



# Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment for Redditch Borough

Borough of Redditch  
Core Strategy  
Background Document

Refreshed April 2010

0908 ref: 0558

**REDDITCH** BOROUGH COUNCIL

*making  
a  
difference*

[www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)

Copies of Council publications can be made available in large print, Braille or audio cassette. We can also help translate and interpret this publication. Call 01527 64252 ext. 3805

# **Redditch Borough Council**

## **Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment for Redditch Borough**

**Refresh - April 2010**



## **Contents**

	<b>Page No.</b>
1. Introduction	1
2. Purpose of the SHLAA	2
3. The Current Housing Land Position	2
4. The SHLAA process	3
5. The SHLAA methodology	5
6. The SHLAA assessment	15
7. Summary of the contribution towards the housing provision within Redditch	30
 Appendix 1 SHLAA Working Partnership members	
 Appendix 2 Windfall calculation	
 Appendix 3 Supplementary Site Information questionnaire	
 Appendix 4 SHLAA Working Partnership Terms of Reference	
 Appendix 5 Assessment matrix of surveyed sites	

## **1. Introduction**

- 1.1 The concept of Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments (SHLAAs) is introduced in PPS3 - Housing (November 2006). They are seen as an important part of the policy process as they provide information on the opportunities that exist to meet the levels of need and demand for housing and in demonstrating a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites.
- 1.2 PPS3 sets out the key objectives which SHLAAs should meet and makes reference to practice guidance about detailed methodology for SHLAA production.
- 1.3 The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments - Practice Guidance was published in July 2007 (hereafter referred to as the 'SHLAA guidance'). The recommended standard methodology prescribed in the SHLAA guidance has been followed for the production of this SHLAA for Redditch.
- 1.4 The SHLAA provides background evidence for the Borough of Redditch Core Strategy which has reached Preferred Draft stage. This is a technical report and is not a decision making document and does not allocate land for housing nor does it determine whether planning permission would be granted for residential development. It will indicate sites that are potentially available to deliver Redditch Borough's housing requirement. The SHLAA was prepared by Council officers in collaboration with the SHLAA Working Partnership (see Appendix 1 for Partnership details), and will be regularly monitored and reviewed as sites become available and are taken out of the "pool" of sites.
- 1.5 This, and future SHLAA refresh documents will merely detail the sites that currently contribute to the SHLAA and suggested sites which were not included/ dropped during the refresh process. Details relating to the initial SHLAA (2008/09) such as the list of originally surveyed sites, consultees and their comments/ actions will not appear in SHLAA refresh documents but can still be referenced in the original SHLAA document and Technical Appendices (27 March 2009).

## **2. Purpose of the SHLAA**

2.1 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.

2.2 Specifically the SHLAA should:

- identify specific, deliverable sites for the first five years of a plan that are ready for development;
- identify specific, deliverable sites for years 6 - 10, and ideally years 11 - 15, in plans to enable the five year supply to be topped up;
- where it is not possible to identify specific sites for years 11 - 15 of the plan, indicate broad locations for future growth.

## **3. The Current Housing Land Position**

3.1 The Redditch Borough Core Strategy is required to establish the strategic housing requirement for the Borough. Currently, the Borough requirement has not been confirmed. Following the change of Government in May 2010, proposals emerged to abolish Regional Spatial Strategies (RSS) and the housing targets embedded in them and return spatial planning matters and decision making to the local level. RSSs have since been revoked; however the Localism Bill detailing approaches to local level planning will not be in the public arena until autumn 2010.

3.2 Until the requirement has been determined, the Council proposes to monitor housing delivery against a requirement derived from the previous RSS (January 2008) requirement for Worcestershire using submitted WMRSS2 proportions and rolling forward for the period 2006 to 2026 (equating to 186 dwellings per year).

3.3 The SHLAA for 2010/11 does not need to identify land to meet the entire housing requirement for Redditch between 2006 and 2026. Housing completions since 1 April 2006, houses under construction, sites with planning permission and allocated land within adopted Local Plans contribute to meeting the housing requirement. At 1 April 2010 the following completions

and small site commitments counted towards meeting housing requirement within Redditch<sup>1</sup>.

Completions 2006 - 2010	-	961
Small site Commitments <sup>2*</sup> (<5 dwellings)	-	<u>48</u>
		1009 dwellings

---

<sup>1</sup> Large site commitments (with planning permission or under construction) are identified in Section 6 of this report to avoid double-counting

<sup>2</sup> Allows a 7.6% lapse rate for small site commitments.

#### 4. The SHLAA process

- 4.1 The methodology used for the SHLAA process is taken directly from the SHLAA guidance (July 2007). Para 15 of the SHLAA guidance states that the use of this standard methodology is strongly recommended because it will ensure that the Assessment findings are robust and transparently prepared.
- 4.2 Figure 1 of the Core requirements of the Assessment sets out the minimum core requirements which should be included in the SHLAA.

Figure 1: Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment core outputs	
1	A list of sites, cross-referenced to maps showing locations and boundaries of specific sites (and showing broad locations where necessary)
2	Assessment of the delivery/ developability of each identified site (i.e. in terms of its suitability, availability and achievability) to determine when an identified site is realistically expected to be developed
3	Potential quantity of housing that could be delivered on each identified site or within each identified broad location (where necessary) or on windfall sites (where justified)
4	Constraints on the delivery of identified sites
5	Recommendations on how these constraints can be overcome and when

The core outputs have been dealt with in the following manner.

Core output	
1	<p>Based on the Stage 3 Desktop review of 594 sites detailed at Appendix 8 (SHLAA 27 March 2009), only those sites considered suitable for further assessment (highlighted grey) were mapped. 102 sites were assessed further and are detailed in Section 7 (SHLAA 27 March 2009). These sites were split into two Technical Appendices for reporting purposes: <i>Appendix A: Sites considered as having development potential in the SHLAA</i>, and <i>Appendix B: Sites dropped from consideration in the SHLAA</i>.</p> <p>With respect to the 2010 SHLAA refresh, Section 6 of this report details additional sites which have been considered for further assessment this year.</p>




Core output	
2	Technical Appendices A and B contain the completed site assessment forms which contribute to the overall site assessment relating to the 2010 SHLAA refresh only. Appendix 5 of this report summarises the findings in a traffic light rated matrix.
3	Indicative layouts have been included in Technical Appendix A. The windfall assumption has been justified (Stage 10) and calculated in Appendix 2 of this report. A windfall allowance has not been included in the first 10 years of land supply in accordance with PPS3, para 59.
4	Constraints to development forms part of the site assessment and is detailed in Technical Appendices A and B. This information was supplemented for the first time in 2010 with additional information from landowners and statutory consultees. The additional information strengthens the viability assessment and has been included as a result of feedback from the SHLAA Working Partnership (see questionnaire at Appendix 3 and summary of questionnaire responses in Section 6 of this report).
5	Overcoming constraints to development forms part of the site assessment and is detailed in Technical Appendices A and B. Following publication of the SHLAA, work will continue to address constraints with landowners (para 5.29).

- 4.3 Figure 2 of the Core requirements of the Assessment states that the assessment should involve key stakeholders including house builders, social landlords, local property agents and local communities plus other relevant agencies such as Housing Corporation and English Partnerships. The purpose of this involvement is to discuss and agree methods, assumptions, judgements and findings throughout the process to ensure the robustness and transparency of the Assessment. Appendix 1 details all members of the Redditch SHLAA Working Partnership which was formally established in October 2009.
- 4.4 Prior to publication, the Partnership agreed the Methodology section of this Report and provided a valuable assessment of contributing sites and their development potential/ viability.
- 4.5 The SHLAA document (27 March 2009) was the subject of public consultation as part of the consultation process for the Draft Preferred Core Strategy and its suite of evidence based background documents. Comments received during the consultation process were addressed as part of this SHLAA refresh.

## 5. The SHLAA methodology

- 5.1 The SHLAA has eight main stages, with two further optional stages, covering broad locations and windfalls. The flowchart below is taken from the SHLAA guidance and illustrates the stages involved. Each of these is detailed in turn below with respect to the Redditch SHLAA.



## Stage 1: Planning the Assessment

5.2 Paragraph 19 of the SHLAA guidance identifies management issues to be addressed at the outset of planning the Assessment. In response to these issues, Redditch Borough Council has adopted the following approaches:

- The Assessment deals specifically with sites within the Borough of Redditch without inclusion of sites within neighbouring authorities. This is because the Redditch Core Strategy is prepared for Redditch Borough and the supporting evidence in the SHLAA needs to relate to the area covered by the Core Strategy. The need for cross-boundary discussion in connection with addressing issues related to potentially planning for housing for Redditch is recognised by the Borough Council.
- There is no existing housing market partnership forum available to scrutinise the SHLAA. Redditch Borough Council officers have however worked to establish a SHLAA Working Partnership (see Appendix 1 for Partnership members and Appendix 4 for SHLAA Working Partnership Terms of Reference).
- Resources for the project were absorbed as part of the Planning Policy workload.
- Assessment skills, management and scrutiny are monitored via the SHLAA Working Partnership (see Appendix 4).

## Stage 2: Determining which sources of sites will be included in the Assessment.

5.3 The SHLAA guidance (Figure 4) lists potential sources of sites which should be considered by local authorities; both sites in the planning process and sites not currently in the planning process. Many of the sites included in the SHLAA were already known to the local authority as they are current Local Plan sites or have been part of previous urban capacity studies, for example.

5.4 Sites included in the Assessment have been derived from the following sources:

- Sites previously identified in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan to meet housing requirements, un-implemented/outstanding planning permissions for housing, and planning permissions for housing that were under construction at 1 April 2010.
- Sites identified in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 to address any shortfall in meeting current housing requirements.

- Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 Omission Sites - sites suggested for inclusion in the Local Plan which were rejected by the Inspector for inclusion in the plan.
- Redditch Borough Council's Preferred Draft Core Strategy (October 2008) relevant emerging strategic sites.
- Sites in Redditch Borough Council's Supplementary Planning Documents (that are not emerging strategic sites).
- Sites identified by White Young Green in their first report into future growth implications for Redditch (Dec 2007) – additional capacity within Redditch Borough.
- Sites identified by White Young Green in their second report into future growth implications for Redditch (Oct 2008) – assessment of surplus Primarily Open Space within Redditch. Comprehensive assessment of all of Redditch's Primarily Open Space for development was excluded from assessment as Redditch's open space standard is an asset which the Borough Council strives to protect. It is one of Redditch's locally distinctive features which is prominent throughout the Borough.
- National Land Use Database sites within Redditch Borough.
- Submitted sites by landowners/ agents.
- Redditch Borough Council land which may have the potential to be declared surplus for disposal.
- Redditch Urban Capacity Study (March 2003) Sites.
- Employment sites considered surplus following the ELR to establish whether they might contribute to the SHLAA.
- Areas of Development Restraint (ADR) within Redditch.
- Green Belt within Redditch, adjacent to the urban area.

5.5 Sites in the following categories identified in the SHLAA guidance (Figure 4) have been excluded from the Assessment at this stage.

- Land in non-residential use which may be suitable for re-development for housing, such as commercial buildings or car parks - as Redditch has emerging needs for competing land uses such as retail, office and employment, including sites in the SHLAA at this stage which may have no housing potential is considered misleading. If included at this stage without prior assessment for other potential, it could subsequently be argued at appeal that these sites were considered suitable in principle for housing by virtue of their inclusion in the SHLAA. If any sites are surplus or offer a mixed use development as contribution to the Core Strategy, then their housing potential will be investigated at an appropriate time and included in the SHLAA at a later date if deemed necessary.
- Large scale redevelopment and re-design of existing residential areas - as Redditch is a new town, the age and layout of the majority of the town indicates that there are no existing residential areas which fall under this category.
- New free standing settlements - the Phase II review of the RSS (stipulated in the Report of the Panel, September 2009) that growth associated with Redditch should be adjacent to the Redditch urban area boundary, thus ruling out a free standing settlement. In the light of RSS revocation (announced 6<sup>th</sup> July 2010) and the absence of an appropriate housing requirement for Redditch, a free standing settlement within the Borough's administrative boundary would not offer any contribution to creating a sustainable mixed community for Redditch as evidenced in the Development Options joint work and Sustainability Appraisal refresh (February 2010).

### Stage 3: Desktop review of existing information

- 5.6 An initial desktop assessment of all sites identified this year from the various sources identified in Stage 2 has been carried out. Additional sources for sites were investigated as suggested in Figure 5 of the SHLAA guidance. However, sources such as the vacant property register only identified sites that fell below the minimum site threshold for this Assessment. Also at this stage, identified sites which were considered unsuitable for assessment were eliminated, e.g. within flood zone, significant access constraints, and unsustainable locations relative to existing settlements. Section 6 of this report gives details of the assessments.

- 5.7 With respect to site size, only sites that were over 0.16 Ha in size were considered, i.e. they are able to accommodate a minimum of 5 dwellings at a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare. To identify sites below this threshold would mean attempting to identify sites of a scale down to individual housing plots. It was considered that this would be too onerous a task, extremely time consuming and potentially endless. Therefore any sites which fell below this threshold were not considered appropriate for the purposes of this study. However, it should be emphasised that the application of this threshold would not preclude smaller sites from coming forward for development. Such sites would be assessed on individual merit via the planning application process and, if suitable for development, would count towards the housing supply as windfall contributions. Windfall contributions are discussed at Stage 10 of this report.

#### Stage 4: Determining which sites and areas will be surveyed

- 5.8 To ensure a comprehensive assessment, all sites identified positively through the desk top review were surveyed, assessed and photographed. For reporting purposes, they have been split into two Technical Appendices: *Appendix A: Sites considered as having development potential in the SHLAA*, and *Appendix B: Sites dropped from consideration in the SHLAA*. As a cross-check mechanism to ensure that all sites which may have development potential were assessed consistently, the SHLAA Working Partnership scrutinised the assessment results prior to publication of this Report.

#### Stage 5: Carrying out the survey

- 5.9 SHLAA guidance states that as a minimum, all sites identified by the desktop review should be visited. A site analysis form was devised with Bromsgrove District Council in order to gather a consistent data set for all sites. The site analysis form is attached at Appendix 4 (SHLAA, 27 March 2009). The assessment was split into three stages:
- 5.10 Stage A assessed initial suitability for further assessment and was a desktop assessment. In order for sites to be fully assessed, they had to be brownfield or greenfield sites within or adjoining a settlement within the Borough boundary. For the purposes of the original survey (2008/09), 'settlements' included Redditch urban area and Astwood Bank but excluded Feckenham. Any sites which were not within or adjoining a settlement were discounted, unless as in the case for Feckenham, a site provided 100% affordable housing (rural exceptions housing). For the purposes of completeness, the sites identified in the Urban Capacity Study (March 2003) in and around

Feckenham, were re-visited as part of the 2010 SHLAA refresh to assess any potential capacity contributions. These sites are detailed in Section 6 of this report.

5.11 Sites were also excluded at Stage A if they met any of the following criteria:

- Schedule Ancient Monument, located on the site;
- Significant adverse impact on biodiversity<sup>3</sup>;
- Site falls within Flood Zone 3<sup>4</sup>.

5.12 Stage B gathered information relating to the sites e.g. environmental issues, sustainability, constraints to delivery and highway access amongst others and was given a traffic light rating. An amber or red rating would not preclude a site from development, rather it gives an indication of which sites may be capable of earlier release for development due to fewer constraints. The traffic light assessment is detailed in a matrix at Appendix 5.

5.13 Stage C sets out housing potential, availability and achievability of sites and is discussed in the subsequent methodology stages. Section 6 of this report details which assessed sites are considered to have development potential.

#### Stage 6: Estimating the housing potential of each site

5.14 SHLAA guidance suggests that the housing potential of an identified site should be guided by existing or emerging plan policy. PPS3 has been revised (June 2010) to remove the 30 dwellings per hectare (dph) national indicative minimum density threshold in favour of Local Planning Authorities establishing their own density ranges. The Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3 Density of Housing policy indicated that development should take place between 30-50 dph except in the town centre where densities of 70 dph should be achieved. This policy was not saved (22/5/2009) as its contents were covered at that time, by the contents of the now superseded PPS3 (2006). Therefore, in the absence of national, regional or local guidance on housing densities, an emerging Preferred Draft Core Strategy policy will address the matter of locally appropriate housing densities to fill this policy gap. Further to this, SHLAA guidance suggests that the capacities of sites should be guided by local level housing densities but where these do not provide a sufficient basis to make a

---

<sup>3</sup> These sites may be reassessed at a later date under SHLAA review if landowners can demonstrate that mitigation measures can be successfully introduced.

<sup>4</sup> These sites may be reassessed at a later date under SHLAA review if landowners can demonstrate that mitigation measures can be successfully introduced.

local judgement, one approach to estimating potential is by sketching a scheme. Although Redditch Borough Council considers its emerging Housing Density policy to provide a sufficient basis to make a local judgement, schemes have been sketched for sites not currently in the planning system to further aid estimation of site yield.

5.15 Density multipliers have been used to gauge a ball-park figure to guide progression of the draft Preferred Core Strategy for Redditch. They have been set out as a lower and upper figure based on 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare (dph) in urban areas and a minimum of 70 dph with the Town Centre and District Centres (based on the former Local Plan No.3 Policy B(HSG).4 – Density of Housing Development). These levels are also being progressed in the emerging Core Strategy. Net developable areas allow for infrastructure provision on sites. As such, the following net developable area criteria have been used with the density multipliers to establish initial potential housing figures:

- Sites up to 0.4 Ha - 100% of site area to be used.
- Sites 0.4 Ha to 2 Ha - 85% of site area to be used.
- Sites 2 Ha and over - 65% of site area to be used.

5.16 As part of this update, sites considered to have development potential have been further assessed by an urban designer who has produced indicative schemes taking account of site constraints, surrounding densities etc. The indicative schemes have been incorporated in Technical Appendix A.

5.17 Of the sites considered to have development potential, the capacity ranges have been detailed in Section 6 of this report. For the purposes of assessing site capacities, the range based on the information provided through indicative schemes and landowner schemes is regarded as offering the most realistic capacity assessment.

#### Stage 7: Assessing when and whether sites are likely to be developed

5.18 The site analysis gives very basic figures for the amount of potential housing land. However, in addition to these figures, the SHLAA needs to consider whether sites are suitable and available for development and if so, the achievability of development. Assessing the suitability, availability and achievability of a site provides the information on which the judgement can be made in the plan making context as to whether a site can be considered deliverable, developable or not currently developable for housing.



- 5.19 In order for a site to be considered as deliverable it must be available now, in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect of delivery within five years.
- 5.20 In order for a site to be considered as developable it must be in a suitable location for housing development with a reasonable prospect that it will be available and could be developed at a specific point in time.
- 5.21 The SHLAA Working Partnership considered that additional site information from landowners and statutory consultees regarding suitability, availability and achievability would strengthen the initial site assessment process. Questionnaires were designed by the Partnership and circulated to all landowners/ agents and statutory consultees. An example of the questionnaire is shown in Appendix 3 of this document. The results of the responses to the questionnaires are detailed in Section 6 of this report.

#### Stage 7a: Assessing suitability for housing

- 5.22 A site is **suitable** if it offers a suitable location for development now and would contribute to the creation of sustainable mixed communities.
- 5.23 Some sites which have received a positive assessment through the Stage A criteria may still not be suitable to continue to further assessment at Stages B and C. Examples include: (i) excess land within a previously identified site which has been developed, was retained by the Scouts and Cadets and is now a well maintained HQ for these groups and relocation would be inappropriate; and (ii) areas of open space may provide essential amenity facilities in densely populated areas.
- 5.24 Section 6 of this report details the assessed sites and their suitability to contribute towards housing provision. Although some sites may indeed have scored positively in the Stage B criteria, local knowledge and a visual assessment of the sites and their surroundings has also been taken into account. A considered judgement has been taken as to whether development would compromise the townscape and visual amenity of the area and thus, some sites have been discounted if development was considered wholly inappropriate.

#### Stage 7b: Assessing availability for housing

- 5.25 A site is considered **available** when, on the best information available, there is confidence that there are no legal or ownership problems, such as multiple

ownerships, ransom strips, tenancies or operational requirements of landowners. This means that the site is controlled by a housing developer or the landowner has expressed an intention to sell.

- 5.26 All sites which were considered suitable for housing development in the 2008/09 SHLAA and new sites identified in the 2009/10 refresh were the subject of viability scrutiny through compilation of additional information from landowners to determine the likelihood of sites coming forward for development. The results of the landowner and statutory consultee questionnaires (Appendix 3) have been incorporated in Section 6 of this report.

#### Stage 7c: Assessing achievability for housing

- 5.27 A site is considered **achievable** when there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered on the site at a particular point in time. This is essentially a judgement about economic viability of a site and the ability of the developer to complete the housing over a particular time period.

Achievability will be affected by:

- Market factors;
  - Cost factors; and
  - Delivery factors.
- 5.28 Estimates regarding the economic viability of sites were supplemented through compilation of additional information from landowners to determine the likelihood of sites coming forward for development. The results of the landowner and statutory consultee questionnaires (Appendix 3) have been incorporated in Section 6 of this report.

#### Stage 7d: Overcoming constraints

- 5.29 With respect to overcoming possible constraints on sites, Redditch Borough Council considers that investigation, mitigation and investment should be the responsibility of the landowner if they wish to progress their site towards development. However, Redditch Borough Council will contact landowners of potential development sites with possible constraints to proactively discuss appropriate courses of action. If landowners are not willing to investigate remedies to overcome constraints then these sites will be dropped to the lower end of the achievability/ deliverability rating as this would be perceived

as an unwillingness to develop the site (Stage 7b). Through discussions with landowners, sites will move up the achievability/ deliverability rating in future SHLAA updates when constraints have been satisfactorily addressed.

#### Stage 8: Review of the assessment

- 5.30 The SHLAA will be reviewed annually and updated to 1 April each year in line with other housing land monitoring. It is anticipated that significant and timely collaboration of the SHLAA Working Partnership (Appendix 1) will continue throughout the ongoing SHLAA process.

#### Stage 9: Identifying and assessing the housing potential of broad locations (where necessary)

- 5.31 PPS3 advises that 'broad locations' may be considered in the context of identifying potential housing supply in the 11 to 15 year period of supply. The SHLAA guidance suggests that the identification of broad locations for growth offers a proactive and positive approach to planning, giving a greater certainty about the locations where development will be encouraged in the longer term. Since the coalition government's proposals to revoke Regional Spatial Strategies and their housing targets (announced 6<sup>th</sup> July 2010), it is unclear how Redditch Borough Council will consider broad locations for future growth under the 'New Localism' initiative especially if this is expected to involve cross-boundary considerations. The available evidence suggests that development broadly to the north of Redditch in Bromsgrove District is the preferred area of search for housing growth.

#### Stage 10: Determining the housing potential of windfall (where justified)

- 5.32 The SHLAA guidance indicates that there may be genuine local circumstances where a windfall allowance may be justified. PPS 3 (2010, para. 59) specifies that an allowance for windfall dwellings should not be included in the first 10 years of land supply unless robust evidence can demonstrate genuine local circumstances that prevent specific sites being identified. It is considered that robust evidence does not exist to demonstrate such circumstances in Redditch Borough. However, based on past trends, the Borough Council's officers consider that small site windfalls (<5 dwellings) will continue to contribute towards the housing supply in the future.
- 5.33 As the site threshold for small site windfall dwellings is effectively 4 dwellings or less, it is more than likely that the majority of these will arise from house conversions to flats or intensification of existing residential plots. As such, they

will be classed as brownfield contributions. For the purposes of establishing a windfall calculation for the SHLAA, an annual average of all small site brownfield completions on sites of less than 5 dwellings has been calculated and is detailed in Appendix 2. In order to ensure compliancy with PPS3 – Housing (para 59), no windfall allowance has been included for the first 10 years of land supply.

- 5.34 It is acknowledged that a downturn in the housing market could affect small scale development such as that established through a windfall assessment. The trend based annual average assumption used in Appendix 2, covers a 13 year period and is based on brownfield completions of less than 5 dwellings within the urban area of Redditch only. It is considered that the data in this time period reflects the ‘peaks’ and ‘troughs’ in the development market and provides a realistic assumption of anticipated small site provision. This calculation will be revisited annually as part of the SHLAA update.

## 6. The SHLAA assessment

- 6.1 The SHLAA assessment process 2008/09 identified 43 sites which were considered suitable for residential development and should count towards the SHLAA. All sites which were considered suitable for inclusion in the SHLAA were apportioned a capacity figure based on 30 dph and 50dph, taking into account the criteria in paragraph 5.15 of this report. They have also been the subject of indicative schemes, produced by independent urban designers to ascertain appropriate and achievable capacities in line with the SHLAA Practice Guidance. A 30 dph capacity assessment has been applied in this report where scheme details are not available.
- 6.2 Following publication of the 2009 SHLAA and public consultation, issues arose concerning some of the included sites and further investigation has been carried out prior to this publication. All sites considered suitable for inclusion appear in Technical Appendix A (2010) and the Site Matrix in Appendix 5 of this report. The sites below (white) have been excluded from contributing towards the 2010 SHLAA; full details of dropped sites can be found in Technical Appendix B (2010).

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	Comments	Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions
LP01	Old Crest, Smallwood (LP 83)		Site completed. Therefore dwellings counted in completions (p.2)	
LP02	Brush Factory, Evesham Road, Crabbs Cross (LP124)	10 (4) (s)	6 Completed, 4 Under construction (B) <sup>5</sup>	N/A site under construction. Available yrs 1-5

<sup>5</sup> Refers to Brownfield (B) or Greenfield (G) nature of site

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	Comments	Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions
LP03	Rear of 144-162 Easemore Road (LP135)	<b>24</b> (s)	(B)	No LOQ information received. Planning consent lapsed. Understand that landowners in discussion regarding revised scheme. Therefore yrs 1-5
LP05	Windsor Gas Works (LP147)	255 <b>(140)</b> (s)	Under construction (B)	N/A 115 units complete and recorded on p.2 of this report. 140 units outstanding. Therefore yrs 1-5
LP06	Mayfields Works	<b>18</b> (s)	(B)	No LOQ information. Understand that landowners in process of progressing a revised scheme for the site. Therefore considered deliverable within yrs 1-5
LP07	Johnsons Cars, Clive Road (06/247)		(B)	No LOQ information. Planning consent lapsed, viable business on site, therefore delete from SHLAA
LP10	Walton Close (07/275)		Site completed. Therefore dwellings counted in completions (p.2)	

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	Comments	Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions
LP11	Community House, Easemore Road			Outline consent lapsed (05/3010l). Landowner withdrawn release of land for development. Therefore delete site from SHLAA
LP13	Land off Torrs Close	<b>6</b> (s)	(B)	No LOQ information. Planning consent lapsed (06/371). Therefore consider deliverability in yrs 6-10
LP16	Land at Tidbury Close (07/214)	<b>6</b> (s)	Valid planning consent (G)	No LOQ. Recent site visit indicated that work on site was imminent. Therefore yrs 1-5
LPX02	Adjacent Castleditch Lane / Pheasant Lane	<b>16</b> (s)	(G)	LOQ identified no deliverability issues. Available as soon as necessary. Therefore yrs 1-5
LPX04	Former Claybrook School, Matchborough	<b>36</b> (s)	(B & G)	No LOQ information. Site currently stalled due to economic deliverability issues. Current attempts to secure variation on no. of affordable units. Still consider within yrs 1-5

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	Comments	Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions
LPX05	Land at Millfields, Fire Station and RO Fire Station	35 (s)	(B & G)	LOQ identifies some contamination issues to be resolved but site available to progress to development. Some LOQ info outstanding. Still consider within yrs 1-5
LPX06	Former Ipsley School playing field	31 (s)	(G)	LOQ identifies no deliverability issues. Therefore yrs 1-5
LPX07	South of scout hut, Oakenshaw Road	32 (s)	(G)	LOQ identifies no deliverability issues. Therefore yrs 1-5
PP01	Red Lion PH, Church Road, Astwood Bank (08/109)		Site completed. Therefore dwellings counted in completions (p.2)	
CS01	Church Hill District Centre	57 (s)	Although this Centre would benefit from regeneration is difficult to estimate the level of housing that could be accommodated without a detailed indicative scheme. Therefore the WYG stage 1 report estimate has	LOQ indicates that tenders are due back imminently from developers. Therefore yrs 1-5



Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	Comments	Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions
			been used for the purposes of this exercise (B)	
CS03	Matchborough District Centre	17 (s)	<p>Although this Centre would benefit from regeneration, it is difficult to estimate the level of housing that could be accommodated without a detailed indicative scheme.</p> <p>Therefore the WYG stage 1 report estimate has been used for the purposes of this exercise.</p> <p>No decision has been taken by the Council at this stage with respect to a timetable for redevelopment (including an element of housing) or what level of housing contribution could be relied upon. (B)</p>	<p>LOQ information identifies that this site will only be considered for redevelopment following evaluation of the completed Church Hill District Centre redevelopment scheme.</p> <p>Therefore yrs 6-10</p>

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Address/Name</b>	<b>Capacity</b> (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions</b>
WYG02	Peterbrook Close (08/303ol)	<b>5</b> (s)	Planning consent (G)	LOQ information identifies that Village Green Application could halt development of this site. Therefore yrs 6-10
WYG03	Tanhouse Lane	<b>14</b> (s)	Planning consent (B)	LOQ information identifies that development on site due to commence by 2011. Therefore yrs 1-5
WYG04	Marfield Farm School	<b>53</b> (s)	(B & G)	No LOQ information received. However, planning application recently refused contrary to officer recommendation. Therefore consider that deliverability should remain as yrs 1-5
WYG06	High Trees, Dark Lane (09/259)	<b>5</b> (s)	Planning consent (B)	No LOQ information received. However 2009 full planning permission approval would indicate intention of deliverability within yrs 1-5

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Address/Name</b>	<b>Capacity</b> (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions</b>
RB03	Widney House, Bromsgrove Road	<b>58</b> (s)	Includes RB07 & RB 38 for assessment (B)	LOQ information indicates immediate availability of site. Some possible contamination issues identified but not considered to hold up deliverability. Therefore yrs 1-5
L4L01	Land off Banners Lane		Scheme falls below the site size threshold (G)	Landowner withdrawn release of land for development. Therefore delete from SHLAA
L4L02	Land off Wirehill Drive (08/305)	<b>15</b> (s)	Planning consent (G)	LOQ information indicates immediate availability of site. Therefore yrs 1-5
UCS 1.35	Rear of Poplar Road shops (18 dwgs)		(B)	Landowner withdrawn release of land for development. Therefore delete from SHLAA
UCS 2.14	Land adjacent Saltways Cheshire Home (08/073)	<b>5</b> (s)	Planning consent (B)	No LOQ information. Planning application won on appeal, would suggest willingness of landowner to develop site. Therefore yrs 1-5

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	Comments	Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions
UCS 2.16	Rear of Sandygate Close	8 (s)	(G)	LOQ indicates that site to be considered as part of 2010 Assets Disposal Programme. Therefore as deliverability uncertain, yrs 6-10
UCS 3.10	Land off Priestfield Road		Scheme falls below the site size threshold	
UCS 3.23	Land off Hunt End Lane (22 dwgs)		(G)	LOQ information indicates that landowner unwilling to release land for development. Plus biodiversity and contamination issues. Therefore delete from SHLAA
UCS 3.43	Land east of Longfellow Close (7 dwgs)		(G)	LOQ information indicates that landowner unwilling to release land for development. Plus biodiversity issues and flooding implications along The Wharrage Park area. Therefore delete from SHLAA

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Address/Name</b>	<b>Capacity</b> (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions</b>
UCS 4.36	Land between Brooklands Lane and Offenham Close (47 dwgs)		(G)	LOQ information indicates that landowner unwilling to release land for development. Therefore delete from SHLAA
UCS 5.20	Land off Lady Harriet's Lane (7 dwgs)		(G)	LOQ information indicates that land reserved for use by Trinity High School. Therefore delete from SHLAA
UCS 8.10	Land opposite Kempsford Close, Oakenshaw South (44 dwgs)		Site merged with UCS 8.46 and part of UCS 8.47 (G)	LOQ information indicates that landowner unwilling to release land for development. Therefore delete from SHLAA
UCS 8.38	Dingleside Middle School & playing field and land rear of 1-11 Auxerre Avenue	<b>120</b> (s)	Merged with LPX01 (B & G)	LOQ information indicates no identified constraints and delivery to commence 2010/11. Therefore yrs 1-5
UCS 9.1	Land rear of Watery Lane / Ravensmere Road (16 dwgs)		(G)	LOQ information indicates that landowner unwilling to release land for development. Plus, biodiversity issues. Therefore delete from SHLAA
<b>Sub Total</b>		<b>705</b>		

6.3 In addition, the following sites were identified (Stage 2) for consideration in the 2010 SHLAA.

6.4 These sites were the subject of an initial desktop assessment (Stage 3) for their suitability to be carried forward for detailed assessment. All sites considered suitable for further assessment appear in Technical Appendices A & B (2010) and the Site Matrix in Appendix 5 of this document. At this stage, some sites (white) were eliminated for the following reasons:

- Landowner unwilling to release land for development
- Within Green Belt but not in a sustainable location
- Inappropriate location for residential development
- Below site size threshold

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	Comments	Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions
2010/01	Harport Road			Landowner withdrew site prior to SHLAA refresh
2010/02	Park House		Site falls below site size threshold	
2010/03	Loxley Close	10 (s)	Site dismissed in 2008/09 (L4L03) due to location within the floodplain. Indicated mitigation measures considered suitable/ appropriate (G)	LOQ information identifies floodplain mitigation measures and immediate availability of site. Therefore yrs 1-5
2010/04	Upper Norgrove House	27 (s)	Site identified as surplus under the Disposal of Assets programme (B)	LOQ information indicates immediate deliverability of site and bridleway realignment is not considered to hinder this. Therefore yrs 1-5

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Address/Name</b>	<b>Capacity</b> (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions</b>
2010/05	Clifton Close	<b>6</b> (s)	Site identified as surplus under the Disposal of Assets programme (G)	LOQ information indicates no constraints and immediate deliverability. Therefore yrs 1-5
2010/06	Community House, Easemore Road			Landowner withdrew site prior to SHLAA refresh
2010/07	Prospect Hill	<b>61</b> (s)	(B)	LOQ information indicates availability of site within 12 months and identifies no constraints to deliverability. Some minor LOQ info outstanding. Therefore yrs 1-5
2010/08	Dilwyn Close			Landowner withdrew site prior to SHLAA refresh
2010/09	RO Alexandra Hospital	<b>145</b> (d)	(G)	LOQ information sketchy as there is no indication of deliverability. Therefore consider that the site should be yrs 6-10

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	Comments	Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions
2010/10	A435 ADR	<b>360</b> (d)	Site needs specific FRA and mitigation measures and possible Transport Assessment which would delay delivery. At this point in time, reliance on this site to meet development needs within this plan period is unclear. (G)	Some minor LOQ information missing. Some LOQ information received indicates that site deliverable within yrs 1-5. However, subsequent meetings with the HCA have revealed that HCA would not support development on the site without Redditch BC and Stratford-on-Avon DC agreement to comprehensively develop up to the A435. This makes delivery uncertain given the recent RSS revocation. Therefore suggest 10+ yrs



Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	Comments	Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions
2010/11	Brockhill ADR	<b>425</b> (west of railway) (s)	(G)	<p><b>Land west of the railway:</b> LOQ indicates no constraints to deliverability. LOQ information indicates that early release of ADR land (Phase1) would enable development to come forward at IN67. Therefore yrs 1-5</p> <p><b>Land east of the railway:</b> LOQ considers site deliverable by 2016. However, at this point in time, there are uncertainties regarding the most appropriate use for the land and the need for the Bordesley Bypass. Therefore, it would be remiss to identify it solely for housing at this stage in the SHLAA. Consider delivery 6-10 yrs</p>

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	Comments	Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions
2010/12	Webheath ADR	<b>350</b> (s) <b>250</b> (d)	Site needs specific FRA and mitigation measures and drainage assessments. There are also ongoing contentious issues surrounding development of this site. Furthermore, at this point in time, reliance on this site to meet development needs in this plan period is unclear. (G)	No LOQ information received, however consultation response to RBC/BDC growth options consultation indicates that only 350 dwellings of the 600 dwelling capacity can be delivered in yrs 1-5. Suggest yrs 6-10 (350) and yrs 10+ (250)
2010/13	Brockhill Green Belt	<b>400</b> (d)	Early progression of this site would promote comprehensive development within the Brockhill area enabling the delivery of necessary infrastructure to this area. (G)	LOQ indicate no constraints to deliverability. Therefore yrs 1-5

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	Comments	Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions
2010/14	Foxlydiate Green Belt	<b>230</b> (d)	At this point in time, reliance on this site to meet development needs in this plan period is unclear and no exceptional circumstances exist to secure its release in preference to other identified sites. (G)	LOQ indicate no constraints to deliverability. Therefore 10+ yrs
2010/15	Walnut Tree Farm & Top Meadow, Astwood Bank		Desktop Survey. This site is within Redditch Green Belt. The SA for consultation options to accommodate 4000 dwellings in Redditch, including revision of Green Belt boundaries, has identified that Green Belt revision to the north/west of the urban area offers the most sustainable option for Green Belt revision. There are no exceptional circumstances, which exist to	

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	Comments	Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions
			secure release of this land in preference to sites in more sustainable locations. Therefore, sites not considered suitable for development due to their location. Dismiss	
2010/16	UCS6.43 – Land between Morrisons superstore and Brooklyn Garage		Desktop Survey. Site dismissed by ELR - AVP. No residential development this side of Battens Drive. Residential development would not be in-keeping with the character of the area. Dismiss	
2010/17	Broadacres Farm, Birmingham Road		Assessed with 2010/10 above as within A435 ADR	
2010/18	Land at Astwood Lane		Same site boundary as 2010/15. Refer to this entry for comments.	

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Address/Name</b>	<b>Capacity</b> (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions</b>
2010/19	UCS4.54 - Land north of Istel, fronting Ravensbank Drive		Desktop Survey. Site dismissed by ELR - Land fronting district distributor within industrial estate. Not considered suitable for residential development. Dismiss	
2010/20	UCS9.50 Studley Road (Delsons)		Desktop Survey. Site dismissed by ELR - Land locked site within industrial estate. Not considered suitable for residential development. Dismiss	
2010/21	UCS9.55 – Land off Heming Road		Desktop Survey. Site dismissed by ELR - Land within industrial estate. Not considered suitable for residential development. Dismiss	

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Address/Name</b>	<b>Capacity</b> (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions</b>
2010/22	UCS9.57 – Land fronting Icknield Street		Desktop Survey. Site dismissed by ELR - Land zoned for employment uses. Not considered suitable for residential development. Dismiss	
2010/23	UCS9.62 – Land fronting Matchborough Way		Desktop Survey. Site dismissed by ELR - Land within industrial estate. Not considered suitable for residential development. Dismiss	
2010/24	UCS5.17 – Land off Fishing Line Road		Desktop Survey. Site dismissed by ELR - Land within industrial estate. Not considered suitable for residential development. Dismiss	

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	Comments	Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions
2010/25	Ipsley Court, Ipsley		Desktop Survey. Redditch Borough Council has an obligation to protect its supply of employment land for appropriate uses. If/when the Law Society vacates these premises in the future; the site will first be assessed through the Employment Land Review to consider its suitability for continued employment uses. Only if it is found to be surplus to employment land requirements will it be assessed for other uses. Dismiss	

Site Reference	Site Address/Name	Capacity (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	Comments	Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions
2010/26	East of Hither Green Lane		Site within Arrow Valley Park. NOT in use as a driving range as suggested. Access to the site is restricted, obtainable only by two shared driveways which offer no options to increase the carriageway width to accommodate additional traffic. Dismiss	
2010/27	Sandycroft, West Avenue	<b>10</b> (d)	Landowner willing to dispose of site for development. Some issues surrounding tenancy agreements (B)	Suggest delivery 6-10 yrs
UCS 11.1	Mill Lane, Feckenham		Desktop Survey. Within Flood Zone 3 - High Risk. Listed building. Dismiss	
UCS 11.2	RO Village Hall, High Street, Feckenham		Desktop Survey. Site developed. Dismiss	



<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Address/Name</b>	<b>Capacity</b> (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions</b>
UCS 11.3	RO Droitwich Road, Feckenham		Desktop Survey. Cannot be developed in isolation as reliant on access through UCS 11.6. Carriageway width of Coupass Cottages fails to meet minimum width to accommodate traffic from additional housing. Also issues with visibility onto High Street. Dismiss	
UCS 11.4	RO 24 Droitwich Road, Feckenham		Desktop Survey. Garden belonging to 24 Droitwich Road. Garden wall listed. Limited access to site. Dismiss	

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Address/Name</b>	<b>Capacity</b> (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions</b>
UCS 11.5	RO Droitwich Road, Feckenham		Desktop Survey. Cannot be developed in isolation as reliant on access through UCS 11.6 and UCS 11.3 Carriageway width of Coupass Cottages fails to meet minimum width to accommodate traffic from additional housing. Also issues with visibility onto High Street. Dismiss	
UCS 11.6	RO High Street, Feckenham		Desktop Survey. Site falls below site size threshold. Dismiss	
UCS 11.7	RO 2-4 Mill Lane, Feckenham		Desktop Survey. Cannot be developed in isolation as reliant on access through UCS 11.8. Dismiss	

<b>Site Reference</b>	<b>Site Address/Name</b>	<b>Capacity</b> (s) = scheme (d) = density multiplier	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Landowner Questionnaire (LOQ) Conclusions</b>
UCS 11.8	2-4 Mill Lane, Feckenham		Desktop Survey. Below site size threshold. 2 dwellings on site. Dismiss	
UCS 11.9	RO 42 High Street, Feckenham		Desktop Survey. Below site size threshold. Dismiss	
UCS 11.10	Adj. 32 High Street, Feckenham		Desktop Survey. Below site size threshold. Dismiss	
UCS 11.11	RO 26 High Street, Feckenham		Desktop Survey. Below site size threshold. Dismiss	
UCS 11.12	17 Droitwich Road, Feckenham		Desktop Survey. Below site size threshold. Site of existing dwelling. Dismiss	
<b>Sub Total</b>		<b>2274</b>		

## 7. Summary of the contribution towards the housing provision within Redditch

- 7.1 This document provides a snapshot of both commitments (with a base date of 1 April 2010) and potential additional supply within the Borough of Redditch. The SHLAA will inform the preparation of the Redditch Core Strategy and provide evidence to support decision making within the plan process.
- 7.2 The SHLAA has been carried out in accordance with the SHLAA guidance and the Council has sought to engage with appropriate stakeholders on both the methodology and by invitation to submit sites for assessment. Ongoing consultation will continue as the SHLAA is a living document and subject to continuous review.
- 7.3 At this stage, the following table indicates the likely potential housing supply based on indicative schemes. Where there is no indicative scheme available; a 30 dwellings per hectare estimate has been applied.
- 7.4 Of the 33 sites considered suitable to contribute positively towards the SHLAA total for 2006-26, the following breakdown has been provided for information.

Total dwellings <b>based on indicative schemes/ 30dph<sup>6</sup></b>	2979
Total dwellings in windfall allowance	170
<b>Total dwellings identified through SHLAA</b>	<b>3149</b>
Completions 2006 to 2010	961
Allowance for small site commitments at 1 April 2010	48
<b>Total (2006-2026)</b>	<b>4158</b>
Total Number of sites	33
Brownfield sites	14 (42.5%)
Greenfield sites	15 (45.5%)
Brownfield/ greenfield mix	4 (12%)
Total number of dwellings based on indicative schemes	2979
Brownfield dwellings	446 (15%)
Greenfield dwellings	2289 (76%)
Brownfield/ greenfield mix	244 (9%)

<sup>6</sup> Includes large scale commitments and small site commitments +5 dwellings detailed in section 4 of this report

## **Appendix 1**

### **SHLAA Working Partnership members**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Alison Grimmett	Redditch Borough Council
Vicky Hines	Homes & Communities Agency
Simon Newbould	DS Designs Ltd
Darryl Saunders	DS Designs Ltd
Mark Sackett	RPS
Carl Taylor	Redditch Co-Op Homes
Eamon Thompson	Bromsgrove District Housing Trust
Ivan Wilcock	Private Consultancy
For Information: James Stevens	HBF

## **Appendix 2**

### **Windfall calculation**

<b>Urban Brownfield Completions on sites of less than 5 dwellings</b>														
96/ 97	97/ 98	98/ 99	99/ 00	00/ 01	01/ 02	02/ 03	03/ 04	04/ 05	05/ 06	06/ 07	07/ 08	08/ 09	09/ 10	<b>Total</b>
17	11	24	16	13	21	16	17	18	24	20	24	11	8	<b>240</b>

240 divided by 14 = 17.1 (rounded to 17 dwellings)

No allowance is proposed in first 10 years from 2006 to 2016 in accordance with PPS3

17 dwellings x 10 years (1 April 16 to 31 March 26) = 170 dwellings

**Small site windfall allowance on sites less than 5 dwellings = 170 dwellings**

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Supplementary Site Information questionnaire**

**Redditch Borough Council  
Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment**

**SUPPLEMENTARY SITE INFORMATION**

**Site Address:**

**Site Ref:**

Is the site boundary shown on the plan below correct?  
If not, please indicate the correct extent of the site to which  
this information relates



**Availability**

Is the site wholly owned/controlled by you or your company?

Are you/your company willing to release the site for residential development?

When could the site be available if it was considered a suitable site for residential development?

Is the site freehold or leasehold?

Is the site registered at the Land Registry with absolute title?

Do you have direct control over the sale, lease or other transfer of ownership of the site?

Are there any third party rights which could affect your ability to dispose of the site or any part of it, or restrict when the site can be assembled?

Would the site have immediate vacant possession if transferred or leased?

Is your land the subject of an option agreement with a housing developer?

Is it possible that your land can be sold free of potential ransom on access to neighbouring land?

Is the site or any part of it subject to a legal charge/mortgage, debenture or a floating charge?

Suitability	
What is the net developable area of the site for residential use?	
What density is proposed for the site and what is the estimated site capacity in respect of residential properties?	
If appropriate, what other land uses will form part of the development and at what scale?	
Can you provide evidence of the <u>lack of</u> constraints in respect of:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vehicular access and traffic impact</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access to public transport, cycle and pedestrian routes (existing and potential) to Redditch town centre, employment areas, schools, Alexandra Hospital, Redditch Bus/Rail interchange</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood Zones 2 and 3</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surface water drainage</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foul water drainage</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public utilities</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecological, archaeological and historic environment issues</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential amenity (eg privacy/overlooking, noise, vibration)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contamination or other pollution</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visual and landscape impact</li> </ul>	
Where there are identified constraints, can you provide evidence of how these may be acceptably mitigated?	
Do any constraints affect the phased release of the site during the period to 2026?	

If the site is developed could it provide access to other land that would be suitable for future consideration as development sites?	
<b>Achievability</b>	
What off-site infrastructure is required for the development, if known, and what is the estimated cost?	
What abnormal on-site development costs are associated with the development, for example site remediation, social infrastructure eg new schools, community provision?	
Do you expect to present viability evidence to justify a departure from the affordable housing target policies of the Local Planning Authority? If so is that evidence currently available?	
What is your expected delivery programme for the site including the timescale for the grant of planning permission (if not already granted), pre-commencement stage, site preparatory works and phased delivery of housing? Can this be presented on a year by year basis (April-March) up to March 2026?	
Do you have a master plan or layout for the site? Can this be supplied?	

**Please return your completed form to:**

Alison Grimmett

Development Plans

Redditch Borough Council

Walter Stranz Square

Redditch

Worcs. B98 8AH

[alison.grimmett@redditchbc.gov.uk](mailto:alison.grimmett@redditchbc.gov.uk)

**Forms to be returned no later than 28 February 2010**

## **Appendix 4**

### **SHLAA Working Partnership Terms of Reference**

## **The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Working Partnership – Draft Terms of Reference**

This Terms of Reference sets out the purpose and role of the Redditch Borough Council SHLAA Working Partnership (SWP) in the SHLAA process, who will make up the SWP, how the Partnership will communicate and how often the Partnership will liaise with the SHLAA co-ordinator (Redditch Borough Council Development Plans Officer).

### **Role of the SHLAA**

The SHLAA forms an important part of the evidence base for the Council's LDF. As the Council progresses with its LDF it is necessary to periodically update the evidence base to ensure it is sufficiently up to date and robust. The SHLAA will specifically inform the production of the Core Strategy DPD and the Site Allocations and Policies DPD. The Council is proposing an annual update of the existing SHLAA, for publication in April each year.

The SHLAA revision will build upon the existing SHLAA and will not fundamentally change the original methodology. However, it is necessary to ensure the full involvement of the SWP to re-evaluate the achievability and economic viability of existing and new SHLAA sites.

### **Purpose of the SWP**

The SWP will provide input on the SHLAA process/review in a more structured format than the previous ad hoc request for comments on methodology. It is intended that this input will be in the form of continuous dialogue with the SHLAA co-ordinator as opposed to a one off consultation. It is important that the SHLAA is as robust as possible and it is anticipated that the local knowledge and expertise of market conditions and viability factors of Partnership members will ensure the SHLAAs robustness.

PPS3 advocates the production of a housing implementation strategy that describes the approach to managing housing delivery. This is very much seen as a progression of the information within the SHLAA. It is anticipated that the level of detail in a housing implementation strategy would generally inform a Site Allocations and policies DPD, however, the general principles of such would form part of the delivery strategy within the Core Strategy. Further to agreement of the SHLAA methodology with the SWP, initial progression on a housing implementation strategy, drawing on the market knowledge of the SWP relating to the SHLAA sites would provide background evidence to support delivery within the Core Strategy. Input of the SWP into preparation of a housing implementation strategy would provide continuity and robustness to both the strategy and the SHLAA.

The SWP will liaise with the SHLAA co-ordinator who will be responsible for the day to day work of the SHLAA, co-ordinating the SWP and producing the final SHLAA and Implementation Strategy documents, with SWP endorsement.

### **Role of the SWP**

The role of the SWP will be to provide advice, agree the SHLAA methodology and contribute towards the production of an Implementation Strategy. It is anticipated that the SWP will, in particular, provide advice on market conditions and site viability. The SHLAA co-ordinator will carry out assessments on any new sites potential suitability for being included in the SHLAA with Partnership members being involved in advising on site availability, achievability and viability factors.

### **SWP Membership**

It is proposed that the SWP will be made up of representatives of the development industry from both the private and public sectors. Membership will be at the discretion of the Council.

### **How the SWP will work together**

It is anticipated that the Partnership will work primarily via email as it is recognised that people's availability and time is limited. However, it would be preferable to start the Partnership with a meeting so members can familiarise themselves with each other. There may be other occasions when round table discussions may be preferable to discuss issues in more depth. It is therefore proposed to have an initial meeting with all Partnership members to discuss in more detail the 'ground rules' for the Partnership; that is, the matters raised in this terms of reference document and any other issues that may arise. Specifically, it will discuss how the Partnership will work together, the suggested work timetable and involvement of the Partnership, communication arrangements in order to ensure efficient meetings are held, procedures for dealing with disagreements between Partnership members and declaration of interests on sites.

### **Responsibility for the SWP**

Responsibility for the Partnership will lie with Alison Grimmert, Development Plans Officer and SHLAA co-ordinator. Correspondence should be directed to Alison who can be contacted via [alison.grimmert@redditchbc.gov.uk](mailto:alison.grimmert@redditchbc.gov.uk) or 01527 64252 extn 3209.

## **Appendix 5**

### **Assessment matrix of surveyed sites**

Appraisal Criteria		LP02	LP03	LP05	LP06	LP13	LP16	LPX02	LPX04
<b>SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT</b>									
<b>Stage A</b>	Strategic Policy	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Land at risk of flooding	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
<b>Stage B</b>	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment							G	G
	Access to public transport							G	G
	Access to primary school							G	G
	Access to local retail facilities		Local Plan Commitments were not assessed at Stage B as they are either under construction or have valid planning consent and therefore are considered suitable by virtue of scrutiny within the Development Control process					A	G
	Access to health facilities							G	A
	Contamination on site							G	G
	TPOs							G	R
	Public Rights of Way							G	G
	Open space & recreation							G	A
	Employment Land							G	G
	Infrastructure capacity							G	G
	Highway access							G	R
	Compatibility with adjoining uses							G	G
<b>SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT</b>									
Is the site immediately available for development?		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
What is the predominant land type?		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
<b>SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT</b>									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
Appropriate timeframe for development		0-5	0-5	0-5	0-5	6-10	0-5	0-5	0-5
<b>POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD</b>									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology		4	24	140	18	6	6	16	36



Appraisal Criteria		LPX05	LPX06	LPX07	CS01	CS03	WYG02	WYG03	WYG04
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	A
	Land at risk of flooding	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment	G	G	G	A	G	G	G	G
	Access to public transport	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Access to primary school	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Access to local retail facilities	G	G	A	G	G	G	G	G
	Access to health facilities	A	A	A	G	A	G	G	G
	Contamination on site	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	TPOs	G	G	G	R	R	G	R	R
	Public Rights of Way	G	G	G	A	A	G	G	G
	Open space & recreation	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	R
	Employment Land	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Infrastructure capacity	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Highway access	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Compatibility with adjoining uses	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?		R	G	G	R	R	R	G	G
What is the predominant land type?		G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development		G	G	G	G	A	A	G	G
Appropriate timeframe for development		0-5	0-5	0-5	0-5	6-10	6-10	0-5	0-5
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology		35	31	32	57	17	5	14	53

Appraisal Criteria		WYG06	RB03		L4L02	UCS2.14	UCS2.16	UCS8.38	2010/03
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy	G	G		G	G	G	G	G
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	G	G		G	G	G	G	G
	Land at risk of flooding	G	G		G	G	G	G	G
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment	G	G		G	G	G	A	G
	Access to public transport	G	G		G	G	G	G	G
	Access to primary school	G	G		G	G	G	G	G
	Access to local retail facilities	A	G		A	A	G	G	G
	Access to health facilities	G	G		A	A	A	G	G
	Contamination on site	G	A		G	G	G	G	G
	TPOs	R	G		G	G	G	G	R
	Public Rights of Way	G	A		G	G	A	A	G
	Open space & recreation	G	R		R	G	G	R	R
	Employment Land	G	G		G	G	G	G	G
	Infrastructure capacity	G	G		G	G	G	G	G
	Highway access	G	G		G	G	G	G	G
	Compatibility with adjoining uses	G	G		G	A	G	G	G
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?		G	G		G	G	R	R	G
What is the predominant land type?		G	G		G	G	G	G	G
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development		G	G		G	G	G	G	G
Appropriate timeframe for development		0-5	0-5		0-5	0-5	6-10	0-5	0-5
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology		5	58		15	5	8	120	10

Appraisal Criteria		2010/04	2010/05	2010/07	2010/09	2010/10	2010/11	2010/12	2010/13
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	G	G	G	G	A	A	G	A
	Land at risk of flooding	G	G	G	G	A	G	G	G
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Access to public transport	A	A	G	A	A	R	A	R
	Access to primary school	G	G	G	G	A	A	G	A
	Access to local retail facilities	G	G	G	A	A	A	G	A
	Access to health facilities	R	A	G	R	R	R	R	R
	Contamination on site	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	TPOs	R	G	G	R	R	R	R	R
	Public Rights of Way	A	G	G	A	A	A	A	G
	Open space & recreation	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Employment Land	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
	Infrastructure capacity	A	G	G	G	G	A	A	A
	Highway access	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	A
	Compatibility with adjoining uses	G	G	G	G	G	G	G	G
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?		G	G	G	R	R	G	R	R
What is the predominant land type?		G	G	G	G	A	A	A	R
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development		G	G	G	A	G	G	A	G
Appropriate timeframe for development		0-5	0-5	0-5	6-10	6-10	0-5	6-10 & 10+	0-5
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology		27	6	61	145	360	425	350 & 250	400

Appraisal Criteria		2010/14	2010/26	2010/27					
SITE SUITABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Stage A	Strategic Policy	G	G	G					
	Biodiversity, Geodiversity & Heritage	A	A	G					
	Land at risk of flooding	G	G	G					
Stage B	Impact on the historic, cultural & built environment	G		G					
	Access to public transport	G		G					
	Access to primary school	G		G					
	Access to local retail facilities	A		G					
	Access to health facilities	A		A					
	Contamination on site	G		G					
	TPOs	G		G					
	Public Rights of Way	A		G					
	Open space & recreation	G		G					
	Employment Land	G		G					
	Infrastructure capacity	A		G					
	Highway access	G		G					
	Compatibility with adjoining uses	G		G					
SITE AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Is the site immediately available for development?		R		R					
What is the predominant land type?		R		G					
SITE ACHIEVABILITY ASSESSMENT									
Willingness of landowner to progress site for development		G		G					
Appropriate timeframe for development		10+		0-5					
POTENTIAL RESIDENTIAL YIELD									
Potential yield based on SHLAA Methodology		230		10					

