kettering Borough).
- 7.20 Provision for a further 3,150 dwellings will be needed to meet the 20-year dwelling target. There remains sufficient capacity without having to use any Category 3 sites.

Table 7.4 Adequacy of Cumulative Housing Potential in Kettering Borough, Forthcoming 5-, 10-, 15- and 20-year Periods⁴⁴

Period	Component	Total		PDL	
		Yield	Additional Sites (i)	Yield (ii)	Additional Sites (i)
First 5 years	pp	1,558	0	1,558	0
	PP+C1a	3,064	27	2,510	21
	PP+C1a+SUE1	3,814	29	2,510	21
	Dwelling Target (iii)	3,474		3,474	
First 10 years	PP+SS1	1,768	0	1,768	0
	PP+SS1+C1a	3,274	27	2,720	21
	PP+SS1+C1a+C1b	3,734	28	2,720	21
	PP+SS1+C1a+C1b+SUE_PHA1	4,484	80	2,720	32
	PP+SS1+C1a+C1b+SUE_PHA1+SUE_PHA2	6,209	79	2,720	32
	PP+SS1+C1+SUE_PHA1+SUE_PHA2+C2a	10,660	130	3,145	43
	PP+SS1+C1+C2+C3	27,204	111	3,458	39
	Dwelling Target (iii)	7,262		7,262	
First 15 years	PP+SS2	1,978	0	1,978	0
	PP+SS2+C1a	3,484	27	2,930	21
	PP+SS2+C1a+C1b	3,944	28	2,930	21
	PP+SS2+C1+SUE_PHA1+SUE_PHA2	6,419	32	2,930	21
	PP+SS2+C1+SUE_PHA1+SUE_PHA2+SUE_PHA3	8,144	34	2,930	21
	PP+SS2+C1+All SUEs+C2a	12,595	85	3,355	32
	PP+SS2+C1+C2+C3	27,414	111	3,668	39
Dwelling Target (iii)	10,721		10,721		
First 20 years	PP+SS3	2,188	0	2,188	0
	PP+SS3+C1a	3,694	27	3,140	21
	PP+SS3+C1a+C1b	4,154	28	3,140	21
	PP+SS3+C1a+C1b+All SUEs	8,354	34	3,140	21
	PP+SS3+C1a+C2a+All SUEs	12,345	84	3,565	32
	PP+SS3+C1+C2a+C2b+All SUEs	23,250	96	3,565	32
	PP+SS3+C1+C2+C3	27,624	111	3,878	39
	Dwelling Target (iii)	13,871		13,871	

Notes:

(i) "Additional" = sites additional to those with planning permission

(ii) PDL yield includes dwellings from planning permissions on greenfield land as well as PDL sites, as these greenfield sites will also contribute to the dwelling requirements even if all other future development were to be on PDL sites.

(iii) The 'Dwelling Target' figure incorporates an allowance for likely demolitions in the Borough.

(iv) The yield figures for the first, second and third phases of the Kettering SUE amounts to 750 ('SUE_PHA1'), 1,725 ('SUE_PHA2') and 1,725 ('SUE_PHA3'), respectively.

Borough of Wellingborough

- 7.21 Outstanding planning permissions are sufficient to meet the Borough's dwelling requirement for the first five years, as shown by Table 7.5. A significant proportion of the supply from existing planning permissions is from the outline planning permission for the first 3,200 dwellings at the Wellingborough East SUE, although we acknowledge that not all of the permitted dwellings are likely to be built in the first 5-year period. Nevertheless, as Table 7.5 shows, even if the existing planning

⁴⁴ Green cells denote where a combination of components is sufficient to meet the LPA dwelling target (refer to paragraph 7.6. for further information).

permission sites in Wellingborough take more than 5 years to be fully implemented, there is plenty of capacity from Category 1a sites to meet any temporary shortfall.

- 7.22 There is a need to make provision for a further 4,484 dwellings to cover the 10-year period. The target can be reached by using most of the Category 1a, 1b and 2a sites, together with the SUE-PHA1 and SUE-PHA2 sites. However, the target cannot be reached from PDL, even if the entire pool of 50 PDL sites across all Category bands - which together offer potential for 2,225 dwellings - is used. The same is therefore true for the third and fourth 5-year periods.
- 7.23 Allocations in the LDF need to be increased by a further 3,948 dwellings to cover Wellingborough's 15-year dwelling requirement. This target can be reached from a combination of Category 1 and Category 2a sites, together with the SUE-PHA1, SUE-PHA2 and SUE-PHA3 sites (that is, the entire expected supply from the Borough's SUEs).
- 7.24 In addition to the allocations described above, a number of sites from Category 2b will be needed to cover the 20-year target. There will be no need to allocate any of the heavily constrained Category 3 sites to meet Wellingborough's long-term dwelling requirements, given the substantial supply that is expected from Wellingborough's SUEs.

Table 7.5 Adequacy of Cumulative Housing Potential in the Borough of Wellingborough, Forthcoming 5-, 10-, 15- and 20-year Periods⁴⁵

Period	Component	Total		PDL	
		Yield	Additional Sites (i)	Yield (ii)	Additional Sites (i)
First 5 years	PP	3,718	0	3,718	0
	PP+C1a	5,680	32	4,912	22
	Dwelling Target (iii)	3,515		3,515	
First 10 years	PP+SS1	3,958	0	3,958	0
	PP+SS1+C1a	5,920	32	5,152	22
	PP+SS1+C1a+C1b	5,920	32	5,152	22
	PP+SS1+C1a+C1b+SUE_PHA1	5,920	77	5,152	36
	PP+SS1+C1a+C1b+SUE1_PHA+SUE_PHA2	7,070	77	5,152	36
	PP+SS1+C1+SUE_PHA1+SUE_PHA2+C2a	10,590	122	5,672	50
	PP+SS1+C1+C2+C3	27,292	120	6,423	50
	Dwelling Target (iii)	7,999		7,999	
First 15 years	PP+SS2	4,198	0	4,198	0
	PP+SS2+C1a	6,160	32	5,392	22
	PP+SS2+C1a+C1b	6,160	32	5,392	22
	PP+SS2+C1+SUE_PHA1+SUE_PHA2	7,310	34	5,392	22
	PP+SS2+C1+SUE_PHA1+SUE_PHA2+SUE_PHA3	9,610	37	5,392	22
	PP+SS2+C1+All SUEs+C2a	13,130	82	5,912	36
	PP+SS2+C1+C2+C3	27,532	120	6,423	50
Dwelling Target (iii)	11,947		11,947		
First 20 years	PP+SS3	4,438	0	4,438	0
	PP+SS3+C1a	6,400	32	5,632	22
	PP+SS3+C1a+C1b	6,400	32	5,632	22
	PP+SS3+C1a+C1b+All SUEs	9,850	37	5,632	22
	PP+SS3+C1a+C2a+All SUEs	13,370	82	6,152	36
	PP+SS3+C1a+C2a+All SUEs+C2b	17,229	87	6,152	36
	PP+SS3+C1+C2+C3	27,772	120	6,663	50
Dwelling Target (iii)	15,427		15,427		
Notes:					
<i>(i) "Additional" = sites additional to those with planning permission</i>					
<i>(ii) PDL yield includes dwellings from planning permissions on greenfield land as well as PDL sites, as these greenfield sites will also contribute to the dwelling requirements even if all other future development were to be on PDL sites.</i>					
<i>(iii) The 'Dwelling Target' figure incorporates an allowance for likely demolitions in the Borough, as well as an allowance for under-provision against the CSS requirements which arose between the base date of the CSS (2001) and the SHLAA study base date (1 April 2008).</i>					
<i>(iv) The yield figures for the first and second phases of the Wellingborough SUEs amount to 1,150 ('SUE_PHA1') and 2,300 ('SUE_PHA2'), respectively.</i>					

Contribution from the Sustainable Urban Extensions

- 7.25 A significant part of the theoretical dwelling potential comes from the five Strategic Urban Extensions (SUEs) that are named in the adopted CSS: West Corby, North East Corby, Kettering East, Wellingborough East, and North West Wellingborough. For the purposes of the study, the SUEs have not been assessed as individual sites. It is better to consider the SUEs as 'broad locations' for strategic growth, and so we have assessed any sites which came forward within or around the SUEs using the same approach that we employed to assess sites within existing settlements. The SUEs are depicted on the plan in Appendix 8.
- 7.26 Sites which have come forward within SUEs tend, in general, to perform less well against the agreed assessment criteria. This is because they are typically large

⁴⁵ Green cells denote where a combination of components is sufficient to meet the LPA dwelling target (refer to paragraph 7.6. for further information).

greenfield sites which by their nature face significant constraints, of various sorts. Principally, the SUE sites: (i) are outside the boundaries of the main towns and so they are relatively distant from the existing services offered by those towns; (ii) lie in open countryside, and their development would consequently have impacts on protected landscapes that must be mitigated; and (iii) they require extensive new access and drainage infrastructure.

- 7.27 However, significant work has already been undertaken to identify the SUEs which offer the greatest potential to accommodate major housing growth and to consider how infrastructure and local services might be provided. We must therefore acknowledge that while the constraints faced by these sites are significant, some work has already been undertaken to identify measures to overcome the constraints. We have taken account of these constraints in identifying theoretical dwelling yields for the sites, as specified in the database.
- 7.28 Thus, we have considered the theoretical dwelling potential offered by each SUE. However, rather than using these database-generated figures, we would not expect the dwelling yield for any of the SUEs to go beyond the targets specified in the CSS. Consequently, the dwelling yield figures for the SUEs that we have used in Tables 7.2 to 7.5 are the figures specified in the CSS. Below, for each of the five SUEs, we consider the extent to which the CSS dwelling targets can be reached.
- 7.29 We have taken the geographical definitions of the SUEs as supplied by the JPU. However, it must be acknowledged that these boundaries are purely indicative, and will be refined through the Councils' land allocations DPDs. Therefore, we have assessed potential sites both within and adjacent to the SUEs; any references in the remainder of this section to SUE 'boundaries' relate to the indicative definitions supplied by the JPU.

North East Corby

- 7.30 The CSS envisages the delivery of 5,100 dwellings at the North East Corby SUE in the period to 2021, with phased delivery anticipated to begin in the period 2006-2011 (Figure 13 of the CSS). The SUE straddles the boundaries of Corby Borough and East Northamptonshire District, and Corby BC has already granted outline planning permission for 4,400 dwellings on the part of the SUE that falls within its administrative boundary. The remaining 700 dwellings will be situated on land that is actually in East Northamptonshire (this element does not yet have planning permission⁴⁶), although as we explained in Section 5 these 700 units will not count as part of East Northamptonshire's supply.
- 7.31 The SHLAA also identified a further four sites in and around the North East Corby SUE, mostly to the east of the village of Weldon, giving a combined yield of 1,324 dwellings - although most of this supply actually falls outside of the indicative boundaries of the SUE. Nevertheless, it can be seen that this SUE is already relatively advanced towards meeting its target, and could conceivably deliver in excess of the CSS target if necessary. For the avoidance of doubt, as emphasised above we have used the figure of 4,400 dwellings in Table 7.2 as the expected yield for this SUE.

West Corby

- 7.32 West Corby is expected to deliver 4,000 dwellings in the period until 2021, with delivery expected to start from 2011. Through the SHLAA we assessed five sites which came forward within and around this SUE (including three very large sites, of over 100ha each), giving a total potential yield of 13,967 dwellings. Some of these sites contain land that falls outside the indicative SUE boundaries supplied by the JPU; even so, there is more than enough identified potential to meet the 4,000-dwelling

⁴⁶ We understand that there is a resolution to approve, but that East Northamptonshire Council has not yet formally granted planning permission for the 700 dwellings.

target identified in the CSS. Again, we have used the figure of 4,000 dwellings in Table 7.2 as the expected yield for this SUE.

Kettering East

- 7.33 The Kettering East SUE is expected to deliver 4,200 dwellings in the period 2006-2021, with delivery expected to start within the 2006-11 period. Our study identified six sites falling within or adjacent to the SUE, offering a total combined yield of 9,467 dwellings. The majority of this theoretical yield figure is made up from one large site (site reference 1,064 in our database), which is able to accommodate up to 8,900 dwellings. This is more than enough by itself to meet the target for this SUE as set out in the CSS. Nevertheless, for the reasons given above we have used the CSS target figure of 4,200 dwellings in Table 7.4.

Wellingborough East

- 7.34 The adopted CSS expects the Wellingborough East SUE to deliver 4,350 dwellings in the period to 2021, again with delivery expected to start in the 2006-11 period. Our study identified three sites within and around the SUE. This includes one site able to provide up to 6,570 dwellings (we assume that on a site of this scale, around 50 per cent of the land would be used for non-residential purposes such as retail, employment, local services, open spaces, and so on). Outline planning permission has already been granted for 3,200 dwellings on this site, and so considerable further capacity remains. Thus, there appears to be more than sufficient scope to meet the CSS target of 4,350 dwellings; we have used this figure (of 4,350 dwellings) in Table 7.5.

North West Wellingborough

- 7.35 The CSS envisages that the North West of Wellingborough SUE will provide 2,300 dwellings in the period to 2021, with delivery expected to start after 2011. Our study identified only one site within this SUE (with a theoretical yield of 3,000 dwellings). There is clearly more than enough potential to meet the dwelling target specified in the CSS; nevertheless, as explained above we have used the figure of 2,300 dwellings as the expected yield for this SUE in Table 7.5.

8 SUMMARY OF MAIN FINDINGS

Introduction

- 8.1 We have undertaken a SHLAA study across North Northamptonshire - the area covered by Corby, East Northamptonshire, Kettering and Wellingborough Councils. The purpose of the study is to establish whether there are sufficient suitable sites that are currently available (or likely to become available in the foreseeable future), which could meet each Council's dwelling targets.
- 8.2 The outputs from the SHLAA study will provide each Council with information on a range of potential housing sites - covering both greenfield and previously developed land - and an indication of how its dwelling targets could potentially be met. This evidence can then be used to inform the Councils' Site Allocations DPDs. The outputs can also assist in annual monitoring and will support each Council in meeting the requirement of PPS3 in that *'the supply of land [be] managed in a way that ensures that a continuous five year supply of deliverable sites is maintained'*.
- 8.3 Below, we summarise the methodology that we employed in undertaking the SHLAA - which is consistent with the approach set out in the CLG's Practice Guidance of July 2007 - and then we pull together the headline findings from the study.

Key Strategic Policy Issues

- 8.4 The Government's core objective of ensuring more sustainable patterns of development is reflected in emerging regional planning policy, which seeks to concentrate most new development within the five Principal Urban Areas in the region and the three Growth Towns of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough. Indeed, the emerging RSS seeks to strengthen the roles of these Growth Towns through *'urban intensification and planned and sustainable urban extensions'*. Beyond these urban centres, the Milton Keynes and South Midlands Sub-Regional Strategy states that development should be focused at the 'smaller towns' of Desborough, Rothwell, Burton Latimer, Rushden, Higham Ferrers and Irthlingborough, and at 'rural service centres' such as Oundle, Raunds and Thrapston.
- 8.5 Policy 1 of the North Northamptonshire CSS, which was adopted in June 2008, confirms that development will be principally focused in the three Growth Towns of Corby, Kettering and Wellingborough. More modest levels of development are directed towards the aforementioned 'smaller towns', and the rural service spine comprising the centres of Oundle, Raunds and Thrapston, with a secondary focus on King's Cliffe.
- 8.6 In addition, the CSS makes provision for five new Sustainable Urban Extensions to the Growth Towns which will provide major locations for housing and employment growth. The five SUEs are North East Corby, West Corby, Kettering East, Wellingborough East and North West Wellingborough. CSS Policy 16 requires that a minimum housing density of 35 dwellings per hectare be achieved at the SUEs.
- 8.7 Thus, North Northamptonshire already benefits from an adopted CSS, which clearly defines the directions for future growth. The CSS therefore provided many of the parameters for the SHLAA, as summarised below.

Study Parameters and Technical Issues

- 8.8 The SHLAA study covers the entire area within the administrative boundary of the four North Northamptonshire Councils. We have taken a comprehensive approach and have considered sites within and around a pre-agreed list of 40 existing settlements and the five SUEs, as follows⁴⁷:
- the three 'Growth Towns';
 - six 'Smaller Towns' within the urban core;
 - four 'Rural Service Centres';
 - some 27 'Other Settlements with a Range of Services' (where local service and community facilities provision could be adequate to support limited sustainable housing growth in principle); and
 - the five Sustainable Urban Extensions that are identified in the CSS.
- 8.9 Thus, our approach to the search for sites was extensive, and was based primarily on the adopted CSS. This extensive approach was necessary in order to fully assess the potential to achieve the four Councils' housing targets, and it is consistent with paragraph 7 of the Guidance which states that a SHLAA study should *'aim to identify as many sites with housing potential in and around as many settlements as possible in the study area'*.
- 8.10 The base date for the study is 1 April 2008, and for the purposes of identifying sites we adopted a minimum size threshold of 0.25ha. After applying various filters, we identified some 577 potential housing sites within and around the 40 existing settlements and the five SUEs referred to above. We visited each of these sites and recorded details of any physical constraints which might affect the site's suitability for housing development, as well as details of anything that might affect availability or achievability.
- 8.11 In order to estimate the potential housing yield of identified sites, we took account of any permanent features or physical constraints that may affect residential development at the site, as well as the likelihood of each site being developed for a mix of uses (which would reduce the number of dwellings that could be accommodated at the site, compared with a housing-only scheme).

Housing Yield Assessment and Site Categorisation

- 8.12 We subjected all of the 577 sites in the database to a comprehensive GIS-based site assessment, scoring each site against 13 different measures in order to derive an initial score out of 65 for each site. The 13 measures are closely related to the 'suitability', 'availability' and 'achievability' criteria referred to in the Practice Guidance.
- 8.13 Sites obtaining a high overall score of 51 out of 65 or above in the initial assessment clearly perform well against most of the assessment criteria, and are affected by the fewest constraints (scoring 0 or 1 in no more than one of the assessment criteria). Accordingly, we initially placed these sites into Category band 1. Sites achieving overall initial scores of between 41 and 50 out of 65 face more significant constraints than the best-scoring sites but are still apparently achievable/deliverable, and so we initially rated these sites as Category 2. Sites achieving low overall scores, of below 41 out of 65, perform least well against the assessment criteria, facing at least three significant constraints; therefore, in our initial categorisation exercise, these sites were initially placed into Category 3.

⁴⁷ Refer to footnotes 11-15 for further detail as to these settlements and SUEs.

- 8.14 Although the initial site assessment described above provides a good indication of each site's performance against a broad number of important measures, it was necessary to undertake a supplementary assessment of the sites to ensure that certain core constraints are taken into account. Thus, if a site is affected by additional constraints (of the types listed in the table at the rear of Appendix 3), these will tend to downgrade its position in the three Category bands as indicated. The overall categorisation of a site therefore depends on the particular combination of constraints affecting it.
- 8.15 Sites in Category 1 have minimal suitability constraints, are immediately available (or capable of being made available within 5 years), and perform well in relation to our achievability criteria. Accordingly, these sites are considered available for delivery within the first five years, and are clear candidates for allocation. Sites in Category 2 have a more significant level of constraint and/or are not likely to become available within 5 years and so, in accordance with the advice in the Guidance (paragraph 33), they are not currently 'deliverable'. However, the constraints that are holding Category 2 sites back are not considered to be insurmountable and so it is likely that they could be made available for delivery after the first five years. Category 2 sites may therefore be suitable for allocation, depending on their individual circumstances and on specific measures being proposed to overcome their constraints. Sites in Category 3 have more significant constraints; for these sites to be considered appropriate for development or for allocation it would have to be clearly demonstrated that the significant constraints could be overcome in order to make them deliverable.
- 8.16 The headline findings from our site categorisation exercise are set out below and are summarised in Table 8.1.

Yield Assessment

Corby Borough

- 8.17 Outstanding planning permissions can easily meet the Borough's dwelling requirement for the first five years. The 10-year target can be reached by using some of the 73 Category 1a sites.
- 8.18 The 15-year target can just about be reached by using Category 1a and Category 2a sites, together with the supply from the SUE sites. However, to meet the 20-year dwelling target, it will be necessary to rely on all of the SUEs and some Category 3 sites, or alternatively by extending the SUEs.
- 8.19 It will not be possible to meet the longer-term dwelling requirements in Corby solely from PDL.

East Northamptonshire District

- 8.20 The target for the first five years can be reached by using all of the Category 1a sites together with a small proportion of the Category 2a sites. The 10-year target can be met through a combination of Category 1a and Category 2a sites. A combination of Category 1a, Category 2a and Category 2b sites will adequately cover the 15-year period. To meet the 20-year dwelling target, some of the larger Category 2b sites would be needed.
- 8.21 It will not be possible to meet the longer-term dwelling requirements in East Northamptonshire without allocating some large greenfield sites.

Kettering Borough

- 8.22 Some Category 1a sites will be required in order to achieve the first 5-year dwelling target. It will also be necessary to use some of the supply from the initial stages of the SUE.

- 8.23 The 10-year target can be reached through a combination of Category 1a and Category 2a sites together with the SUE-PHA1 and SUE-PHA2 sites. To achieve the 15-year target, the SUE-PHA3 sites will also be needed. There remains sufficient capacity to meet the 20-year dwelling target without having to use any Category 3 sites.
- 8.24 It will not be possible to meet the dwelling requirements in Kettering purely from PDL.

Borough of Wellingborough

- 8.25 Outstanding planning permissions are theoretically sufficient to cover the first five years, although a significant proportion of this supply is from the outline planning permission for the first 3,200 dwellings at the Wellingborough East SUE, which is unlikely to be fully implemented within 5 years. Nevertheless, there is sufficient capacity from Category 1a sites to meet any temporary shortfall.
- 8.26 Most of the Category 1a, 1b and 2a sites will be required in order to meet the 10-year dwelling target, together with the SUE-PHA1 and SUE-PHA2 sites. To achieve the 15-year dwelling requirement, the SUE-PHA3 sites will also be needed. To cover the 20-year period, some Category 2b sites will also be needed. Thus, the Borough's entire 20-year dwelling target can be reached without the need for any of the significantly constrained Category 3 sites.
- 8.27 Again, it will not be possible to meet the longer-term dwelling requirements in Wellingborough without the allocation of greenfield sites.

Sustainable Urban Extensions and Other 'Broad Locations'

- 8.28 Our database includes some large 'sites' where a decision to allocate land or approve development would have to be based on wider policy considerations than is the case with smaller sites. These considerations are likely to include the broad sustainability of the total development pattern, strategic transport and other infrastructure capacity. Before such very large sites could be proposed for allocation they would also require careful attention be made to their size, capacity and boundaries, all of which is beyond the remit of this strategic study. These large sites are best considered as 'broad locations' in the terminology of the Guidance. For the purposes of our assessment we treated any sites with a gross area above 10ha as 'broad locations'.

Corby Borough

- 8.29 The CSS envisages the delivery of 5,100 dwellings at the North East Corby SUE in the period to 2021, with phased delivery anticipated to begin in the period 2006-2011 (Figure 13 of the CSS). Outline planning permission already exists for the vast majority of this SUE and so meeting the target should not be difficult. A further four sites were identified by the SHLAA, providing the opportunity to expand this SUE further if required.
- 8.30 Five SHLAA sites came forward within and around the West Corby SUE (including three very large sites, of over 100ha each), giving a total potential yield of about 14,000 dwellings. The CSS target for this SUE, of 4,000 dwellings in the period until 2021, can therefore also be achieved quite easily.
- 8.31 In addition to the SUEs, we identified a further 16 sites over 10ha in Corby Borough. Five of these sites achieved a Category 2 rating with the remaining 11 sites being rated as Category 3. Together these 16 sites offer a combined yield of about 15,800 dwellings, all of which comes from greenfield sites.

East Northamptonshire District

- 8.32 A small part of the North East Corby SUE lies within East Northamptonshire District, providing potential for around 700 dwellings of the total contribution from this SUE, of 5,100 dwellings. However, MKSM Northamptonshire Policy 1 in the emerging RSS stipulates that cross boundary sites count against the provision for the main authority, and so they will not count as part of East Northamptonshire's supply.
- 8.33 The District contains a further 15 broad locations, offering a combined yield of around 11,400 dwellings. None of the 15 broad locations are in Category 1 but five, offering a potential yield of 3,800 dwellings, are in Category 2. All 10 of the broad locations that are rated as Category 3 are greenfield sites.

Kettering Borough

- 8.34 The Kettering East SUE is expected to deliver 4,200 dwellings in the period 2006-2021, with delivery expected to start within the 2006-11 period. Our study identified six sites falling within and around the SUE, offering a total combined yield of just under 9,500 dwellings. This is more than sufficient to meet the target for this SUE as set by the CSS. The majority of this theoretical yield figure is made up from one large site, which has potential for about 8,900 dwellings.
- 8.35 There are 19 further broad locations in Kettering, offering a combined yield of about 18,800 dwellings. None of these broad locations are in Category 1. In contrast, there are 12 broad locations in Category 2, offering a substantial combined yield of about 11,000 dwellings, all of which comes from greenfield sites. All of the seven broad locations that are rated as Category 3, which offer potential for about 7,800 dwellings, are also greenfield sites.

Borough of Wellingborough

- 8.36 There are two large SUEs envisaged for Wellingborough, to the east and north west of the town. The CSS sets targets for these SUEs of 4,350 dwellings and 2,300 dwellings, respectively, in the period to 2021. Our study identified sites within or adjacent to these SUEs which had the potential to comfortably meet these targets.
- 8.37 Wellingborough contains a further 16 broad locations, offering a combined yield of just under 16,000 dwellings. None of the 16 broad locations are in Category 1, but there are five broad locations in Category 2 offering a potential yield of around 3,900 dwellings, and 11 in Category 3, offering potential for around 12,000 dwellings. All 16 of these broad locations are on greenfield land.