

## **Annex F: Affordable Housing Options**

As requested by the LDF Working Group Officers have tested the various affordable housing policy alternatives put forward at the LDF Working Group on 20<sup>th</sup> April, in terms of their potential contribution to affordable housing numbers. This desktop work uses data from the Housing Trajectory, which includes housing allocations without planning permission, sites identified within planning briefs and area action plans, and potential sites from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). A summary of this work is set out below (Options and Implications) with further details set out in the tables which follow.

The assessment excludes windfall sites which, to accord with government guidance, Officers are advising should not be taken into account for the first 15 years of the housing trajectory.

It must be noted that these figures represent *maximum* levels of affordable housing achievable through the application of the various options. Experience shows that assessments of viability often lead to a reduction in these targets, especially at times of economic downturn.

### Options and Implications

#### *Option 1 - Existing 50% Policy Target*

Implications – The existing policy target could achieve up to 40% affordable housing, subject to assessments of site viability. This is consistent with the findings of the 2007 SHMA and the provisional minimum target of 40% set out in the 2008 Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). As set out in the LDF report, there is unlikely to be that level of achievement on sites of between 15 and 28 homes, and there is currently no affordable housing on sites below 15 homes.

#### *Option 2 – Draft Core Strategy Preferred Option*

Implications – This sliding scale could achieve up to 40% affordable housing, subject to assessments of site viability. This is consistent with the findings of the 2007 SHMA and the provisional minimum target of 40% set out in the 2008 RSS.

#### *Option 3 - LDFWG Alternative Option*

Implications – This sliding scale approach could achieve up to 34% affordable housing, subject to assessments of site viability. This is below the SHMA proposed figure and below the provisional minimum target of 40% set out in the 2008 RSS. Unlike options 1 and 2, this option sets out the same target for affordable housing in rural areas. This will mean a reliance on sites of 10 homes or more achieving affordable housing. Monitoring of housing in rural areas concludes that there are very few sites of more than 10 homes coming forward. Caveats (c) and (d) in this option refer to off-site provision and payments being acceptable. This is not consistent with PPS3 policy and wider government objectives which aim to create mixed and balanced communities and tackle social inclusion. Research by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, for example, confirms that “mixed income communities studied

were overwhelmingly judged successful”, and that “there was no evidence to suggest that mixed communities lowered the prices of houses for sale or put off potential purchasers.”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Foundations. Analysis informing change, March 2006. [www.jrf.org](http://www.jrf.org)