
Core Strategy Background Paper

No. 3

**Producing and Assessing Housing Distribution
Options**

Housing Distribution Options

Context

- 1.1 At the Issues and Option Stage, four scenarios for future housing growth were identified, ranging from highly concentrated development in and around Selby to a dispersed strategy. The scenarios were:
1. Growth Concentrated in Selby Town and Adjoining Parishes;
 2. Principal and Local Service Centres Strategy
 3. Service Centres and Largest Villages Strategy
 4. Dispersed Growth Strategy

- 1.2 Preferences expressed in responses to the Issues and Options consultation were fairly equally divided between the four scenarios. Option 1 has been chosen as the preferred option for the following reasons:-

- I. The Regional Assembly took the unequivocal view that Option1 was the only one, which fully conforms to the Regional Spatial Strategy.
- II. Further more local evidence analysed since the Issues and Options Report was published supports the view that this is the most sustainable approach.

However, the results of the consultation have continued to be borne in mind when evaluating the more detailed alternatives below.

- 1.3 Development scenario Option 1, as presented at the Issues and Options stage, was a relatively generalised strategy and did not quantify the proportions of housing development to be accommodated within Selby, nor the spatial distribution across the remainder of the District. The Draft Revised Regional Spatial Strategy indicates that the majority of new homes within the 'rural' authorities should be provided in the Principal Towns. However, as approximately 48% of Selby District's housing requirement between 2004 and 2026 is already built or committed through planning permissions, the overall impact of variations in the distribution of the residual housing requirement will be limited.
- 1.4 Nevertheless there still remains some scope for variation in the distribution of housing growth whilst still remaining within the general parameters of Option 1 and in conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy.
- 1.5 Four potential approaches have been examined to determine the distribution of future housing growth. These were based on the

following themes:

- A *Matching Future Housing Supply to Affordable Housing Need*
- B *Maximising the Use of Previously Developed Land*
- C *Ensuring a Balanced Distribution of New Housing*
- C *Maximising the Amount of New Housing in Selby.*

1.6 Approach A represents the most evenly distributed option and D the most concentrated on Selby. Approach B is self-explanatory, while approach C attempts to provide a balance between the other three themes. This background paper explains the methodology used to determine the most appropriate distribution based on these alternatives.

The Alternatives

- A *Matching Future Housing Supply to Affordable Housing Need*

2.1 The two main sources of information on affordable housing need are the Council's Housing Needs Study, undertaken in 2004 and published in March 2005 and the Council's housing waiting list. Assessing affordable housing need is not an exact science and both sources have limitations. For example, the Housing Needs Study only covers the period 2004 – 2009, whilst the waiting list contains entries duplicated in differing areas of the District. The need for affordable housing may clearly alter over time, as circumstances such as house prices and incomes in the area change and the Council intend to roll forward the Housing Needs Study through a new Strategic Housing Market Assessment as soon as possible.

2.2 Analysis of affordable housing completions and the Housing Needs study suggests that the need identified up to 2009 has already been met in certain parts of the District. However, when considering the longer term picture and the Council's waiting list, it is evident that it would be misleading over the whole Plan period to rely solely on the Housing Needs Study. Whilst it is not possible to make forecasts of absolute numbers, a projection of the future distribution of affordable housing distribution has been made from a combination of the waiting list and Housing Need distributions.

Methodology

2.3 The housing study provides the distribution of need over the five years 2004 to 2009 for each of the 10 study areas in terms of dwellings per annum. These annual figures have been grossed up for the full five years and the number of built or committed affordable dwellings achieved since 2004 has been discounted to indicate a net residual requirement in each of the areas for this time period. The distribution of need over the 10 areas was also established from the waiting list and the average of the two distributions calculated. The

*Selby District Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Background Paper No.3
Housing Distribution Options*

resultant average percentage in each area was then apportioned between the eligible settlements within that area (i.e either the three market towns and or the relevant Service Villages) on the basis of population size. The results are as follows:

Analysis of Affordable Housing Need Indicators						Table 1		
Area	Annual Requ't.	5 year Requ't 2004-9	Built or Com'ted as at 31/3/07	Net Requ't	% HNS Dist'n of future need	Wait'g List Nos.	% Dist'n	AVE. %
Selby	52	260	255	5	0.5	619	13.5	7.0
Sherburn	13	65	83	-18	-1.9	281	6.1	2.1
Tadcaster	31	155	0	155	16.2	269	5.9	11.0
North	0	0	0	0	0	281	6.1	3.0
West	-2	-10	58	-68	-7.1	685	15.0	4.0
North East	61	305	14	291	30.4	459	10.0	20.2
East	58	290	8	282	29.5	452	9.9	19.7
Central	17	85	69	16	1.7	844	18.4	10.0
South East	33	165	0	165	17.2	338	7.4	12.3
South	31	155	26	129	13.5	352	7.7	10.6
TOTAL	294	1470	514	957	100.0*	4580	100.0*	99.9*

N.B. Percentages may not add up to 100 due to rounding

2.4 After apportioning the percentages for each area between the differing tiers in the settlement hierarchy, the following distribution is obtained (See Appendix 1 for details):

Affordable Housing Led Distribution 2007 - 2026		Table 2
Area	% Affordable Housing	
Selby AAP	33	
Sherburn in Elmet	5	
Tadcaster	14	
Service Villages	48	

*Selby District Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Background Paper No.3
Housing Distribution Options*

B *Maximising the Use of Previously Developed Land (PDL)*

2.5 Predicting the future availability of previously developed land is notoriously difficult as it involves assessing whether currently active uses will relocate or cease over the Plan period. It is therefore considered that the best proxy available for the future distribution of development on previously developed land is the average distribution obtained from the distribution of housing completions on PDL over the last three years since 2004, combined with the outstanding completions on PDL at 31/3/07.

2.6 The resultant distribution is as follows:

PDL Led Distribution 2007 - 2026				Table 3
Area	Total PDL Complet'ns 2004 - 2007	Commitm'ts on PDL 31/03/07	Total Commitments and Completions	PDL led Distribution %
Selby AAP	587	580	1167	44
Sherburn in Elmet	48	36	84	3
Tadcaster	0	165	165	6
Service Villages	672	554	1226	47
	1307	1335	2642	100

C *Ensuring a Balanced Distribution of New Housing*

2.7 This distribution aims to meet the following criteria:

- To achieve at least 50% of all new dwellings between 2004 and 2026 within Selby
- To ensure, as far as practicable, that the proportions of new development (2004 –2026) for Sherburn in Elmet and Tadcaster are compatible with the equivalent proportions in the Affordable Housing led approach in order to reflect the need for affordable housing in those Local Service Centres.
- Continue to allow a limited degree of development in the larger villages.

In addition the relatively low absolute amount of future development

*Selby District Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Background Paper No.3
Housing Distribution Options*

should allow the majority of the distribution to met on previously developed land except in very limited cases.

The percentage allocation to Tadcaster has been significantly reduced from that required in the affordable housing led distribution (13%). This is because of land ownership and flood risk constraints within the town, which make it unlikely that the amounts predicted in the latter distribution would be implemented.

2.8 The resulting distribution is as follows:

Balanced Distribution 2007 - 2026		Table 4
Area	Balanced	Distribution
		%
Selby	61	
Sherburn in Elmet	5	
Tadcaster	6	
Rural Settlements	28	
		100

D Maximising the Amount of New Housing in Selby.

2.9 In this approach 100% of additional new development is located in the Selby area. The alternative illustrates the maximum concentration on Selby possible, given existing commitments and completions over the last 3 years.

Implications of Alternative Approaches

3.1 The estimated outcomes from the four alternative assessments for both market and affordable housing over the two periods 2007 –2021 and 2004 – 2026 are illustrated in Tables A,B,C and D. The tables distribute the 4954 additional dwellings required up to 2026 in accordance with the appropriate distribution being featured.

A Matching Affordable Housing Need

3.2 Option A relies on a high proportion of housing to be accommodated in the rural villages at the expense of the Selby area which would generally be contrary to RSS guidelines . It would also mean the identification of more ‘greenfield’ sites within villages and a strong constraint on previously developed land development in the Selby area, which would not be a sustainable approach.

B Maximising the Use of Previously Developed Land

- 3.3 This option results in a greater concentration of development in Selby and is more in accordance with the Regional Strategy in overall terms. In this distribution there is roughly equal split between new housing in the Selby area and the villages, with Sherburn and Tadcaster having lower proportion than that required for them to fulfil a local needs role as illustrated by their percentages in approach A.

C Balanced Distribution

- 3.4 This approach firstly ensures a distribution in accord with the Regional Spatial Strategy. It also ensures that the three Service Centres accommodate at least the appropriate percentage of new housing indicated in the affordable housing led approach.
- 3.5 The main limitation is that it represents a compromise solution in terms of meeting affordable housing need as close as possible to need. It places greater emphasis on Selby at the expense of the rural villages. However, as the bulk of affordable housing need is concentrated in the east of the District, Selby is relatively well located to cater for it.

D Maximising the Amount of New Housing in Selby.

- 3.6 Approach D demonstrates the maximum potential for concentration on Selby. However, it would not be the optimum solution for the location of affordable housing and it would restrict opportunities for developing previously developed land outside Selby. It would be more likely to require significant 'greenfield' releases within the Selby AAP area.

Conclusion

- 4.1 Alternatives A and D are at the opposite of the range in terms of the RSS strategy, which aims to focus development in Selby. In the case of approach A, although meeting affordable housing need closer to the local area of need is a laudable objective, all such housing outside the Selby area tends to remain subject to the more general sustainability disbenefits of encouraging longer distance commuting to the larger surrounding urban areas. This is particularly the case as it inevitably relies on a similar level of market housing to exist.
- 4.2 Alternative D represents an even more unbalanced situation. Although it increases the concentration of new development in Selby, it completely disregards the need and potential to have a wider distribution of affordable housing and to utilise previously developed land outside Selby for the benefit of the continued development and vitality of many settlements.
- 4.3 Alternatives B and D fall within the range provided by A and D. The approach B distribution is not dissimilar to approach A – affordable

*Selby District Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Background Paper No.3
Housing Distribution Options*

housing led. However, it is debateable whether accommodating 42% of new housing development between 2004 and 2026 in villages meets RSS and Core Strategy objectives. For example, one of the key objectives to minimise further growth in long distance commuting may be undermined by increasing the amount of housing provided outside Selby.

4.4 The Balanced Distribution - approach C would provide a greater concentration on Selby than approaches A or B. It also provides the next best match to affordable housing need in Sherburn and Tadcaster, after the affordable housing led approach (A). The Regional Strategy places some emphasis on these Local Service Centres meeting at least their own local needs outside the Selby area and it is considered that the housing development proportions allocated to these towns should be, as far as practicable in line with those of Alternative A.

4.5 In conclusion, therefore, it is considered that Alternative C, would provide the best balance between the conflicting objectives, for the distribution of future housing development within the District.

Selby District Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Background Paper No.3
Housing Distribution Options

Table A

A Affordable Housing Led Distribution

	Dwellings Required 2007 - 20026 (Additional to Commitments)						Overall RSS Period 2004 - 2026 (Including completions and commitments)					
	Aff'dable Housing Distr. %	No.of Aff'dable Dwgs	No. of Market Dwgs	Market Housing Distr. %	All Dwgs.	All Dwgs. Dist. %	Total No. of Aff'dble Dwgs.	Aff'dable Housing Distr. %	Total No. of Market Dwgs	Market Housing Distr. %	All Dwgs.	All Dwgs. Dist. %
Selby AAP*	33	769	1062	40	1831	37	1083	38	3167	48	4250	45
Sherburn**	5	117	117	4	233	5	200	7	328	5	527	6
Tadcaster**	14	326	326	12	652	13	326	11	514	8	840	9
Service Villages**	48	1119	1119	43	2237	45	1191	42	1669	25	2859	30
Other Villages**	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	2	957	14	1001	11
Totals	100	2330	2623	100	4954	100	2843	100	6634	100	9478	100

* Assumes threshold of 10 dwellings, a 50/50 affordable to market split and 16% of dwellings on sites of 9 dwellings or less.

** Assumes a minimum site size and threshold of 2 and a 50/50 affordable /market split

Future commitments have been discounted by 15% to allow for non-implementation

*Selby District Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Background Paper No.3
Housing Distribution Options*

Table B

B Maximising the Use of Previously Developed Land

	Dwellings Required 2007 - 20026 (Additional to commitments)						Overall RSS Period 2004 - 2026 (Including completions and commitments)					
	Dist. of All Dwgs %	All Dwgs.	No.of Aff'dable Dwgs	Aff'dable Housing Distr. %	No. of Market Dwgs	Market Housing Distr. %	Total No. of Aff'dable Dwgs.	Aff'dable Housing Distr. %	Total No. of Market Dwgs	Market Housing Distr. %	All Dwgs.	Dist. of All Dwgs %
Selby AAP*	44	2181	916	40	1265	48	1230	44	3370	51	4600	49
Sherburn**	3	149	74	3	74	3	157	6	285	4	443	5
Tadcaster**	6	297	149	6	149	6	149	5	337	5	485	5
Service Villages**	47	2329	1165	51	1165	44	1237	44	1715	26	2951	31
Other Villages**	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	2	957	14	1001	11
Totals	100	4956	2304	100	2652	100	2817	100	6663	100	9480	100

* Assumes threshold of 10 dwellings, a 50/50 affordable to market split and 16% of dwellings on sites of 9 dwellings or less.

** Assumes a minimum site size and threshold of 2 and a 50/50 affordable /market split

Future commitments have been discounted by 15% to allow for non-implementation

Selby District Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Background Paper No.3
Housing Distribution Options

Table C

C - Balanced Distribution

	Dwellings Required 2007 - 20026 (Additional to commitments)						Overall RSS Period 2004 - 2026 (Including completions and commitments)					
	Dist. of All Dwgs %	All Dwgs.	No. of Aff'dable Dwgs	Aff'dable Housing Distr. %	No. of Market Dwgs	Market Housing Distr. %	Total No. of Aff'dble Dwgs.	Aff'dable Housing Distr. %	Total No. of Market Dwgs	Market Housing Distr. %	All Dwgs.	Dist. of All Dwgs %
Selby AAP*	61	3023	1270	57	1753	64	1584	58	3858	57	5442	57
Sherburn**	5	248	124	6	124	5	207	8	335	5	542	6
Tadcaster**	6	297	149	7	149	5	149	5	337	5	485	5
Service Villages**	28	1388	694	31	694	26	766	28	1244	18	2010	21
Other Villages**	-	-	-	-	-	-	44	2	957	14	1001	11
Totals	100	4956	2236	100	2720	100	2749	100	6731	100	9480	100

* Assumes threshold of 10 dwellings, a 50/50 affordable to market split and 16% of dwellings on sites of 9 dwellings or less.

** Assumes a minimum site size and threshold of 2 and a 50/50 affordable /market split

Future commitments have been discounted by 15% to allow for non-implementation

Selby District Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Background Paper No.3
Housing Distribution Options

Table D

Option D Maximum Concentration on Selby Area

	Dwellings Required 2007 - 20026 (Additional to commitments)						Overall RSS Period 2004 - 2026 (Including completions and commitments)					
	Dist. of All Dwgs %	All Dwgs.	No.of Aff'dable Dwgs	Aff'dable Housing Distr. %	No. of Market Dwgs	Market Housing Distr. %	Total No. Aff'dble Dwgs.	Aff'dable Housing Distr. %	Total No. of Market Dwgs	Market Housing Distr. %	All Dwgs.	Dist. of All Dwgs %
Selby AAP*	100	4956	2082	100	2874	100	2396	92	4979	72	7375	78
Sherburn	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	3	211	3	294	3
Tadcaster	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	188	3	188	2
Service Villages**	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	3	550	8	622	7
Other Villages**	0						44	2	957	14	1001	11
Totals	100	4956	2082	100	2874	100	2595	100	6885	100	9480	100

* Assumes threshold of 10 dwellings, a 50/50 affordable to market split and 16% of dwellings on sites of 9 dwellings or less.

** Assumes a minimum site size and threshold of 2 and a 50/50 affordable /market split

Future commitments have been discounted by 15% to allow for non-implementation

Methodology Details

Distributing Affordable Housing Need

- 1.1 In calculating the Table 2 distribution of affordable housing (Paragraph 2.4 above), the following methodology was used to convert the information in Table A (below), which is based on the Housing Needs Study areas, to the areas used in the Core Strategy distribution. The need in each area was apportioned between the Service Villages within that area and in certain cases the larger settlements of Selby, Sherburn and Tadcaster, (where these are adjacent), on the basis of existing population size.
- 1.2 The overall percentage for each of the Core Strategy areas set out in Table 2 of the background paper is produced by summing the individual percentages in the final column of Table A.

Allowance for the amount of housing on smaller sites of 9 dwellings or less

- 2.1 In order to estimate the split between affordable housing and market housing in the Selby urban area, where schemes of 9 dwellings or less are not required to provide affordable housing, an assumption has been made on the number of dwellings likely to come forward on sites of less than 9 dwellings.
- 2.2 Dwelling completions between 2004 and 2007 are presented in Table B below, using the Selby Town administrative area as a potential proxy for the Selby urban area¹ to which the 10 dwelling threshold applies.
- 2.3 It can be seen that there was a substantial difference during those three years, between the proportion of smaller development sites in the Selby town area and the District as a whole. It is difficult to know how applicable these results will be in future years. It is certainly likely that the proportion of smaller sites will continue to be lower in Selby than in the district as a whole. However, there is a danger that using a figure as low as 8% for future years may lead to an overestimate of the amount of affordable housing achievable in Selby, with a threshold of 10 dwellings. A relatively conservative figure of 16% has therefore been used.

1 Includes parts of Barlby Bridge and Brayton. See Core Strategy Paragraph 4.19 for full definition.

*Selby District Local Development Framework
Core Strategy Background Paper No.3
Housing Distribution Options*

Allocation of Affordable Housing Need

Table A

Housing Needs Study Area	Eligible Destination Settlements	Destination Settlement Category	% Alloc'n	Overall %
Selby	Selby	Selby AAP	100	7.0
Sherburn	Sherburn	Sherburn	100	2.1
Tadcaster	Tadcaster	Tadcaster	100	11.0
North	Tadcaster	Tadcaster	100	3.0
West	Sherburn	Sherburn	60	2.4
	South Milford			
	Monk Fryston			
	Byram	Service Villages	40	1.6
North East	Escrick			
	Cawood			
	Riccall			
	North Duffield	Service Villages	100	20.2
East	Barlby	Selby AAP	85	16.7
	Cliffe			
	Hemingbrough	Service Villages	15	3.0
Central	Selby			
	Brayton Thorpe Willoughby	Selby AAP	92	9.2
	Hambleton	Service Villages	8	0.8
South East	Camblesforth			
	Carlton	Service Villages	100	12.3
South	Eggborough			
	Kellington	Service Villages	100	10.6

Selby District Local Development Framework
 Core Strategy Background Paper No.3
 Housing Distribution Options

Table B			
Dwelling Completions 2004 - 2026			
Area	0- 9 Dwellings	Total	%
Selby Town (Parish 19)	53	625	8.5
Selby District	474	1980	24.0
