

Job Name:	Maidstone Borough Council Revised Plan Viability and CIL Study
Note Title:	Viability Addendum Report
Note No:	1
Date:	7 <sup>th</sup> August 2015
Prepared By:	Mark Felgate
Subject:	Response to the High Court decision to quash government guidance in respect
	to affordable housing thresholds and development contributions from small
	sites

Item	Subject
1.	Background
	The Maidstone Revised Plan Viability and CIL Study was prepared on the basis of Government guidance contained within the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) on setting thresholds for development contributions, including affordable housing on small sites. The guidance required local authorities to impose a threshold of more than 10 homes, or 5 homes in designated rural areas. Effectively this meant that schemes of 10 units and less (or which have a maximum combined floorspace of 1,000 sq.m) or of 5 or less in designated rural areas, were exempt from contributing to affordable housing or tariff based S106 infrastructure requirements.
	In terms of recommending affordable housing policy and CIL rates the Study assumed that affordable housing would be zero on the majority of developments of 10 or under dwellings and that on this basis a CIL rate of £93 (in the urban area) and £99 (in the rural area) were viable.
	Since the national threshold policy was put in place in December 2014, there have been a number of concerns expressed by a range or organisations as to the effect the policy will have on affordable housing delivery and whether the government were justified or allowed to bring in such a policy through the NPPG. The latter concern was acted upon with two local authorities mounting a legal challenge to the guidance and taking the Government to Court. Following a High Court decision on the 31 <sup>st</sup> of July 2015, which found in favour of the two local authorities, the Government intends to remove the guidance relating to a threshold for development contributions.
	In the absence of any national standard for threshold it is for the local authority to determine what threshold they want to set for affordable housing. However, for a sound and robust development plan this threshold needs to be set on the basis of (viability) evidence that supports the approach and provides for a deliverable plan.
	Therefore, Maidstone Borough Council have requested PBA to review the viability testing and make recommendations based on any necessary revised testing as to whether the Council's policy towards affordable housing and approach to CIL requires amending.
2.	Revised testing
	The removal of the national thresholds means that the Maidstone Borough Council need to consider their local circumstances in respect of setting affordable housing policy and CIL rates.
	The previous viability work set out in the Revised Plan and CIL Viability Study, July 2015 tested a range of typologies based on future supply of housing and other development. In respect of housing, a range of site sizes and locations were tested, however these were considered in respect of the national policy on thresholds.





		:	Subject			
PBA have reviewed the typologies used in the original study to test whether they presented sufficient examples on which to base a threshold policy. It was considered that there was a gap testing between 1 and 5 dwellings and 9 and 20 dwellings.						
	In addition it was also conside also be made to how any three allocations, most of the supply windfall sites. Windfall sites by can be taken from past perform	shold may impao r from smaller sin r their very defin	ct on supply. Whilst the tes to which a thresho ition are hard to antic	nere are son old policy ma cipate, howe	ne smaller ay effect is fr ver some co	
	The Council has analysed the urban area the majority of site the picture is more balanced w the supply. Therefore it is cons the impact of affordable housin interests of filling a gap in the	s were brownfie vith smaller sites sidered that furth ng and CIL on si	Id and above 5 dwelli s (under 5 dwellings), her testing of fewer th ites under 5, in partic	ings, howeve contributing nan 5 dwellir ular in the ru	er in the rura g to around h ngs is require ural areas an	
-	Revised testing results					
report. <i>Table 3.1 – Testing results – Zero Affordable housing</i>						
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – Ze		-			
		ero Affordable ho Value Area	Land type	AH %	Headroom	
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – Ze Typology 1 unit Brownfield (UA)		Land type Small Brownfield	<b>AH %</b> 0%	Headroom £70	
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – Ze	Value Area	Land type			
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – ZeTypology1 unit Brownfield (UA)3 units Brownfield5 units Brownfield (UA)	<b>Value Area</b> Urban Area	Land type Small Brownfield	0%	£70	
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – Ze         Typology         1 unit Brownfield (UA)         3 units Brownfield         5 units Brownfield (UA)         9 units Brownfield (UA)	Value Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area	Land type Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield	0% 0% 0%	£70 £110 £290 £229	
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – ZeTypology1 unit Brownfield (UA)3 units Brownfield5 units Brownfield (UA)9 units Brownfield (UA)12 units Brownfield	Value Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area	Land type Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield	0% 0% 0% 0%	£70 £110 £290 £229 £278	
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – ZeTypology1 unit Brownfield (UA)3 units Brownfield5 units Brownfield (UA)9 units Brownfield (UA)12 units Brownfield20 units Brownfield (UA)	Value Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area	Land type Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Brownfield	0% 0% 0% 0% 0%	£70 £110 £290 £229 £278 £357	
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – ZeTypology1 unit Brownfield (UA)3 units Brownfield5 units Brownfield (UA)9 units Brownfield (UA)12 units Brownfield20 units Brownfield (UA)1 unit Greenfield (Rural)	Value Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Rural	Land type Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Brownfield Small Greenfield	0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%	£70 £110 £290 £229 £278 £357 £338	
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – ZeTypology1 unit Brownfield (UA)3 units Brownfield5 units Brownfield (UA)9 units Brownfield (UA)12 units Brownfield20 units Brownfield (UA)1 unit Greenfield (Rural)3 units Greenfield	Value Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Rural Rural	Land type Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Brownfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield	0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%	£70 £110 £290 £229 £278 £357 £338 £308	
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – ZeTypology1 unit Brownfield (UA)3 units Brownfield5 units Brownfield (UA)9 units Brownfield (UA)12 units Brownfield20 units Brownfield (UA)1 unit Greenfield (Rural)3 units Greenfield5 units Greenfield (Rural)	Value Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Rural Rural Rural	Land type Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Brownfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield	0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%	£70 £110 £290 £229 £278 £357 £338 £308 £418	
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – ZeTypology1 unit Brownfield (UA)3 units Brownfield5 units Brownfield (UA)9 units Brownfield (UA)12 units Brownfield20 units Brownfield (UA)1 unit Greenfield (Rural)3 units Greenfield (Rural)9 units Greenfield (Rural)9 units Greenfield (Rural)	Value Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Rural Rural Rural Rural	Land type Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Brownfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield	0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%	£70 £110 £290 £229 £278 £357 £338 £308 £418 £376	
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – ZeTypology1 unit Brownfield (UA)3 units Brownfield5 units Brownfield (UA)9 units Brownfield (UA)12 units Brownfield (UA)12 units Brownfield (UA)1 unit Greenfield (Rural)3 units Greenfield5 units Greenfield (Rural)9 units Greenfield (Rural)12 units Greenfield (Rural)12 units Greenfield	Value Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Rural Rural Rural Rural Rural	Land type Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Brownfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield	0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%	£70 £110 £290 £229 £278 £357 £338 £308 £418 £376 £376 £430	
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – ZeTypology1 unit Brownfield (UA)3 units Brownfield5 units Brownfield (UA)9 units Brownfield (UA)12 units Brownfield (UA)12 units Brownfield (UA)1 unit Greenfield (Rural)3 units Greenfield5 units Greenfield (Rural)9 units Greenfield (Rural)12 units Greenfield (Rural)12 units Greenfield (Rural)11 unit Brownfield (Rural)	Value Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Rural Rural Rural Rural Rural Rural	Land type Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Brownfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield	0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%	£70 £110 £290 £229 £278 £357 £338 £308 £418 £376 £430 £430 £251	
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – ZeTypology1 unit Brownfield (UA)3 units Brownfield5 units Brownfield (UA)9 units Brownfield (UA)12 units Brownfield (UA)12 units Brownfield (UA)1 unit Greenfield (Rural)3 units Greenfield (Rural)9 units Greenfield (Rural)9 units Greenfield (Rural)12 units Greenfield (Rural)3 units Greenfield (Rural)3 units Brownfield (Rural)3 units Brownfield (Rural)3 units Brownfield (Rural)3 units Brownfield	Value Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Rural Rural Rural Rural Rural Rural Rural Rural	Land type Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Brownfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield Small Brownfield	0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%	£70 £110 £290 £229 £278 £357 £338 £308 £438 £418 £376 £430 £251 £216	
	Table 3.1 – Testing results – ZeTypology1 unit Brownfield (UA)3 units Brownfield5 units Brownfield (UA)9 units Brownfield (UA)12 units Brownfield (UA)12 units Brownfield (UA)1 unit Greenfield (Rural)3 units Greenfield5 units Greenfield (Rural)9 units Greenfield (Rural)12 units Greenfield (Rural)12 units Greenfield (Rural)11 unit Brownfield (Rural)	Value Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Urban Area Rural Rural Rural Rural Rural Rural	Land type Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Small Brownfield Brownfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield Small Greenfield	0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%	£70 £110 £290 £229 £278 £357 £338 £308 £418 £376 £430 £430 £251	





Item		Sı	ıbject			
	Table 3.2 – Testing results – 30% a	and 40% afforda	ble housing			
	Туроlоду	Value Area	Land type	AH %	Headroom	
	1 unit Brownfield (UA)	Urban Area	Small Brownfield	30%	-£162	
	3 units Brownfield (UA)	Urban Area	Small Brownfield	30%	-£117	
	5 units Brownfield (UA)	Urban Area	Small Brownfield	30%	£139	
	9 units Brownfield (UA)	Urban Area	Small Brownfield	30%	£52	
	12 units Brownfield (UA)	Urban Area	Small Brownfield	30%	£124	
	20 units Brownfield (UA)	Urban Area	Brownfield	30%	£188	
	1 unit Greenfield (Rural)	Rural	Small Greenfield	40%	£107	
	3 units Greenfield (Rural)	Rural	Small Greenfield	40%	£56	
	5 units Greenfield (Rural)	Rural	Small Greenfield	40%	£240	
	9 units Greenfield (Rural)	Rural	Small Greenfield	40%	£170	
	12 units Greenfield (Rural)	Rural	Small Greenfield	40%	£260	
	1 unit Brownfield (Rural)	Rural	Small Brownfield	40%	-£38	
	3 units Brownfield (Rural)	Rural	Small Brownfield	40%	-£97	
	5 units Brownfield (Rural)	Rural	Small Brownfield	40%	£83	
	9 units Brownfield (Rural)	Rural	Small Brownfield	40%	-£1	
	12 units Brownfield (Rural)	Rural	Small Brownfield	40%	£196	
4.	housing is introduced at the prop can be seen that sites under 5 dw dwellings in the rural area. This is that a threshold of 5 dwelling or r In terms of CIL rates if these are the rural area then at the respect dwellings in the urban area would greenfield site and the 1, 3, 5 and However, if we assume that affor typologies where a CIL rate may and 9 unit brownfield schemes in rural area is on sites below 5 dwe affordable housing requirements significant issue.	vellings in all ar suggests that via nore contribution applied at the p ive affordable h d not be able to d 9 unit brownfie dable housing v be a concern a the rural area. ellings and that	eas are negative, as ability is more difficult g to affordable housin proposed rates of £93 iousing rates for all si afford the CIL rate an eld sites would also s will only be liable on £ re the 9 unit scheme Bearing in mind that all the greenfield type	is a brownfi for the very ng may be a in the urban tes that sites nd in the rur truggle to pa o dwellings a in the urban the majority plogies are v	eld site of 9 small sites ar appropriate. In area and £9 s 1, 3 and 9 al area the 3 u ay a CIL rate. and more the of a area and the of supply in the viable and that	nd 9 in unit 5 ne
	In the July 2015 study, there was affordable housing on sites with 6 through commuted sums rather the category was the 9 dwelling schee this was not shown to be viable a to applicants as to whether their of recommended that a separate ra The situation has now changed a looks at a greater range as it is u previously there has to be eviden	$\delta - 10$ dwellings han on site. At the reme on a brown and in the intered development was te was not intro and rather than p to the Counci	as allowed by the re- that time the only type field site in the rural a st of simplicity at that as in a 'designated' ru duced. considering just one t I to set policy rather t	gulations at blogy that w area. As sho time (espec ural area) it cypology, the	that time, alb as within this own in Table 3 cially in explain was e evidence not	.2 ning w





Item	Subject
	The enclusie choice is eaction 2 choice that there is a need to recommend on other active encroach
	The analysis above in section 3 shows that there is a need to recommend an alternative approach to the threshold as which affordable housing will be sought; however there is no need to amend the approach to CIL.
	In the interest of a simple, clear and understandable approach it is not proposed to further test different proportions of affordable housing other than those already varied by urban and rural areas. In addition there has been no further consideration of introducing a differential CIL rate by reference to size as the proposed CIL rates work across the typologies.
	In summary it is recommended that:
	<ul> <li>The threshold for affordable housing is set at five or more dwellings in both urban and rural areas</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>The CIL rate is retained at £99 per sq m in the rural area and £93 per sq m in the urban area</li> </ul>
	Approach to 'unviable' sites
	As set out above the generic site testing shows that 3 of the tested typologies would be marginal or unviable if the threshold policy was brought in and the CIL set at the recommended rates. The guidance (on CIL) is quite clear on this matter that it is not expected that all sites will be viable and the real test is whether a CIL rate puts at risk delivery of the Plan. Within that context it is acceptable for some sites not to be viable within the testing.
	However, whist the tested sites are just examples albeit reflecting the market, it is likely that there will be circumstance where development are proposed that those promoting will claim they are unviable. In these circumstance there are a number of options available to the Council to help deliver those sites –
	<ul> <li>The Council could suggest to the promoter a change in the mix or size of housing to achieve a better return – on small sites this can make a big difference</li> </ul>
	If affordable housing is an issue then a change in the type of affordable housing tenure
	<ul> <li>could help improve viability – i.e. agree on more valuable tenures</li> <li>It could be suggested that land deals could be renegotiated as the CIL liability is intended to come out of land value rather than development value, so this should be reflected in the price paid for the land</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Finally if all these measure don't realise sufficient value then affordable housing is negotiable and could be reduced to allow the development to become more viable</li> </ul>
	A note of caution
	Whilst the High Court has quashed the guidance, it is likely the Government will appeal the decision because of the wider implications for future changes to policy. Even if this decision is maintained the Government may well seek to alter policy through other means or through a revised consultation process. Therefore in making any decisions on future policy approach and CIL, the potential for further changes should be made clear.

