

URBAN HOUSING CAPACITY STUDY

Harrogate District
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT
FRAMEWORK



April 2005

T P Richards Dip T&RP, MRTPI, Head of Planning Services

PLANNING DIVISION

Department of Development Services, Knapping Mount, West Grove Road, Harrogate HG1 2AE.

www.harrogate.gov.uk/planning



Report Contents

Executive Summary and Conclusions

- 1. Introduction**
- 2. Methodology**
- 3. Assessment of site-specific opportunities in the Study settlements**
- 4. Yield from site-specific sources**
- 5. Discounting process and adjusted yields from site-specific sources**
- 6. Identification of provision from non-specific sources**
- 7. Combining the different components of potential**
- 8. Implications for the Local Development Framework**
- 9. Conclusions and recommendations**

Appendices

Appendix 1. Urban Housing Capacity Study, Final Report Jan 2003- Text of Report (pages 1- 43)

Appendix 2. Rejected site Schedules and Analysis Worksheets:

Appendix 2A - Schedule of all rejected sites

Appendix 2B - Analysis forms/worksheets with individual plans for 2004 rejected sites (pages 1 – 90)

Appendix 3. Site Yield (Accepted sites) Schedules and Site Analysis Worksheets with Plans:

Appendix 3A.
Opportunity Sites -Site Yield Summary Table

Appendix 3B.
Opportunity Site Analysis Worksheets with Individual Plans (pages 1- 66)

Appendix 4. Dwelling Yield by Source of Potential – ‘Presentation of Results’

The Final Report of the Harrogate Urban Housing Capacity Study 2004

1. Executive Summary and Conclusions

1. This Final Report of the Harrogate Urban Housing Capacity Study 2004 does not commit the Borough Council to agree with the Study recommendations on either the principle of development or dwelling yield on any of the sites identified. However the Final Report has been agreed by the Cabinet Member (Planning) as a report for informing the Council's ongoing work on the LDF Core Strategy and Housing and Employment DPD's (see paragraph 12 below).
2. Harrogate Borough Council is preparing a new style development plan, a Local Development Framework (LDF), under the procedures outlined in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. In preparation for the commencement of the new Act the Council began an update of Harrogate's 2002 Urban Housing Capacity Study¹ (UHCS) in February 2004, to provide further background information for the development of housing and settlement policies and proposals in the new LDF.
3. The main objective of the 2004 UHCS is, as in 2002, to estimate potential future housing yield from all appropriate sources in the six urban areas of Harrogate, Knaresborough, Ripon, Boroughbridge, Masham and Pateley Bridge. The 2004 UHCS builds on the work undertaken for the Council by Baker Associates in 2002. The 2004 UHCS brings the 2002 Study forward to April 2004, and provides what the Council believes to be a realistic estimate of potential future housing yield from all appropriate sources in the District's six urban areas based on adopted development plan policy.
4. The methodology used is similar to that designed in 2002, but as the review was only 2 years after the original survey, a less extensive approach to identifying new sites has been adopted. To identify new development opportunities a standard letter was circulated to the 350 stakeholders included in the 2002 Study, inviting them to suggest sites within the development limits of the six urban areas that they felt were suitable for housing development. In addition the 2004 UHCS was publicised through the local press welcoming contributions from the general public. Stakeholders were also asked, where relevant, to update the Council of any changes in the availability of sites identified as having housing potential in the 2002 UHCS.
5. Every site newly promoted to the Council by Stakeholders and individual members of the community was analysed to identify housing opportunity sites. The first stage in the analysis sifted sites against policy and physical constraints. Many promoted sites were considered to be too constrained physically or by Local Plan policies to come forward as housing opportunity sites and were rejected at this stage by the Study. Sites that were considered to present an opportunity for housing development of five or more new dwellings, after the first sift, were then the subject of physical, policy, economic/market viability, and accessibility criteria to arrive at an 'identified' dwelling yield for each site.
6. All sites included in the 2002 UHCS were reassessed using the same method of analysis as that applied to newly promoted sites. 2002 sites where planning permission had been granted between April 1st 2002 and April 1st 2004 were rejected from the Study, and the remaining 2002 sites were then reassessed against physical, policy, economic/market viability, and accessibility criteria to provide an identified yield for each of the remaining 2002 identified sites.
7. The unidentified/non site-specific yield from small sites under 5 dwellings was estimated by

¹ Urban Housing Capacity Study (published Jan 2003 based on April 2002 data) Baker Associates

projecting past rates of completion over 7 years from Council records including residential and non residential conversions, small site redevelopments, and flats over shops.

8. The following key factors have been taken into account in carrying out the Study.
 - Current or former employment use sites have only been identified as having housing potential where the continued use of the site for business is likely to cause unacceptable planning problems and where other benefits arise from a housing use on the site. The Council envisage policy E2 of the Local Plan, which protects such sites for continued employment use, will be a 'Saved' policy in the development plan beyond 2007.
 - No allowance has been made for windfall sites of 5 dwellings or more as there has been no identifiable trend in the number of sites coming forward and they are also restricted by the application of policy HX of the Local Plan. The Council do envisage that a windfall allowance for sites of 5 dwellings or more will be necessary in future updates of the UHCS when a trend over a reasonable time period has been identified.
 - No assessment has been made of rural housing capacity, as the amount of development to take place in sustainable rural settlements is a key policy issue to be addressed in the LDF. The continuation of current housing policy in rural settlements, even with the application of policy HX, would result in a significant additional housing potential in the District. The 2002 UHCS estimated some 2000 dwelling capacity in the District's rural areas from 2002 to 2016.
 - Where known this Study has taken into account competing land uses in determining both the suitability of opportunity sites in principle and the estimated yield on each site. However, the Council are in the process of assessing the need for open space and sites for retail development and these requirements may affect the final urban housing capacity of the six main settlements.
9. In October 2004 the Cabinet Member (Planning) for Harrogate Borough Council considered a report on the Harrogate Urban Housing Capacity Study² (UHCS). The report was noted for the purposes of informing Core Policies and site selection for housing allocation in the new Local Development Framework (LDF). It was also agreed that the report would be published on the Council's website, a six week period of consultation would be undertaken with key stakeholders and other interested parties and that comments be reported back at an early date following completion of the consultation.
10. The UHCS was published on the Council's website on 27th October 2004 with an invitation to comment by 10th December 2004. Letters were sent to stakeholders notifying them of publication of the 2004 UHCS and seeking comments on the Study by 10th December 2004. A "Developer Forum" also met to discuss the findings of the Draft Study with the Council. The publication of the Draft Study produced a significant response from both the property world and local residents
11. Each response was reconsidered carefully and the inclusion or rejection of individual sites, and the site yields suggested in the Study were reviewed against existing Local Plan Policy, recent Planning Appeal decisions and current government planning policy guidance. A response was then prepared for each site and/or issue raised. A consultation response report³ was considered by the Cabinet Member (Planning) on 18th March 2005 when it was agreed:
 - To amend Appendix 1 to the report to delete site H5 (Fulwith Mill Lane);
 - To publish the amended report as the 'Report of Consultation';
 - To amend the UHCS to reflect the officer recommendations given in Appendix 1 attached to the response report to produce this Final Report; and
 - That the amended UHCS 2004 be approved as a report for informing the Council's

² Harrogate Urban Housing Capacity Study, Draft Report, October 2004

³ Harrogate Urban Capacity Study 2004 Consultation Response Report

ongoing work on the LDF Core Strategy and Housing and Employment DPD's

12. Following the amendments indicated above, the Study now concludes that 33 sites yielding 803 dwellings, after discounting, could be brought forward for housing as part of the LDF to contribute to meeting the District's housing requirement. The attached list gives details of the capacity on these sites prior to discounting. A discounted supply of 1224 dwellings from non site-specific sources is estimated as likely yield from unidentified sources. The Study therefore estimates that a combined total of 2027 dwellings, after discounting, could come forward in the six urban areas of the District up to 2021.
13. The 2002 Study assessed the Borough's housing requirements against the pre-deposit draft Structure Plan housing requirement up to 2016. This comparison is no longer appropriate as updated guidance is no longer available
14. The results of this 2004 Study will be assessed against the housing requirement that emerges from the Regional Spatial Strategy and used in the preparation of the LDF Core Strategy and Major Allocations DPD.
15. The Appendices to the Study include extracts from the 2002 Study Final Report, accepted and rejected site schedules and a results table breaking down the dwelling yield by source of potential. The unconstrained summary table below indicates the 33 sites that had potential as housing development sites at 1st April 2004. Some of these sites have now received planning permission.
16. Prior to approval of the relevant LDF DPD for development control purposes, the Council will continue to use policy HX in the adopted Local Plan (incorporating the Selective Alteration), to manage the release of housing land in the District.

UNCONSTRAINED YIELD SUMMARY TABLE

HARROGATE			
<i>Reference</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>Area (Ha)</i>	<i>Yield</i>
H2	Pannal Grange Nursing Home, Pannal Green	0.45	23
H4	Rossett Manor, Leadhall Lane	0.61	13
H8	Bogs Lane	1.77	28
H10	Knareborough Road	0.18	9
H13	Mowbray Square/Myrtle Square	0.76	41
H26	Dragon Junction Allotments	0.24	8
H31	Roberts House, Wetherby Road	0.56	40
H33	BT Training School, Rossett Drive	0.37	15
H38	Former Police Stables, High Street	0.60	35
H41	Convent of Holy Child Jesus	2.47	50
H43	York Place, POW Mansions	0.17	36
H47	139-149 Kings Road	0.15	5
H62	St Georges House, Harlow Oval	0.34	15
H65	White's Removals, Mornington Crescent	0.12	12
H67	Swinton Court Workshops	0.52	30
H70	Clarendon House, Station Parade	0.075	6
H73	Station Parade	0.83	100
KNARESBOROUGH			
<i>Reference</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>Area (Ha)</i>	<i>Yield</i>
K6	Chain Lane/Park Lane	0.98	44
K28	Land off Blind Lane	0.29	12

RIPON			
<i>Reference</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>Area (Ha)</i>	<i>Yield</i>
R2	Ripon Cathedral CE School, Low St Agnesgate	0.29	14
R3	Auction Mart, North Road	2.6	104
R7	Tower Road	1.26	40
R10	Blossomgate	0.3	25
R17	Red House, Palace Road	1.62	51
R43	Ostcliffe Court, St Agnesgate	0.19	10
R45	Ripon Fire Station, Stonebridgegate	0.3	20
R47	Land at Blossomgate	0.07	9
BOROUGHBRIDGE			
<i>Reference</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>Area (Ha)</i>	<i>Yield</i>
B4	The Maltings	0.27	24
B6	Rose Manor Hotel, Roecliffe Lane	1.05	45
MASHAM			
<i>Reference</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>Area (Ha)</i>	<i>Yield</i>
M2	The Oaks	0.28	12
M4	Swinburn Road	0.38	20
M5	Auction Mart, Leyburn Road	1.03	36
M6	Maple Creek	0.69	8

The 2004 Urban Housing Capacity Study

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Harrogate Borough Council is preparing a new style development plan, a Local Development Framework (LDF), under the procedures outlined in the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004¹. In preparation for the commencement of the new Act the Council began an update of Harrogate's 2002 Urban Housing Capacity Study² (UHCS) in February 2004, to provide further background information for the development of housing policies and proposals in the new Local Development Framework. The 2004 UHCS builds on the work undertaken for the Council by Baker Associates in 2002. The 2004 UHCS brings the 2002 Study forward to April 2004, and provides what the Council believes to be a realistic estimate of potential future housing yield from all sources in the District's six urban areas of Harrogate, Knaresborough, Ripon, Boroughbridge, Masham and Pateley Bridge to 2021.
- 1.2 The 2004 Study:
- Identifies new development opportunities in the urban areas that have emerged since April 2002;
 - Reviews the opportunity sites presented in the 2002 Harrogate UHCS;
 - Updates the estimates of yield from non specific sites below the Study threshold of 5 dwellings; and
 - Considers the possible contribution from empty homes, to provide an overall estimate of urban housing capacity in the main settlements in Harrogate District from 2004 to 2021 (17 year period).
- 1.3 The base date for the 2004 review was set at 01/04/2004, two years on from the base date of the 2002 Study. The same threshold as in 2002 was used for recommending specific sites as opportunity sites.
- 1.4 To identify new development opportunities a standard letter was circulated to stakeholders included in the 2002 Study, inviting them to suggest sites within the development limits of the six urban areas that they felt were suitable for housing development. Stakeholders were also asked, where relevant, to update the Council of any changes in the availability of sites identified as having housing potential in the 2002 UHCS.
- 1.5 Through the spring and summer of 2004 sites identified by Stakeholders were analysed. An internal working group of officers and external service providers e.g. North Yorkshire County Council Highways, considered all the policy and physical constraints, and following an economic viability assessment of the sites considered to have housing potential identified:
- Sites from the 2002 Study still considered to have housing potential;
 - A limited number of the new sites as having housing potential;
 - Yield from the remaining 2002 sites and the newly identified housing sites;
 - Non site specific housing yield (paragraph 6.17); and
 - District yield by settlement (paragraph 4.17).

¹ Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

² Urban Housing Capacity Study (published Jan 2003, based on April 2002 data) Baker Associates

2. Methodology

Introduction

- 2.1 The 2004 UHCS review followed broadly the approach and methodology outlined in the 2002 UHCS but the Study is to be used for informing the preparation of Harrogate's first LDF under the 2004 Act with the output from the Study informing the Council's ongoing work on the LDF Core Strategy and Housing and Employment Development Plan Documents (DPD's) to **2021**.

The Methodology

- 2.2 The methodology was similar to that designed in 2002, but as the review was only 2 years after the original survey, a less extensive approach to identifying new sites was adopted. As the 2004 UHCS is a review of the 2002 UHCS (Appendix 1), it was decided that it would be more cost effective to concentrate on landowners' and communities' perceptions of how the potential of sites in the urban areas had changed in the two years since the original UHCS. Therefore the Council relied on interested parties to nominate new sites, rather than a physical re-survey of the urban areas, as the method for identifying site-specific opportunities. As the Study was broadly similar to that used in 2002 it was not felt necessary to include public meetings with stakeholders, to introduce and agree the methodology, in the consultation process.
- 2.3 The Study has assessed and analysed information on specific sites which could be allocated for housing, or for mixed development including housing, and the amount and type of development that could come forward from unidentified opportunities with known potential, following the 9 steps outlined in the 2002 UHCS paragraphs 2.20 to 2.56.

Policy matters

- 2.4 In October 2001, the Council approved an Interim Housing Release Policy to manage the release of land for housing in view of the estimated over provision of housing in the period to 2006. This was introduced into the Local Plan³ by way of a Selective Alteration, tested at public inquiry during 2003 and adopted as amendments to the Local Plan in May 2004. Policy HX limits the normal release mechanism for new housing sites to previously developed sites below 0.3 ha providing fewer than 10 dwellings. Above this threshold, substantial community benefit such as a large element of affordable housing above normal policy requirements must be secured as part of the consent. In addition, Policy CFX of the Selective Alteration resists the loss of land or buildings in community use with some exceptions.
- 2.5 The policies contained in the Local Plan, including Policies R1 and HD12 (protecting open spaces), E2 and E5, and the Selective Alteration, particularly CFX, were taken into account in reaching decisions on a consistent basis on the appropriateness of sites as housing opportunities. Since the publication of the 2002 Study there has been greater experience of the application of PPG3⁴ to development proposals in the District and in developing case law in the country, requiring the approach to greenfield sites in the Study to be tightened. A particularly sensitive policy issue is the possible residential development of sites used, formerly used, or allocated for other uses, particularly employment uses (see paragraph 3.12 below for how this aspect of policy was dealt with).

³ Harrogate District Local Plan (2001 as altered 2004)

⁴ Planning Policy Guidance Note 3

3. Assessment of site-specific opportunities in the Study settlements

Programme

- 3.1 This section briefly reviews the way that the work on the update Study proceeded through 2004 and 2005.
- 3.2 In Spring 2004 Harrogate Council sent out a standard letter to the stakeholders included in the 2002 Study (local agents, housebuilders, landowners, Parish and Town Council's, Civic Societies, Chambers of Trade, Local Groups, Residents Associations and the Council for the Protection of Rural England) inviting them to identify sites they felt were suitable for housing development, and/or to update the Council of any changes in the availability of sites identified as having housing potential in the 2002 UHCS. As in 2002 the direct approach to stakeholders was followed by press coverage, advertising that the Council was reviewing the 2002 UHCS and inviting any interested party to provide the Council with details of sites considered to have potential for housing development in the period up to 2021.
- 3.3 A considerable response was received from stakeholders and interested individuals nominating sites for consideration.
- 3.4 Site information received was sorted into new site information and information on 2002 sites. For newly nominated sites a second sort took place into those within the development limits of the six urban areas of Harrogate, Knaresborough, Ripon, Boroughbridge, Masham and Pateley Bridge, and sites outside the urban development limits. Information on sites outside the urban development limits was recorded, but as in the 2002 Study these sites were excluded from any further consideration.
- 3.5 Information on 2002 UHCS sites and newly nominated sites within the urban development limits was then processed as follows:
- For sites that had been accepted as an opportunity site in 2002, the information recorded in the 2002 work sheets/site schedules was updated and presented in a form compatible with the treatment of new sites.
 - For sites newly promoted a full assessment as outlined in the section below was undertaken
 - For sites that had been previously rejected as not being an opportunity site, and that had been promoted again in 2004, the information was used to reassess the sites fully, treating these sites to the same assessment as new sites promoted for the first time in 2004, again as outlined in the section below.
- 3.6 The base date for the review was set at 01/04/2004, two years on from the base date of the 2002 Study. Any opportunities nominated after the 1st April date were not included. Sites nominated by landowners, builders and/or agents were only included for initial analysis where property had been declared surplus to requirement, or likely to be surplus at a defined future date. Where community representatives and individuals promoted sites, these were only included if the site/property was vacant and appeared to be available for development.
- 3.7 As in 2002 all sites with planning permission, including outline at the start date for the Study (1st April 2004) were not included in the Study yields.

Recording the detailed area Study

- 3.8 The 2002 Study did not include a site analysis form/worksheet for sites where an opportunity was not proceeded with. However, for reasons of transparency, opportunities that were not proceeded with, i.e. “rejected” sites of 5+ dwellings, were included in a schedule in Appendix 3 of the 2002 Study, together with plans showing their locations, with a short reasoned justification for each sites exclusion.
- 3.9 In the 2004 UHCS a similar site analysis form/worksheet to that used in the 2002 Study was prepared for each site identified to the Council by developers, agents, landowners, community representatives, and members of the public. Information on availability and site ownership/agents acting for owners was recorded on similar worksheets to those used in the 2002 UHCS from information submitted to the Council by those presenting the site as an opportunity for consideration. Further data was recorded on site, and then additional information (relating to constraints) was added in the office. The sites were delineated on GIS and data held on the GIS system and site plans were added to the work sheets/ schedules. This update presents the site analysis forms/worksheets that emerged from this process for all the new sites promoted to the Council in the period of February to April 1st 2004 alongside updated analysis forms/worksheets for the 2002 UHCS sites.

Assessing the constraints to development

- 3.10 Sites were analysed to determine whether there are policy and/or physical constraints that should prevent the development of the opportunity for housing presented by the promotion of a new site to the Council. Consultation and discussion with internal and external service providers took place to assess constraints to development on all new sites identified by stakeholders and interested members of the public. Newly identified sites were analysed by assessing their policy and physical constraints using similar methods to those applied in 2002. Comments were sought on all of the sites promoted to the Council in 2004 from:
- North Yorkshire County Council Highways, and Highways Agency staff to assess highways and transport issues
 - Yorkshire Water to assess water and sewerage/drainage provision`
 - The Environment Agency and Harrogate Environmental Health Officer to assess environmental issues
 - North Yorkshire County Archaeologist to establish archaeological protection constraints
 - Harrogate Council Planning Policy and Conservation and Design officers to establish Local Plan policy constraints and conservation and built environment issues:
 - Harrogate Council's Economic Development Officer to assess the demand for employment use of employment sites:
- 3.11 When the policy and physical constraints had been established for the “new” sites, and the 2002 site information had been updated a “development team” of District and County Council Officers with responsibilities in the service and policy areas above met on several occasions to sift both 2002 and the “new” 2004 sites into those considered to be opportunity sites and those rejected as opportunity sites.
- 3.12 As in 2002, in response to adopted local plan policy on employment land and premises, potential sites also had to pass the following additional test in order to be considered:
- Employment land and premises, i.e., industrial, warehousing, offices, which are clearly long-term vacant, run-down/partly vacant, or genuinely operating at

the margins of economic viability, demonstrably unviable in its current state and for the foreseeable future by virtue of proper evidence of marketing, **OR** which comprise land which is being used in a conspicuously inefficient, or profligate, manner, **AND**

which fall to be considered within definitions of Policy E5 of adopted local plan, i.e., be a non-conforming user, being conspicuously inappropriate amongst (not just different to) uses in the near vicinity, **OR**

- which are altogether appropriate to residential use in relation to its surroundings

- 3.13 A number of employment sites were included in the 2002 UHCS as it was felt that they could possibly satisfy the exception tests under Policy E2. Further experience at the local level of the operation of the employment property market over the last two years has demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that there is sufficient demand for employment uses on existing and previous employment sites to justify specifically excluding many of the employment sites promoted to the Council as possible opportunity sites for housing. This has implications for both sites with existing or previous employment use previously included in the 2002 UHCS and sites submitted by stakeholders for new consideration/reconsideration in 2004. Sites with E2 Policy implications have therefore only been included in this review/Study as housing opportunity sites where the Council has evidence of lack of demand for this type of site, or the use of the site is likely to add to the relevant town centre's vitality and viability without harming the supply of employment land and/or premises of the relevant city/town centre it is close to, or where the site was felt to be conspicuously inappropriate as defined in Policy E5.
- 3.14 Employment land and premises that were promoted or commended to the Study, which did not comply with these definitions, were not considered as opportunity sites. For reasons of transparency, if they lay within the Study boundaries, such sites appear in the schedule at Appendix 2A, and the site analysis forms/worksheets for rejected sites appear at Appendix 2B of this Study.
- 3.15 Local Plan Policy HX (Selective Alteration) seeks to limit the release of any housing site with 10+ units because of the forecast over provision of housing up to 2006. This Study is intended to assess the level of housing capacity in the District, and place sites in time periods in which they could come forward for development, not when they will be developed. The Study identifies sites that are suitable and available for housing that could be developed in the next 5-year period. It is a policy decision of the Council for a restrictive approach to apply on large sites defined as over 0.3 hectares and providing 10 or more units net. The Study therefore concerns itself with the suitability and availability of opportunities, and the dwelling yields in the opportunity schedules and dwelling yield summary table related to this, do not commit the Council to the release of sites in any time period whatsoever. The Council will consider the housing capacity of its urban areas in reaching appropriate policies to fulfil its housing provision in the development of both a strategy for the level and distribution of housing development and policies for the allocation and release of housing land, and the provision of affordable housing for local needs in the LDF to 2021.
- 3.16 Policy CFX of the Selective Alteration is aimed at retaining land and buildings in use, or last in use, as community facilities. A number of nursing homes and day centres were put forward for consideration in the 2002 Study, and were rejected because of this policy, unless there was a commensurate community gain achieved by the release of a site that outweighed the loss of the original community use. Only three new sites with policy CFX constraints have been promoted to the Council in 2004.

The one site that is recommended as having potential for housing development was a care home in current use, but the Council is satisfied that proposals to redevelop the property for housing can meet criterion B of Policy CFX.

- 3.17 The same threshold as in 2002 was used for recommending specific sites as opportunity sites, and limitations on the capacity of sites to provide five or more dwellings emerged as a result of officer assessment. This resulted in a number of sites being rejected as opportunity sites, though they may still come forward in the plan period as sites of less than 5 dwellings. They are recommended for exclusion from the Study, but the estimated yield from such sites is represented by the estimates of non-specific site yield.

Assessing the prospects of development

- 3.18 For the 2002 and 2004 sites considered to be an opportunity site after the assessment of policy and physical constraints the Council then considered the prospect of development taking place through normal development processes, taking full account of the market and other competing land uses which could be appropriate for the site and those rejected as opportunity sites.

Accessibility of Services/Sustainability

- 3.19 All the opportunity sites considered likely (2004 sites) or still likely (2002 sites) to come forward were considered against a number of 'accessibility' criteria including access to public transport, local shops, employment opportunities, schools provision, and the availability of facilities and services (GP practices and health centres, Post Offices). As in the 2002 Study this information, along with site specific information is reflected in the yield attributed to the opportunity, reflecting different density assumptions.

Estimating yield

- 3.20 For the remaining sites after the market appraisal/reappraisal and the sustainability assessment the likely appropriate yield in terms of dwelling numbers were:
- Reviewed in the case of remaining 2002 sites, and
 - Identified in the case of 2004 sites
- Following the general approach outlined in section 5 of the 2002 UHCS.

Use of design studies

- 3.21 The 2002 Study Brief stipulated that design was to be a key issue in the Study, and the consideration of design was a crucial element of the approach Baker Associates followed. In 2004 the Council have applied the experience gained from using the twenty case studies in 2002 to the assessment of site capacity in 2004, retaining the output from the work undertaken in 2002 in all but one instances. The Council has not however undertaken detailed design case studies for sites newly submitted for consideration in 2004. In response to comments received as part of the consultation on the Study in autumn 2004, design densities were further reviewed where local residents showed concern at densities suggested by the consultants. This resulted in a site that had been the subject of a design study having its density reduced slightly (H14 Rossett Manor).

4. Yield from site-specific sources

Introduction

- 4.1 As in the 2002 UHCS a specific stage in the identification of the potential from site-specific sources has been the attribution of yields to each of the opportunities that have been identified by the process described in section 3 above. The 2004 Study followed the same general approach as that described in Section 5 of the 2002 UHCS using the experience of that Study, and the experience of officers involved in the 'development team' discussions, to identify where low, medium and high densities would be appropriate.

Presentation of findings from the detailed study of identified and promoted sites

- 4.2 An important aspect of the detailed area studies in 2002 and the site assessment in 2004 was the completion of a site analysis form/worksheet for every opportunity identified - all the relevant information gathered was recorded on these. In 2002 after the survey work the information compiled was analysed, and the results generated in terms of:

- the opportunity presented
- sustainability criteria
- environmental and development constraints
- market appraisal
- yield in three different density/design situations
- timescale of expected development
- how the opportunity should be dealt with in the new style development plan

- 4.3 In this 2004 Study a similar approach has been adopted, but more detail on environmental and development constraints has been provided in both reviewing the 2002 site analysis forms/worksheets and in developing the information for the 2004 promoted sites as follows:

- for each of the sites included as an opportunity site, a reasoned justification is made for the recommended yield; and
- for sites that have been rejected as an opportunity a reason for rejection has been provided as a conclusion of the Study, and therefore no yield estimates have been produced.

Each site analysis form/work sheet is accompanied by an individual site plan defining the relevant site boundaries in relation to its surroundings.

Recommendation

- 4.4 Officers recommend that for each opportunity site examined, the sites should be dealt with in one of the following ways:
- The opportunity should not be proceeded with, in which case it should be rejected and it appears as a rejected site in appendices 3;

- The site is available for allocation for housing (or for mixed development including housing if appropriate) in the review of the Local Development Framework in which case it appears as a recommended site in the Site Yield Summary Table at Appendix 3; or
- The site opportunity was capable of accommodating less than 5 dwellings, and is therefore rejected as a specific opportunity, but allowed for in estimating the amount of development which could come forward from non specific- sources as set out in Section 6 of this Study.

Consultation Stage

- 4.5 In October 2004 the Cabinet Member (Planning) for Harrogate Borough Council considered a report on the Harrogate Urban Housing Capacity Study⁵ (UHCS). The report was noted for the purposes of informing Core Policies and site selection for housing allocation in the new Local Development Framework (LDF). It was also agreed that the report would be published on the Council's website, a six week period of consultation would be undertaken with key stakeholders and other interested parties and that comments would be reported back at an early date following completion of the consultation.
- 4.6 The UHCS was published on the Council's website on 27th October 2004 with an invitation to comment by 10th December 2004. Letters were sent to local agents, housebuilders, Parish and Town Councils in the Urban areas, Civic Societies, Chambers of Trade, Local groups, Residents' Associations, the Council for the Protection of Rural England, the Housebuilder's Federation and interested individuals notifying them of publication of the 2004 UHCS and seeking comments on the Study by 10th December 2004.
- 4.7 The publication of the Draft Report produced a significant response from both the property world and local residents. Forty-eight letters and a petition were received. Twenty letters were received from agents making representations mainly about the rejection of sites, but also taking up detailed technical points about the content of the UHCS and the methodology used in assessing the housing potential of the District. One Civic Societies and two residents' Groups commented on individual sites included in the Study and issues relating to planning obligations and development in Conservation Areas. Twenty-three letters from residents were received commenting on the suggested yields attached to 3 sites in the south of Harrogate Town. One of these sites was also the subject of a petition.
- 4.8 Each response was reconsidered carefully and the inclusion or rejection of individual sites, and the site yields suggested in the Study were reviewed against existing Local Plan Policy, recent Planning Appeal decisions and current government planning policy guidance. A response was then prepared for each site and/or issue raised

Report of Consultation

- 4.9 A consultation a consultation response report⁶ was considered by the Cabinet Member (Planning) on 18th March 2005 when it was agreed:
- To publish the amended report as the Report of Consultation;
 - To amend the UHCS to reflect the officer recommendations given in Appendix 1 attached to the response report;

⁵ Harrogate Urban Housing Capacity Study, Draft Report, October 2004

⁶ Harrogate Urban Capacity Study 2004 Consultation Response Report

- That the amended UHCS 2004 be approved as a report for informing the Council's ongoing work on the LDF Core Strategy and Housing and Employment DPD's; and
- That in addition to those changes recommended by officers, site H5 (Fulwith Mill Lane) be deleted from the UHCS for the following reason: -

That development would be detrimental to character of the residential area and likely to impact negatively on the adjoining Special Landscape Area.

4.10 This Final version of the UHCS 2004 has been amended to reflect the decisions of 18th March 2005.

Aggregating the yield

- 4.11 The total yield from the opportunities identified in the detailed area studies for the District is **933** dwellings. 843 dwellings are in the first 10-year period, with a further 90 dwellings which could become available between 2014 and 2021. All the opportunities were considered to be developable and able to come forward within the defined periods, subject to the District's housing requirement.
- 4.12 Of these opportunities, the District Yield Summary Table on page 10 below indicates that 626 units can be expected to be available for development (subject to required release) in the first 5 year period, 217 between 5 and 10 years, and the remaining 90 dwellings are allocated to the 2014 – 2021 period. This categorisation was informed by a combination of a relative accessibility assessment and status in the current planning framework, as well as such practical considerations as land assembly and access constraints.
- 4.13 The release of these sites, in accordance with the requirements of Plan Monitor and Manage (PMM), can help to inform and develop possible phasing policies, as discussed in Section 8. The actual release date will be a matter for the LDF and may not reflect the timescales contemplated by this Study.
- 4.14 Following the update of 2002 sites and the assessment of newly promoted 2004 sites by the internal "development team" of District and County Council Officers with responsibilities in the service and policy areas considered constraints to development, 43 sites were removed from consideration, because of policy issues, or insufficient confidence in their ability to come forward for housing development, or because they had a planning consent prior to the base date for the Study of 01/04/02, in all cases taking account of competing uses. Then, in response to comments received as a result of the consultation on the Urban Housing Capacity Study Draft Report – October 2004 in the autumn of 2004 the Cabinet Member (Planning) on 18th March 2005 decided to reject a further three sites (H1 Fairhaven, Pannal Avenue, H5, Fulwith Mill Lane, K4, Cattle Market) and add in 1 site (H70 Clarendon House).
- 4.15 Appendix 2A now shows 95 rejected sites from the combination of the 2002 Study and the 2004 as amended following consideration by the Cabinet Member (Planning) in March 2005.
- 4.16 Appendix 3 now shows **33 opportunity sites** in total considered to have potential for housing development. The Site Yield Summary table (Appendix 3A) shows the cumulative results of the site analysis forms, comprising the sites the Study recommends for consideration by the Council as potential housing allocations in the forthcoming Local Development Framework. Whilst the Study sets out the capacity in different time periods, it is for the LDF to decide the extent of required allocations in agreed phases in accordance with a plan monitor and manage approach and the

inclusion of a site in the Study does not commit the Council to any position with regard to the sites identified.

4.17 The table below summarises the identified sites by settlement.

District Yield Summary Table by settlement:

Settlement	0-5 years	5-10 years	10-17 years	0-17 totals
Harrogate	400	13	50	463
Knaresborough	12	44	0	56
Ripon	125	104	40	269
Boroughbridge	69	0	0	69
Pateley Bridge	0	0	0	0
Masham	20	56	0	76
Totals	626	217	90	933

4.18 The tables below show all the opportunity sites disaggregated by source type:

Harrogate - Source of potential and timescale					
Category		0-5 yrs	5-10 yrs	10-17 yrs	TOTAL
1	Previously developed, vacant & derelict land & buildings	268	0	0	268
2	Redevelopment of existing housing	0	0	0	0
3	Development of car parks	36	0	0	36
4	Conversion of non-residential buildings	45	0	0	45
5	Sub-division of existing housing	0	0	0	0
6	Flats over shops	0	0	0	0
7	Intensification	15	13	50	78
8	Vacant land not previously developed	36	0	0	36
TOTAL		400	13	50	463

Knaresborough - Source of potential and timescale					
Category		0-5 yrs	5-10 yrs	10-17 yrs	TOTAL
1	Previously developed, vacant & derelict land & buildings	0	0	0	0
2	Redevelopment of existing housing	0	0	0	0
3	Development of car parks	0	0	0	0
4	Conversion of non-residential buildings	0	0	0	0

5	Sub-division of existing housing	0	0	0	0
6	Flats over shops	0	0	0	0
7	Intensification	0	44	0	44
8	Vacant land not previously developed	12	0	0	12
TOTAL		12	44	0	56

Ripon - Source of potential and timescale					
Category		0-5 yrs	5-10 yrs	10-17 yrs	TOTAL
1	Previously developed, vacant & derelict land & buildings	60	104	0	164
2	Redevelopment of existing housing	0	0	0	0
3	Development of car parks	0	0	0	0
4	Conversion of non-residential buildings	65	0	0	65
5	Sub-division of existing housing	0	0	0	0
6	Flats over shops	0	0	0	0
7	Intensification	0	0	0	0
8	Vacant land not previously developed	0	0	40	40
TOTAL		125	104	40	269

Boroughbridge - Source of potential and timescale					
Category		0-5 yrs	5-10 yrs	10-17 yrs	TOTAL
1	Previously developed, vacant & derelict land & buildings	0	0	0	0
2	Redevelopment of existing housing	0	0	0	0
3	Development of car parks	0	0	0	0
4	Conversion of non-residential buildings	69	0	0	69
5	Sub-division of existing housing	0	0	0	0
6	Flats over shops	0	0	0	0
7	Intensification	0	0	0	0
8	Vacant land not previously developed	0	0	0	0
TOTAL		69	0	0	69

Masham - Source of potential and timescale					
Category		0-5 yrs	5-10 yrs	10-17 yrs	TOTAL
1	Previously developed, vacant & derelict land & buildings		36	0	36
2	Redevelopment of existing housing	0	0	0	0

3	Development of car parks	0	0	0	0
4	Conversion of non-residential buildings	0	0	0	0
5	Sub-division of existing housing	0	0	0	0
6	Flats over shops	0	0	0	0
7	Intensification	20	0	0	20
8	Vacant land not previously developed	0	20	0	20
TOTAL		20	56	0	76

4.18 No table is included for Pateley Bridge as no sites for 5+ dwellings were found in this settlement during survey work in 2002 or 2004.

4.19 Therefore, the total capacity from the identified opportunity sites in the District from the survey total **933** dwellings over the period to 2021, as shown in the table below.

Harrogate Borough Total Source of potential and timescale					
Category		0-5 yrs	5-10 yrs	10-17 yrs	TOTAL
1	Previously developed, vacant & derelict land & buildings	328	140	0	468
2	Redevelopment of existing housing	0	0	0	0
3	Development of car parks	36	0	0	36
4	Conversion of non-residential buildings	179	0	0	179
5	Sub-division of existing housing	0	0	0	0
6	Flats over shops	0	0	0	0
7	Intensification	35	57	50	142
8	Vacant land not previously developed	48	20	40	108
TOTAL		626	217	90	933

5. Discounting process and adjusted yields from site-specific sources

Approach taken for the Study.

- 5.1 The approach to discounting and adjusting yields adopted for the 2004 Study is similar to that used in the Harrogate Borough Council's 2002 UHCS Section 6⁷ (Appendix 1) of this Study.
- 5.2 The process for the review of sites identified in the 2002 UHCS and new sites promoted to the Council in 2004 outlined in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.13 above has produced **33** sites, considered to have potential for housing development (listed in Appendix 3A). However all the sites contained in the Site Yield Summary Table in Appendix 3A cannot be guaranteed to be available during the preparation of the LDF and deliver the exact figures arrived at by this Study. The variety of constraints, including particularly ownership, site assembly, access and other competing land uses, and political decision-making will all combine to alter the predicted yield. The Study has been framed with the view that only realistic sites should be considered as dwelling yield in the first instance; all sites which should have been excluded for 'land-use suitability' reasons from consideration have been sieved out during the 2002 and 2004 survey and analysis process. This includes sites with a current planning permission, and sites not surplus to requirements or still in use. Appendix 2A contains details of the 95 sites rejected by the two Urban Housing Capacity Studies, with a short reasoned justification for their exclusion. In addition Appendix 2B provides a site analysis form/worksheet for each of the sites included as opportunity sites in 2002 but rejected in this Study (many because they now have planning permission), and for sites promoted in 2004 and rejected in this Study (2004).
- 5.3 The Council has followed the advice of Baker Associates on discounting in the context of undertaking a review based on the work already undertaken in 2002 and used similar processes to identify new potential housing sites, and employed a discounting proportion for the Study that is relatively low. This is for the same principle reasons identified in 2002:
- The sieve techniques already employed and described above have already discounted many sites as being too constrained physically and/or by Local Plan policies;
 - The continuing relatively buoyant housing market in Harrogate District has led developers increasingly to seek out smaller previously-developed sites typical of the Study opportunity sites; and
 - The purpose of Urban Capacity Studies and a main aim of PPG3 is to:

 ' maximise the use and yield of urban land for the provision of housing, partly in order to minimise the release of undeveloped land beyond the defined urban boundaries. Plan, monitor and manage (PMM) is an essential component of PPG3, and a necessary ingredient of any Local Plan. This is a vital and related process, and by minimising discounting at this stage, the development industry will be better encouraged to seek out sites identified by this Study, to bring them forward for development in the absence of 'easier' sites, perhaps on the urban fringe'.⁸
- 5.4 Discounting must take account of the different characteristics of the sites identified. There can be considerable confidence that sites already with a resolution to grant consent awaiting a legal agreement, or in the hands of developers negotiating prior to

⁷Urban Housing Capacity Study (Jan 2003) Baker Associates

⁸ Urban Housing Capacity Study (Jan 2003) Baker Associates

submission of an application where the Council have indicated that the proposal is accepted in principle, will be developed for housing within a period related to the date of likely consent. Discounting such sites is not reasonable, and is therefore not proposed. Only three sites fall into this category (B4, R10 and R47), but account for 54 dwellings of the total of dwellings on identified sites, which fall into the first 5-year period. This number will therefore be deducted from the total yield of 933 to give a figure of 879 units, which will be subject to the discounting process. For the sake of transparency, these are as follows:

Ref. No.	Site	Details	Yield
B4	The Maltings, Boroughbridge	Disused part of former brewery	24
R10	Blossomgate	Part of West of market Place	21
R47	Blossomgate	Restaurant and land adjoining	9
Total			54

- 5.5 None of this process involves double counting. The contribution from small-identified sources will come from a projection of past rates of such development, including such sources as net residential conversions, small plots, and spaces over shops.
- 5.6 Given the state of the housing market in Harrogate Borough, the policy-restrained demand caused by the Selective Alteration, the exclusion of sites in existing or former employment use, the discounting rate for the remaining 879 units on identified sites is set at 15%; this is on the low side, but appropriate for the particular circumstances prevailing in Harrogate Borough. This is illustrated in the Table below:

Total dwelling yields on identified sites

Undiscounted Yields				15% Discount				Discounted Yield			
0-5 years	5-10	10-17	0-17	0-5	5-10	10-17	0-15	0-5	5-10	10-15	0-17
572 (626 less 54)	217	90	879	86	33	13	132	486 +54 =540	186	77	803

- 5.7 The undiscounted 54 dwellings subject to a Legal Agreement (from paragraph 5.4) must be added to the discounted first 5-year period of 486 to total 540, making the total discounted yield 803 dwellings.

6. Identification of provision from non site-specific sources

- 6.1 The terms ‘windfall’, ‘unidentified’, and ‘non site-specific’ sources, (as opposed to ‘site-specific’) refer to sites which come forward for housing development on an ad-hoc basis, and are not identified in the LDF or through other normal planning policies. In the 2002 Study, Bakers examined those areas where there was potential for further development, but where a site-by-site examination would not add anything to the level of confidence with which the potential could be predicted. This approach relied mainly on examination of information on past development from the Council. It is important that the examination of provision from these types of source and area are included again in this update of the 2002 UHCS, as the results of the Study will be used to ‘plan, monitor and manage’ housing provision through the LDF. The Local Development Framework will not have the influence it should unless it embraces all sources of provision.

- 6.2 The issue of ‘unconstrained capacity’ was considered cautiously, as when some established areas of development are considered in an Urban Housing Capacity Study, virtually any figure can be arrived at for the ‘unconstrained capacity’, by assuming the residential conversion of all of the larger housing stock, or the redevelopment to a higher density of some areas, for instance. As in the 2002 UHCS the Council has not sought a numeric value for unconstrained capacity, primarily due to the fact that the 2002 survey work itself was very intensive, with constrained sites being eliminated, and with site assessment in 2004 reflecting a more realistic assessment of the impact of Policy E2 and E5 only sites with a strong possibility of being realised were recommended for inclusion, as discussed below.

- 6.3 In estimating the urban capacity of the District’s six urban areas an allowance has to be made for new dwellings on sites with a capacity of less than 5 dwellings and other forms of dwelling yield that will continue to come forward from development within the urban settlements as a consequence of normal development activity and under the influence of planning policy and the development control process.

- 6.4 For the reasons argued in Section 7 of the 2002 UHCS (included in Appendix 1) this Study prefers to rely upon a yield projected from past rates of completions as the discounted figure for provision from non site-specific sources, since this is based upon development that has actually happened.

- 6.5 Information has been provided from an analysis of records for the seven years from 1997 to 2004 and completions have been identified under the following categories:
 - residential conversions
 - non-residential conversions (whole/part of buildings, not space over shops)
 - the redevelopment of sites formerly in other than residential use
 - the development of small plots within residential areas
 - space over shops conversions

- 6.6 The average annual rate at which units have come forward within these categories over the last seven years for sites less than five dwellings, is shown in the table below:

Harrogate Borough Completions for sites of less than 5 dwellings

YEAR	Cat 1	Cat 2	Cat 3	Cat 4	Cat 5	TOTALS
97-98	5	6	16	6	3	36
98-99	8	11	4	7	2	32
99-00	10	7	8	7	3	35
00-01	12	22	15	18	5	72
01-02	31	30	20	17	10	108
02-03	15	14	8	6	8	51
03-04	22	16	9	7	2	56
TOTALS	103	106	80	68	33	390
Average 7years	15	15	11	10	5	56
Average last 5 years	18	18	12	11	6	64
Average last 3 years	23	20	12	10	7	72

Cat 1 - Net gain by sub division of existing residential buildings

Cat 2 – Conversion of non-residential buildings (hotels, offices)

Cat 3 – Redevelopment of PDL producing net residential gain

Cat 4 – Small plots in residential areas (infill & garden plots)

Cat 5 – Flats over shops or other commercial, (where commercial continues)

- 6.7 The UHCS 2002 used only the last three years of non site-specific yield for sites of less than 5 dwellings because of the upward trend in completions from the 5 categories identified above. For the 2004 UHCS, again using the most recent three-year period to reflect current trends, the provision that could come forward from this source in the study settlements in the following 17-year period to 2021 is **1224** (i.e., the average annual dwelling completion rate for the last three years, 72 x 17 years). This assumes a base date of 1st April 2004 for the housing land supply figures, and is shown in the Table in paragraph 7.3 as **360** dwellings for the first two 5-year periods (72 x 5 years), and **504** units (72 x 7 years) for the period 2014 - 2021.

Large windfalls

- 6.8 As far as large sites (5+) are concerned, the identified Study sites are intended to replace what was previously regarded as windfall in Local Plans. In Section 5 a discounted dwelling yield is identified from site-specific sources of **803** dwellings for the 0 -17 year period. In addition there is the possibility of other large sites coming forward for development, which are impossible to identify at this moment in time.
- 6.9 The Council recognises that the development process will continually bring forward sites not able to be considered now because they are in alternative uses. This could include local authority and government land and buildings (not identified by this Study as surplus to requirements at this time). As in the 2002 UHCS instead of projecting past rates of windfall the Study is now seeking to replace a windfall allowance with identified Study sites, preferring not to introduce an allowance that cannot pass the critical test of reasonableness, by being a realistic probability. The

Council monitors carefully the completion rate from any such site and if there is any firmly quantifiable evidence showing completions on sites of 5 or more dwellings not identified in the Study, then adjustments can be made to the LDF at an appropriate stage.

- 6.10 However, it would be instructive to compare the discounted Study yield with past rates of development on large previously developed sites. The table below shows an annual average of 55 dwellings over the five-year period. If projected at the same rate, this would give a total of 550 dwellings for the first 10-year period. This compares with the Study yield figure (discounted) of 720 (72 dwellings per annum (532 + 184) / 10 from discounted total dwelling yields) dwellings from the survey for the same period, which is above past rates. This is a good benchmarking exercise, and shows that the Study predicts that urban housing development will produce slightly more completions annually than in the last five years.

Harrogate Borough Completions for sites of 5+ dwellings (unallocated sites)

YEAR	Cat 1	Cat 2	Cat 3	Cat 4	Cat 5	TOTALS
97-98	1	21	112	0	0	134
98-99	0	6	136	0	9	11
99-00	11	20	55	0	11	97
00-01	0	9	39	0	0	48
01-02	0	27	5	0	0	32
02-03	18	25	20	0	0	63
03-04	23	0	8	6	0	37
TOTALS	53	108	375	6	20	422
Average 7 years	8	15	54	1	3	60
Average 5 years	10	16	25	1	2	55
Average last 3 years	14	17	11	2	0	44

- 6.11 Since the 2002 Study a number of sites identified as opportunity sites have come forward for development as windfalls. Other windfalls have also come forward within the six main settlements in this period.
- 6.12 The continued application of Policy HX to the development control process up to the end of the plan period in 2006 will continue to limit the extent to which such large windfalls will come forward.
- 6.13 The development of a housing allocations policy and identification of sites through the LDF process following a plan, monitor and manage approach will need to make allowance for windfall sites that do not conflict with the aims of a phased and managed release of housing land, that are located in sustainable locations, compatible with surrounding land uses and other relevant planning policies and guidance.

Empty Homes

- 6.14 Unnecessary dwelling vacancies are a wasted housing resource. Some vacancies are necessary to allow the normal operation of the housing market, including pending re-let, re-sale, repairs, and probate settlement. However, properties vacant for over 6 months give cause for concern, and represent the stock that could be brought back into use. At April 2004, Harrogate Borough had 1462 vacant dwellings,

of which 705 had been vacant longer than 6 months. This represents 1% of all the stock in the District, reduced from 1444 or 2.2% in 2002, and is being targeted by the Council's Empty Property Initiative in partnership with Leeds Federated Housing Association.

- 6.15 The rate at which vacancies are taken up and therefore reduced is difficult for the planning system to monitor, as planning consent is not required to bring a vacant unit back into use. Such activity does not constitute a new dwelling, and therefore does not contribute towards the District's housing supply. Instead, assumptions about reductions in vacancies are taken into account when housing requirements are established in regional planning guidance, rather than treating vacancies as a potential contributor to the housing land supply to meet housing requirements.
- 6.16 Therefore, the yield from this source, which could be set at 705 unconstrained capacity (the properties vacant for 6+ months), cannot contribute to this Study's yield. It is, however, included in the 'Presentation of Results' Table in Appendix 4.

Total Yield

- 6.17 The total Study yield from non site-specific sources is therefore **1224** units over the plan period to 2021 (3-year annual average completion rate x 17 years or 72 x 17).

7. Combining the different components of potential

- 7.1 The Study has examined the potential for further dwellings to be provided within the identified settlements in the District by a variety of means. These sources need to be combined to provide the full output from the Study and this is illustrated in the table in paragraph 7.3.
- 7.2 The figures in the table are the number of dwelling units it is estimated could come forward from all sources within the six urban areas within the Plan period, and beyond to 2021.
- 7.3 The table below shows all sources of the figures used to arrive at the total yields.

Site specific sources – Discounted by 15% (+undiscounted element) <small>(from paragraph 5.6)</small>				Non site specific sources – small site allowance <small>(from paragraph 6.7)</small>				Totals			
Years 0-5	Years 5-10	Years 10-17	Years 0-17 total	Years 0-5	Years 5-10	Years 10-17	Years 0-17 total	Years 0-5	Years 5-10	Years 10-17	Years 0-17 total
540	186	77	803	360	360	504	1224	900	546	581	2027

8.Implications for the Local Development Framework

- 8.1 The adopted Harrogate District Local Plan 1991-2006 incorporating the Selective Alterations is to be replaced by the Local Development Framework. The LDF will help guide new development and land use up to 2021. The Harrogate District Local Development Scheme came into effect in March 2005 and sets out how the Council will progress the first three years work of plan preparation under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase act 2004. The Core Strategy is in the Council's first DPD and will comprise:
- A vision and objectives for the District;
 - A spatial strategy for the level and distribution of housing and employment development and other major development needs;
 - Policies for the allocation and release of housing land, and the provision of affordable housing for local needs; and
 - A monitoring and implementation framework.
- 8.2 The early stages of the Local Development Framework are therefore a highly opportune time at which to review and update the 2002 UHCS. PPG3 has created the expectation that before Plans are adopted they will have been influenced by such studies – and clearly the more up to date such a Study can be the better.
- 8.3 Development Plans are now expected to be more dynamic in their provision of housing, replacing the setting of long term targets with the continuous management of the provision according to the objectives set out in the plan and informed by frequent monitoring of the provision taking place. The new style Plan will need to demonstrate how it has embraced the 'plan, monitor and manage' approach.
- 8.4 The Major Land allocations (Housing and Employment) DPD will be prepared in parallel with the Core Strategy and will roll forward the housing and employment land allocations of the Harrogate District Local Plan (incorporating the Selective Alteration) The UHCS will form an important part of the evidence base for this DPD.
- 8.5 The Major Policies for allocating and releasing housing land will be informed by the output from this Study. The 2004 Study was the subject of community involvement between October and December 2004 and this Final Report has been amended following the consideration by the Cabinet Member (Planning), when decisions were taken to amend the Draft Report - October 2004 to reflect the Council's response to comments received during the consultation period. The report as amended by the decisions of 18th March, referred to above, was also approved as a report for informing the Council's ongoing work on the LDF Core Strategy and Housing and Employment DPD's.

Implications for the way that provision is made in the LDF

- 8.6 With the change over to the new style development plan, incorporating a transitional period regarding strategic guidance set out in Regional Spatial Strategy 12, and the emerging new Regional Spatial Strategy, no comparison has been made of the UHCS yield and possible housing requirements at this stage. The 2004 Study update simply provides an estimate of the provision that could come forward within the study settlements from both site-specific and non site-specific sources.

- 8.7 There are 33 sites identified by the surveys undertaken as part of the Study that could in the view of officers reviewing the 2002 Study and undertaking the assessment of sites promoted to the Council in 2004 provide additional dwellings in the Local Development Framework period. Subject to the views of Council Members some or all of these sites could be identified in the first Local Development Framework allocations and be counted towards the provision to be made.

9. Conclusions

- 9.1 The Council has updated Harrogate's 2002 Urban Housing Capacity Study⁹ (UHCS) to provide further background information for the development of housing and settlement related policies and proposals in the new Local Development Framework. The 2004 UHCS Final Report builds on the work undertaken for the Council by Baker Associates in 2002, using a similar methodology to carry out the 2004 Study. The 2004 UHCS brings the 2002 Study forward to April 2004, and provides what the Council believes to be a realistic estimate of potential future housing yield from all sources in the District's six urban areas of Harrogate, Knaresborough, Ripon, Boroughbridge, Masham and Pateley Bridge to 2021.
- 9.2 The findings from the Study points to a 'main settlement' housing capacity of **2027** dwellings in the period up to 2021. Further potential exists in the rural areas.

⁹ Urban Housing Capacity Study (Jan 2003) Baker Associates