



# SETTLEMENT CAPACITY STUDY

Epping Forest District Council | March 2016

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Epping Forest District Council (EFDC) retained Fregonese Associates (FA) to perform a Settlement Capacity Study (SCS) for 9 settlements within the District. The purpose of the SCS was to estimate development capacity (including for housing) on non-greenbelt land specifically considering brownfield sites at non-traditional densities.

### Methodology

The SCS was broken down into four phases:

1. Identification of a site pool of potential housing sites within Epping Forest's major settlements,
2. a provisional capacity estimate of those sites,
3. viability testing, and
4. a final validation of the provisional capacity estimates.

FA performed a review of developable sites within the 9 identified settlements using the recently updated Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) as well as other local and nationally-available datasets. From this list of potential sites, capacity was tested under four scenarios which included varying assumptions regarding density and the size of the pool of sites (i.e. SLAA sites or SLAA sites and non SLAA sites assumptions).

The results of the scenario analysis and provisional capacity estimates were vetted with EFDC staff and council members who participated in two workshops on 5 October and 8 October 2016. These workshops yielded a set of 5 development strategies which were used to categorise all potential development sites in the district.

These development strategies were then tested on 11 pilot sites identified from the crop of developable sites identified in the original site identification. The purpose of this was twofold: first, to demonstrate the viability of compact development within existing settlements, and second to ground-test assumptions within the provisional capacity estimate in order to refine the final, validated capacity estimate.

### Conclusions

At October 2015 the SCS found potential additional capacity of up to around 6,000 could be accommodated within the boundary of the 9 settlements studied through making more efficient use of the land identified in this study. This capacity identified is higher than the capacity of sites put forward in the Strategic Land Availability Assessment 2014 and would enable the authority to achieve a greater quantity of housing within the 9 settlements to contribute to meeting the objectively assessed housing need. The SCS found that a significant proportion of these homes would be deliverable within the first 10 years of the plan period.

However, the study found that this would require higher densities than traditionally delivered in the District. The Study did not specifically consider the housing mix identified in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment for West Essex and East Hertfordshire 2015 (SHMA) and this would also need to be considered before determining the additional capacity that could be achieved. Therefore, further assessment of capacity in relation to the housing mix identified by the SHMA will be required.

## CONTENTS

Executive summary .....	1
Contents .....	2
1.0 Introduction & Purpose of the study .....	3
2.0 Methodology .....	3
3.0 Viability Testing .....	10
4.0 Results .....	13
5.0 Conclusions .....	15
6.0 Next Steps .....	15

Appendix 1: SLAA Site Sieving

Appendix 2: Additional Inspire Sites

Appendix 3: Initial Site Pool

Appendix 4: Brownfield Greenbelt Sites

Appendix 5: Final Site Pool

Appendix 6: Parking Provision

Appendix 7: Modelling assumptions

Appendix 8: Opportunity Site Visualisations, Capacity, and Viability Analysis

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION & PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

- 1.1. Fregonese Associates were appointed by Epping Forest District Council (EFDC) to undertake the study in order to understand whether there were opportunities over and above the sites identified in the Strategic Land Availability Study (SLAA) to increase capacity for development and housing growth within existing settlements.
- 1.2. The 2015 West Essex and East Hertfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) identified an objectively assessed housing need of 46,100 dwelling units across the SHMA area (which consists of the areas of East Hertfordshire, Epping Forest, Harlow and Uttlesford Districts) with 11,300 needed in Epping Forest District. The 2014 Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SLAA) identified a capacity of 1,928 units within areas that may be suitable for development under current policies in the Local Plan (1998) and Alterations (2006). As stated in the 2014 SLAA, if the need for housing is greater than the 1,928 dwelling unit capacity plus yearly windfalls, the Council will need to consider whether policies on the location of development may need to change. Indeed, the production of the new Local Plan which is in progress involves a review of the Green Belt.
- 1.3. It is good planning practice to seek to keep to a minimum the amount of Green Belt land that may be released therefore, the Council wanted to re-examine options for the provision of additional development in existing settlements at a range of higher densities. Moreover, the Council wanted a re-examination of sites that may have been overlooked during the 2014 SLAA due to factors that may have included ownership, existing use, environmental constraints, or size.

## 2.0 METHODOLOGY

- 2.1. The approach for this study involved four phases of analysis:
  1. Identification of a pool of potential development sites within Epping Forest's major settlements,
  2. a provisional capacity estimate of those sites,
  3. viability testing, and
  4. a final validation of the provisional capacity estimates in order to reach conclusions.
- 2.2. The steps involved in the project were as follows:
  1. Identification of initial site pool from Strategic Land Availability Assessment.
  2. Identification of additional potential sites from review of aerial photographs.
  3. Adjustment of site areas to accommodate known development constraints.
  4. Provisional capacity estimates for the sites – testing different density scenarios.
  5. Verification of site pool by workshop.
  6. Production of a typology of site (5 in total) and the form of development most suited to the type of site e.g. large sustainably located sites could accommodate high densities and include higher densities in their centres whilst less sustainable sites would accommodate more moderate densities.
  7. Selection of 11 pilot sites – a cross section of types of site and geographical location.
  8. Production of prototype buildings for the pilot sites, collection of information relating to viability and producing schemes for the sites.

9. Testing the data behind the pilot schemes.
10. Production of generalized densities for site types as a result of the pilot testing for the 5 site types.
11. Application of the generalized densities to the sites in the pool to establish overall capacity of the settlements.
12. Conclusion on overall capacity in terms of maximum yield from the settlements.

2.3. Study Area

For the purposes of this study, 9 settlements were identified using the EFDC settlement hierarchy agreed in September 2015. Listed in table 1 below, the 9 settlement boundaries were defined by the Green Belt boundary for each settlement.

Table 1: Selected Settlements

Settlement	Hectares
Waltham Abbey	4,240
Chigwell	1,568
Loughton	1,512
Theydon Bois	832
Nazeing	1,644
Ongar	902
North Weald Bassett	2,278
Buckhurst Hill	385
Epping	773

2.4. Identification of a Site Pool

The identification of the pool of potential sites was the first step in re-examining potentially available sites within the 9 settlements. The total land area of the 9 settlements was divided into two categories: those areas considered within the 2014 SLAA (SLAA sites) and those areas outside the SLAA (non- SLAA sites).

2.5. SLAA Sites Review

In order to create the pool of potential sites, the 2014 SLAA was used as a starting point. All sites in the draft 2014 SLAA outside the 9 identified settlement boundaries were first eliminated from the study reducing the original 642 sites to 162 sites. A full list of these sites can be found in Appendix 1: SLAA Site Sieving. The remaining sites were further evaluated and some were sieved out from the study as follows:

- all sites in use as allotments
- sites within flood zones 2, 3a, and 3b
- all sites smaller than 500 square metres
- any sites that appeared to have access problems identified from a visual survey.

2.6. The final set of SLAA sites totalled 76 with a combined area of 109 hectares. A list of these sites can be found in Appendix 1: SLAA Site Sieving. Though fewer than the number of sites identified as “within policy” in the SLAA, the total area of the 76 re-evaluated SLAA sites

exceeded the original set of 139 suitable sites from the SLAA by 69 hectares. More information about the 139 sites deemed suitable is in the SLAA, (see page 16, section 3.12 and the associated Microsoft Excel database). Table 2 below provides a comparison of SLAA site area identified by settlement in the 2014 SLAA and the identification of the site pool.

Table 2: SLAA and Site Pool Areas

Settlement	SLAA	Identified for Site Pool
Buckhurst Hill	1.5	0.8
Epping	14.5	15.0
Ongar	2.1	1.6
Chigwell	0.4	23.0
Loughton	10.9	36.9
Nazeing	0.3	0
Theydon Bois	0.7	0.6
North Weald Bassett	0.6	6.7
Waltham Abbey	8.9	24.5

2.7.

#### Non-SLAA Site Review

In addition to an evaluation of all sites within the 2014 SLAA, additional sites not considered as part of the SLAA were also reviewed. These additional sites, all within the boundaries of the 9 settlements were identified through a survey of aerial imagery. To define the boundaries of these additional sites, INSPIRE Index Polygons were used. INSPIRE Polygons are a digital mapping product of the UK Land Registry that provides boundaries of freehold registered property in England and Wales. Each polygon shows the position and indicative extent of a registered property. A detailed review of constraints similar to that done for SLAA sites was completed; the availability of these non SLAA sites for development is unknown but is being researched. An additional 148 sites were identified totalling 31 additional hectares. A full list of selected INSPIRE sites can be found in Appendix 2: Additional INSPIRE Sites.

2.8.

The site pool, consisting of a total of 140 hectares in 224 sites was then examined using GIS to remove those portions of the sites that were constrained by floodplains or other constraints that could not be mitigated. These were flood zone 3B, ancient woodland, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Special Protection Areas, and Special Areas of Conservation. The remaining site areas were then used as the initial site pool to develop four capacity scenarios. A full list of these sites can be found in Appendix 3: Initial Site Pool. Table 3 below shows the total land area by type (SLAA and non-SLAA) identified by the Site Identification process by settlement.

Table 3: SLAA and Non-SLAA Site in the Site Pool

Settlement	SLAA Sites	Non-SLAA Sites
Buckhurst Hill	0.8	5.0
Epping	15.0	2.1
Ongar	1.6	2.6
Chigwell	23.0	3.6
Loughton	36.9	9.7
Nazeing	0	3.7
Theydon Bois	0.6	0.8
North Weald Bassett	6.7	1.6
Waltham Abbey	24.5	1.6

## 2.9. Provisional Capacity Estimate

In order to assess development capacity of the sites identified in the potential site pool, four capacity scenarios were developed based upon:

- varying housing densities,
- varying the number of sites on a SLAA only group and a SLAA and non-SLAA site group.

The scenarios, along with their average gross densities, are outlined in table 4 below.

The Envision Tomorrow model, explained in detail in Appendix 7, was used to model each scenario. The process for developing each scenario involved developing models of buildings that reflected the density, height and financial characteristics that would be feasible and appropriate in the sites in the study. Average densities were developed for what are called "development types" – combinations of uses and structures that are typical of various urban developments. Each development type has an average density and parking rate.

Table 4: Scenario Theme Matrix



- 2.10. **Scenarios 1 and 2: 'SLAA only' Site Pool**  
 The intent with these scenarios was to test capacity within settlements while constraining that capacity to only sites identified as suitable in the SLAA i.e. the 'basic sites'. More information is known about these sites than those outside the SLAA so having a sense of their capacity in isolation is important. Two scenarios were created using the "basic" pool of sites. These differed in the assumed density of development possible on each site and were named "Conventional Density" and "Higher Density".
- 2.11. The "Conventional Density" scenario averaged 54 units per hectare. The "Higher Density" scenario assumed higher densities on some of the sites further from the centre of settlements that were previously considered "suburban" in scenario 1. Average dwelling unit densities were 88 units per gross hectare.
- 2.12. **Scenarios 3 and 4: "SLAA and Non SLAA" Site Pool**  
 The addition of non-SLAA sites expanded the area of developable land, thus leading to higher overall capacity totals. As with scenario 1 above, scenario 3 assumed lower densities on most sites, with an average density of 53 dwellings per gross hectare. Scenario 4, like scenario 2 above, applied a higher average density of 84 units per gross hectare on a broader set of sites. Table 5 below presents the results of each scenario comparing key indicators for each and demonstrates that the four scenarios conducted as part of the provisional capacity estimate provide a range of capacity estimates given different policy assumptions.



Table 5: Housing Mix by Scenario

	Scenario 1: "SLAA" / "Conventional "	Scenario 2: "SLAA" / "Higher Density"	Scenario 3: "SLAA + Non SLAA" / "Conventional"	Scenario 4: "SLAA + Non SLAA" / "Higher Density"
Total Dwelling Units	3,904	5,205	5,016	6,792
Flats	438	2,416	537	2,984
Terraced Homes	556	1,380	662	1,773
2 Bedroom Houses	408	252	531	353
3 Bedroom Houses	2,203	1,019	2,894	1,482
4+ Bedroom Houses	298	138	392	200
Dwellings Units/Gross Ha	54	88	53	84
Parking Spaces per Unit	1.6	1.0	1.6	1.0

### 2.13. EFDC Scenario Review

Two workshops, held on the 5th and 8th of October 2015, were conducted with District Council members and staff, and the sites were further refined using aerial imagery and local knowledge. Staff and Council members were provided with the draft site pool maps and asked to identify additional sites and flag other sites for removal. Further refinement of the site pool included removal of some sites and the addition of: underused sites known to the Council and brownfield sites that while in the greenbelt, were previously developed and adjacent to existing built up areas. It should be noted that the latter brownfield sites in the Green Belt were not included in the final calculations in this study. Details of these Green Belt sites are contained in Appendix 4: Brownfield Greenbelt Sites.

2.14. The Council Member workshops resulted in an updated site pool that reduced the overall site count to 132 and the total site area to 93 hectares, 23 hectares of which was on land outside of current policy, within the greenbelt which was not included in the final calculations for this study. The overall breakdown of sites was 111 sites within current policy and 21 outside current policy (greenbelt). While the 21 greenbelt sites were included in the final site pool, they were not used for any capacity calculations. For a detailed listing of the final site pool, see Appendix 5: Final Site Pool.

### 2.15. Development Strategies

In addition to a provisional capacity estimate range of 3,904 – 6,792 (table 5 above), the scenarios also highlighted similarities between many of the sites in size, current/potential use and location. Furthermore discussions with EFDC staff and members led to the understanding that these similarities meant that similar, potential development strategies (in terms of density, mix and type of development) could be applied to groups of sites. From this finding, a typology of sites was developed and assigned to each site as follows:

- Large, Sustainably Located Sites
- Small, Sustainably Located Sites
- Re- developable Car Parks
- Large, Less Sustainably Located Sites

- Small, Less Sustainably Located Sites

The typologies are explained below in terms of their location or current use characteristics. Each category in the site typology lent itself to a particular development strategy with respect to the type, mix and density of development. This enabled the selection of a range of pilot sites that are more broadly representative of potential development opportunities throughout the District. In addition, it allowed reference from the pilot site work to inform the assessment of the capacity of all of the settlements.

2.16. **Large, Sustainably Located Sites**

These sites, many of which are Council-owned green space, are large and located in close proximity to services, tube stations/ bus routes and town centres. They offer advantages in that they are able to absorb a large number of new units, can be master planned, and have the potential for urban design features (such as upper floors set back from the lower floors to give the appearance of a building that is less tall, streets that can be closed to traffic for pedestrian focused events, and public squares). Density can be maximised in the centre of these sites without visual impacts to surrounding sites.

2.17. **Small, Sustainably Located Sites**

These sites are similarly located to those above but due to their size have less opportunity for master planning and higher density. Many, however, are on previously developed land within town centres and may be appropriate for higher density development.

2.18. **Re-developable Car Parks**

These are sites that are currently under public ownership, either by Epping Forest District Council, local authorities, or Transport for London (TFL). These sites are all centrally located and in the case of TFL-owned sites, are adjacent to London Underground stations. Some are also adjacent to large supermarkets such as Tesco. For these sites, the key strategy here is phasing and vertical garage parking. Public-private partnerships should provide developers with the incentives necessary to build adequate structured parking as well as higher density housing development to account for parking need in these areas while increasing housing capacity in the settlements.

2.19. **Large, Less Sustainably Located Sites**

While larger than 1 hectare, these sites are not located in close proximity to public transport or town centres. Thus, they are better suited for terraced and detached homes than flats. These areas provide an opportunity for master planned development at moderate densities where larger 2 and 3 bedroom units can be built.

2.20. **Small, Less Sustainably Located Sites**

These sites may only have capacity for 10 to 20 units, primarily at low to moderate densities. Terraced homes and smaller detached homes should predominate with some flats.

Table 6: Development Typology

Category	Description	Hectares
Large Sustainably Located	>1 Ha, largely undeveloped sites near high streets with good transit access	25.7
Small, Sustainably Located	<1 Ha, largely undeveloped sites near high streets with good transit access	8.6
Re-developable Car Parks	TFL or EFDC-owned car parks	4.0
Large, Less Sustainably Located	>1 Ha, largely undeveloped sites not near high streets with poor transit access	22.2
Small, Less Sustainably Located	<1 Ha, largely undeveloped sites near high streets with poor transit access	9.4

2.21.

**Associated Parking Provision**

Parking provision for each site in the SCS was defined on a per dwelling unit basis for each development type. Parking per dwelling unit ratios varied based on the assumption that less sustainably located sites would require more parking and development on existing car parks would require replacement parking in addition to parking to serve new uses. Table 7 below lays out parking provision by development type. For a full listing of SCS sites and number of parking spaces provided for each, see Appendix 6: SCS Parking Provision.

Table 7: Associated Parking Provision

Development Type	Parking Spaces per Dwelling Unit
Small Site / Less Sustainable Location	1.0
Small Site / Sustainable Location	0.7
Large Site / Less Sustainable Location	1.0
Large Site / Sustainable Location	0.8
Car Park / Sustainable Location	2.9

3.0

**VIABILITY TESTING**

3.1.

In addition to a high-level scenario analysis of potential settlement capacity, the consultant team developed an approach to verify the capacity assumptions through site-level viability testing. Envision Tomorrow includes a viability tool that allows users to input detailed site parameters (such as land values) that provide information about potential yield, value, and viability of development. In order to validate these parameters, extensive testing and review was done in close partnership with the District's estates team.

### 3.2. Pilot Site Selection

The next step in the process was to examine 11 specific sites taken from the site typologies outlined in Table 6, to test the assumptions made and confirm the potential, additional capacity achievable within settlements. Sites were selected based on their assigned typology and to achieve a representative sample across most of the 9 settlements. In this exercise development constraints were taken into account which could have an impact on the potential development density. For each selected site, a form of development was selected (in line with the most fitting development strategies in the site typology) and was then designed to fit the site, and reviewed by EFDC planning staff. Modifications were made for a variety of reasons, including the relationship to adjoining residences, preserving important trees and vegetation, and protecting threatened species, to name a few. The pilot sites can be seen in Table 8 below. For specific locations, see Appendix 8: Pilot Site Visualisations.

Table 8: Pilot Sites

Site Name	Settlement	Site Size (Ha)	Development Strategy
Buckhurst Hill Station	Buckhurst Hill	0.20	Small Site / Sustainable
Waltham Abbey Community Centre	Waltham Abbey	0.44	Small Site / Sustainable
Epping Station	Epping	1.58	Car Park / Sustainable Location
Baker's Lane Car Parks	Epping	0.86	Car Park / Sustainable Location
Debden Station	Loughton	1.60	Car Park / Sustainable Location
Colebrook Lane Amenity Open Space	Loughton	8.60	Large Site / Less Sustainable
Epping Sports Centre	Epping	0.43	Small Site / Sustainable
North Weald Industrial	North Weald	1.10	Large Site / Less Sustainable
Limes Estate	Chigwell	1.99	Large Site / Less Sustainable
Tesco Car Park	Waltham Abbey	1.52	Large Site / Less Sustainable
EFDC Offices and Car Park	Epping	0.99	Small Site / Sustainable

### 3.3. Visualisation

A visualisation was created for each pilot site, showing a realistic view of what the prototype new development could look like. Figure 1 below provides a sample visualisation of a development adjacent to the Buckhurst Hill Tube Station. For a more detailed overview of the visualisations created for the 11 pilot sites, see Appendix 8: Pilot Site Visualisations.

Figure 1: Sample Pilot Site Visualisation



### 3.4. Pilot Site Yield and Model Revision

Detailed viability analysis was then completed for each of the 11 pilot sites. This included information regarding housing units, unit sizes, retail space, and parking. Specifics regarding these parameters can be found in Appendix 8. For a detailed yield by site, see table 9 below.

Table 9: Yield by Site

Site Name	Site Typology	Housing Units	Retail Sqm	Parking Net Chng	Hectares
Baker's Lane	Car Park / Sustainable Location	37	0	+286	0.86
Buckhurst Hill Station	Small Site / Sustainable	40	353	-0	0.20
Community Ctr Total	Small Site / Sustainable	53	0	+33	0.44
Epping Sports Centre	Small Site / Sustainable	94	0	+15	0.43
Debden Station	Car Park / Sustainable Location	265	2811	+181	1.60
Epping Station	Car Park / Sustainable Location	206	1412	+90	1.58
Colebrook Lane	Large Site / Sustainable	811	2249	+642	8.60
North Weald Industrial	Large Site / Less Sustainable	93	0	+53	1.10
Limes Estate	Large Site / Sustainable	125	0	+125	1.99
Tesco Car Park	Large Site / Less Sustainable	90	584	-200	1.52
EFDC Offices	Small Site / Sustainable	128	931	-72	0.99
<b>Total</b>	-	<b>1,942</b>	<b>8,340</b>	<b>+1,153</b>	<b>19.31</b>

3.5. Based on the yield for the 11 sites, a housing unit yield per hectare, was established for each category of the site typology (Table 10). These densities were then applied to all sites within the Site Pool to produce a revised dwelling unit yield by site typology, which is summarised in table 11 below. Note that the total includes a recent estimate (October 2015) of units with planning permission and units built or under construction since the SLAA was completed, which were not mapped as part of the analysis.

Table 10: Density by Typology

Generalised Yield (Gross dph)	
Car Park / Sustainable Location	129.3
Large Site / Less Sustainable	64.7
Large Site / Sustainable	81.1
Small Site / Less Sustainable	44.5
Small Site / Sustainable	125.8

Table 11: Dwelling Unit Yield by Development Type

Development Type	Dwelling Unit Yield
Large Site / Sustainable	2,331
Small Site / Sustainable	1,192
Car Park / Sustainable Location	527
Large Site / Less Sustainable	1,476
Small Site / Less Sustainable	426
Units with Planning Permission	410
Units Built or Under Construction	1,289

## 4.0 RESULTS

- 4.1 The analysis showed that the potential amount of housing that could be achieved in each of the five development type categories (e.g. large site/ sustainable, small site/ sustainable, etc.) totalled 5,952 housing units. Including recently completed units and those with planning permission (1,699) the SCS reaches a total of 7,651 units within the 2011-2033 planning horizon, which is 3,649 units short of the District's Objectively Assessed Housing Need of 11,300 for the Local Plan period.
- 4.2 These are estimates, and when actual development is designed, a deviation from the current estimates of plus or minus 10% can be expected, and unique characteristics of each site and its specific development proposal come into play.

### 4.3 Deliverability

In order to further organise and prioritise sites for development that were included in this study, Fregonese Associates (FA) undertook an analysis of "deliverability" based on information contained in the SLAA, Fregonese Associates field research in October 2015, and input from EFDC staff, Council members, and officers. EFDC commentary was received from two sources: two rounds of Settlement Capacity workshops held with staff and Council members in October 2015 and a member-officer workshop to gather opinions on SLAA sites the previous year in October/November 2014. A deliverability index was created that organises each of the sites into the following 5 categories:

- Type 1
  - Deliverable or Developable in SLAA <5 years
    - § Identified in SLAA
- Type 2
  - Deliverable or Developable in SLAA 5-10 years

- § Identified in SLAA
  - § Identified during 2014 Member-Officer Workshop
- Type 3
  - Publicly-owned land:
  - Received positive comment in October 2015 Settlement Capacity Workshops
- Type 4
  - Achievable but unknown availability and:
    - § Identified in SLAA
    - § Identified during 2014 Member-Officer Workshop
    - § Received positive comment in October 2015 Settlement Capacity Workshops
- Type 5
  - Achievable but unknown availability and:
  - Identified during Fregonese Associates field research

4.4. Table 12 below shows the number of units within each of the above deliverability categories. Note that over half of the projected yield (4,024 units) is considered to be in the first three deliverability categories and likely to be deliverable within 10 years.

Table 12: Projected Units by Deliverability

Deliverability	Dwelling Units
Type 1	1,096
Type 2	663
Type 3	2,265
Type 4	714
Type 5	1,214

4.5. The composition of the 4,024 units in the first deliverability categories shows that a majority of those sites are underused tube station car parks or large, sustainably located sites – which are predominantly comprised of public green space. Thus the focus of the EFDC in bringing forward sites for infill development should be in those two categories. Table 13 below shows the same deliverability categories as above, but with the composition of each in terms of site development typology.

Table 13: Deliverability by Site Typology

	Tube Station or Council-Owned Car Park	Large / Sustainable Location	Small / Sustainable Location	Large / Less Sustainable Location	Small / Less Sustainable Location
Type 1	0	417	167	469	43
Type 2	0	359	142	162	0
Type 3	502	1217	296	165	85
Type 4	0	0	473	109	132
Type 5	25	338	114	571	166

## 5.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1. The SCS tested the potential capacity of the 9 settlements studied to accommodate development through more efficient use of land. As at October 2015, the study identified the potential for around 7,600 dwellings as being theoretically deliverable from within the current settlement boundaries of the 9 settlements over the plan period 2011 - 2033. This figure includes units already constructed and those with planning permission. Excluding those built or with planning permission the Study revealed a capacity of up to around 6,000 dwellings within the boundary of the 9 settlements studied, through making more efficient use of the land identified in this study. The Study also provides useful exemplar of development types for pilot sites identified.
- 5.2. The deliverability of the sites in the Study has been assessed and as at October 2015 it is estimated that around 4,000 dwellings (deliverability types 1-3) could be delivered from the sites in the first 10 years of the plan, of which around 1,000 could be in the first 5 years of the plan.
- 5.3. However, the SCS also found that the density required to achieve these yields is significantly higher than what has historically been delivered in the District. Moreover, the housing mix identified in the 2015 SHMA showed the need for a much larger share of 3 and 4-bedroom housing than the SCS identified which if provided would reduce the dwelling yield. Further work is therefore required during the site selection and allocation process to consider in more detail the capacity of the sites identified in this study, their suitability for allocation and the dwelling mix requirement to meet the identified needs for the District

## 6.0 NEXT STEPS

- 6.1. The broad findings of the study can be used to assist the Council in its evidence and deliberations in bringing forward sites in the forthcoming Local Plan to meet the Objectively Assessed Housing Need for the District.
- 6.2. The sites identified in this study should be taken forward through an updated SLAA and through the site selection process for further analysis to fill in any gaps in data e.g. land ownership and the willingness of the land owner to develop the site or sell it for development. This will enable the Council to consider the sites as part of the potential trajectory for the Draft Local Plan.