

STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (SHLAA)

Update May 2013

CONTENTS

	Disclaimer	4
1.0	Introduction	5
2.0	Context	6
3.0	Main issues from first SHLAA study	7
4.0	The update approach	7
5.0	Conducting the Review	8
	<i>Table 1 Assessment Matrix</i>	11/12
6.0	Background to results	13
7.0	Main Results	14
	<i>Table 2 Total SHLAA Land supply Overview - comparison since first SHLAA</i>	14
	<i>Table 3 Settlement by settlement land supply</i>	16
8.0	Conclusions	17

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Timing of Supply by Settlement Category

<i>Table 4</i>	<i>District Wide</i>	20
<i>Table 5</i>	<i>Main Bradford Urban area (Regional City)</i>	21
<i>Table 6</i>	<i>Principal Towns</i>	22
<i>Table 7</i>	<i>Local Growth Centres</i>	23
<i>Table 8</i>	<i>Local Service Centres</i>	24

Appendix 2 Settlement Summaries

2A	Bradford City Centre	26
2B	Canal Road	30
2C	Bradford North East	34
2D	Bradford North West	38
2E	Bradford South East	42
2F	Bradford South West	46
2G	Shipley	50
2H	Keighley	54
2I	Ilkley	58
2J	Bingley	62
2K	Burley in Wharfedale	66
2L	Menston	70
2M	Queensbury	74
2N	Silsden	78
2O	Steeton	82
2P	Thornton	86
2Q	Addingham	90

2R	Baildon	94
2S	Cottingley	98
2T	Cullingworth	102
2U	Denholme	106
2V	East Morton	110
2W	Harden	114
2X	Haworth	118
2Y	Oakworth	122
2Z	Oxenhope	126
2AA	Wilsden	130

Appendix 3	Timing of Supply – SCRC AAP and Shipley excluding SCRC area	135/36
-------------------	--	--------

Appendix 4	5 year supply statement	138
-------------------	--------------------------------	-----

Appendix 5	5 year table of sites contributing to first 5 years of the trajectory and beyond This table is available as separate PDF	
------------	--	--

Appendix 6	Membership of the SHLAA working group	142
-------------------	--	-----

DISCLAIMER

In relation to the information contained within this report (and any other report relating, or making reference, to the findings of Bradford's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) the Council makes the following disclaimer without prejudice:

The identification of potential housing sites in this SHLAA does not imply that the Council will necessarily grant planning permission for residential development. Planning applications will continue to be treated on their merits against the appropriate development plan policies and other material planning considerations including the National Planning Framework. Sites which are for example, currently in employment use or in the Green Belt still need to be assessed against the relevant planning policies that seek to protect employment land and the Green Belt.

The identification of potential housing sites in the SHLAA which is a purely technical document does not imply that they will necessarily become housing site allocations in the Local Plan. There are many factors involved in selecting the most appropriate sites in the Local Plan such as local environmental impact which are not part of the SHLAA process. Thus sites which are assessed favourably by the SHLAA process may not necessarily be considered acceptable for allocation in the Local Plan. The inclusion of potential housing sites in the SHLAA does not preclude them being developed for other suitable purposes. Information relating to individual sites in the SHLAA was based on the best information available at the time of the assessment. Circumstances can change rapidly and there may be some site omissions and /or factual inaccuracies. These will be rectified in future updates as further information becomes available.

Other additional constraints may also come to light which were not identified at the time of the assessment and new information such as flood risk patterns may be updated during the course of the study. Likewise some constraints may no longer be applicable.

The deliverability and developability categories are based on judgements made on the best information available at the time of the assessment. Circumstances or these assumptions may change which may mean that sites come forward sooner or later than envisaged. Capacities and densities identified on sites either relate to the number of dwellings for which planning permission has been granted or are based on indicative assessments by employing density multipliers adjusted to take account of known constraints. They are indicative and may change subject to site circumstances as more detailed information is taken into account at planning application stage.

The exclusion of sites from the assessment does not preclude the possibility of residential development being granted on them.

Site visits by the Council and other SHLAA Working Group Members took place over a period spanning early to mid 2012 with further negotiation and exchange of information beyond this and the status of sites and information relating to them may have since changed. For example, an identified site may subsequently have been granted planning permission whilst other planning permissions may have lapsed. The base date for the study is April 2011. Consequently any permissions after this date will only be referred to in the conclusions and not identified fully in the trajectory, although an estimated yield will be used.

This report was revised in November 2016 to correct calculation errors noted in the combined settlement summary tables presented in Appendix 1 and Table 2. These changes have not affected the overall land supply total for the District.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 In October 2011 the Council published its first SHLAA as part of the evidence base of the Core Strategy Further Engagement Draft. The published report set out the methodology used in undertaking the study and its findings, having assessed over 700 sites across the District in terms of their suitability, availability and their potential to deliver new homes up to 2026¹.
- ¹The Trajectory
- 1.2 It is a Government requirement that all Local Authorities produce a SHLAA which is a process which identifies land with potential for future housing development. The production of a SHLAA is an important function of the planning system, as a technical appraisal of land in a District.
- 1.3 It is important to emphasise that many sites considered in the study will be currently protected from development in the adopted development plan for the District (the RUDP) including sites within the present Green Belt. The SHLAA does not allocate land for development neither is it there to make specific policy judgements on the future of sites. Its main role is to reveal the extent of available land and the nature of this potential supply in order to inform the choices the Council will need to make in both the strategic part of the Local Plan, the Core Strategy and also that part of the Local Plan which will actually identify and allocate sites - The Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).
- 1.4 As a technical study and in response to a changing market it is important that SHLAA's are updated regularly, taking on board new information and revising the data accordingly. This update sets out the Councils approach in undertaking its first review of the published SHLAA, including a few changes to the assessment process. This update should be read in conjunction with the first SHLAA and it should be noted that most aspects of the methodology and approach of the first SHLAA have been carried forward in this update. The findings of the SHLAA update should also be considered alongside other documents produced as part of the wider Core Strategy evidence base including; The Strategic Housing Market Assessment, The Growth Study, Employment Land Study and other Local Development Plan Documents.
- 1.5 The scope of this update has been to expand on the findings of the first SHLAA, by updating information on sites, including those with planning permission and under construction, and to add further sites to the assessment process and revise the outcomes on a settlement by settlement and District wide basis. As with the first SHLAA this update has been undertaken with the help of key stakeholders² involved in the delivery of new homes in the Bradford District. The members of the SHLAA Working Group are detailed in Appendix 6. Their role has been to provide advice in minor revisions to the methodology used in the application of the first SHLAA and to provide feedback on the provisional site assessments undertaken by the Council with regards deliverability and developability of sites included in the study.

²The SHLAA working group

2.0 CONTEXT

- 2.1 National Planning Policy is set out by the Government in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The requirement to undertake SHLAA's was introduced in Planning Policy Statement 3 which is now superseded by NPPF. The NPPF has carried forward the requirement for SHLAA's to be produced. Paragraph 159 of the NPPF states that local planning authorities should "*prepare land availability assessments to establish realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability and the likely economic viability of land to meet the identified need for housing over the plan period*".
- 2.2 In conjunction with PPS3, the previous Government issued a Practice Guidance document setting out in broad terms the methodology and stages to be followed in producing a SHLAA. The Council's first SHLAA was designed to accord with this guidance but also to take into account the specific circumstances within Bradford and the views and comments of stakeholders, in particular the views of the SHLAA Working Group. The current Government is now considering the findings of a report which they commissioned into the future of a whole range of technical and supplementary guidance including the SHLAA Practice Guidance. The report by Lord Taylor has recommended that the current Practice Guidance should therefore be retained for now but should be reviewed and updated as a matter of priority. The Government has yet to respond to the report and therefore any changes in future guidance will not be available until later this year, so will feature in future SHLAA updates. The first SHLAA was carried out in accordance with the procedure and stages set out in the Government Practice. It is therefore not intended in this report to recount these stages in detail again since the overall methodology for this update is broadly similar to that of the first SHLAA.
- 2.3 Bradford's Local Plan Core Strategy¹ will set the broad pattern and scale of development across the District over the next 15 years. It will identify how much housing development there will be in different parts of the district but these decisions must be backed up by evidence that sufficient developable land exists in those areas to meet these targets. The SHLAA will assist in showing how realistic different options for accommodating development are alongside other studies being undertaken including the Growth Study. It will show broadly how much green field or green belt land might be needed in individual settlements and groups of settlements to illustrate how the Core Strategy figure may affect local areas.
- ¹Consultation on the Local Development Framework-Core Strategy took place between October 2011 and February 2012. The final draft will be presented to committee in later this year. The title LDF has now been replaced with the term Local Plan in accordance with Central Government regulations.
- 2.4 The aims of the SHLAA are therefore to provide a pool of sites for the Local Plan Development Plan Documents (DPDs) to select from. The Local Plan process will then be able to scrutinise the site development opportunities identified in the SHLAA and subject sites to a fuller Planning and Environmental assessment. The Local Plan will aim to address which of the *candidate sites* in the SHLAA are most sustainable and would best accord with the goals of the Core Strategy which include promoting a continuing emphasis on the use of previously developed land and the focussing of the majority of growth to the main urban areas.
- 2.5 Once finalised the Local Plan will replace the adopted Unitary Development Plan (RUDP) which is the current land use and policy plan covering the Bradford District.

3.0 MAIN ISSUES FROM FIRST SHLAA

- 3.1 An important role of the SHLAA is to assess whether there is a sufficient supply of available and deliverable/developable of land for new homes. When all the sites had been appraised in the first SHLAA a number of challenges in terms of the shortage of land became apparent which has resulted in the approach taken in this update.
- 3.2 The first issue arises from the fact that the total capacity of deliverable and developable sites in the first SHLAA was close to the total requirement for new homes as set out in the Core Strategy Further Engagement Draft. Of this available land only a limited supply was from sites that could be considered to be suitable now and a significant proportion of sites lay in areas currently protected from development in the RUDP. Without additional opportunities, this would mean there would be limited prospect in being able to steer development choices away from the more environmentally sensitive areas of the District. There was therefore the need to undertake an update of the SHLAA in order to identify other sources of land supply in line with stage 8 of the Governments Practice Guidance. This requirement was further underlined by another conclusion from the results of the first SHLAA – namely that there was a significant shortage in deliverable sites in the short term (sites categorised in the SHLAA as ‘Suitable Now’) and that the Council could therefore not comply with the Government requirement to be able to demonstrate the availability of a 5 year land supply.
- 3.3 Part of the work undertaken for the first SHLAA involved extensive surveying to identify as much previously used and vacant/underused land and buildings as possible. However, when published in 2011 alongside the Core Strategy Further Engagement Draft, concerns were raised by the public that not all potentially developable vacant land and buildings in the urban area had been included and that too much “green” land was identified in the study.
- 3.4 Some of the omissions of vacant sites from the first SHLAA were the simple result of the length of time involved in undertaking the study – inevitably some sites will become vacant or be subject to planning applications in the period between the study commencing and the final report being issued. Where the public consultation process produced further hitherto overlooked sites these have been incorporated within the SHLAA update. The second key concern raised by the public about the extent of green field and green belt land within the SHLAA simply reflects the sites being submitted to the Council by land owners and developers.

4.0 THE UPDATE APPROACH

- 4.1 701 sites were assessed in the first SHLAA. This second SHLAA has updated these assessments and undertaken an appraisal of new sites, since the last study. It has therefore considered new sites submitted for consideration by landowners, developers and the local community.¹ Other sources of supply such as sites which have had had residential planning permission approved before 31st March 2011 and sites identified by further survey work undertaken by Council officers since the last study have also been included. Sites included in the first SHLAA raised both objections and support when the SHLAA was published as background evidence to the LDF (Local Plan) Further Engagement Draft consultation. Whilst the SHLAA is only a technical study it is still useful to garner reactions on sites in advance of the Allocations DPD. It is not however a function of the SHLAA process to make changes to the site conclusions based on objections unless a fundamental change on owner intentions for instance affects the availability or achievability of the site. Some additional sites were also

submitted alongside other comments on the Core Strategy Policies. These sites will be assessed at the next update.

¹Many sites and buildings identified by the community were already counted in the first SHLAA, others were on land protected for other uses, outside of the District boundary or were too small or information provided was too limited to be able to realistically assess these.

²The revised base date of the study

- 4.2 In response to the overall shortage in identified capacity and the need to identify additional opportunities within the urban area and in order to seek to meet the challenges of a high housing requirement target, the site size threshold for the SHLAA update has been lowered from 0.40 to 0.20 ha or 6 units and above. In doing this it was possible to ensure a wider sweep of the District of potential further opportunities of land and buildings which may previously have been overlooked as they were smaller than the previous threshold.
- 4.3 The update has taken new data to the new base date of 1st April 2011 with this being the new, year 1 of the trajectory making 2029 year 18, which adds 3 years to the timeline of the last study, in line with the Core Strategy. The 3 periods of the trajectory have also been revised as follows:
- short term, years 1-5 at 2011/12 to 2015/16
 - medium term, years 6-10 at 2016/17 to 2020/21
 - long term years, 11-18 at 2021/22 to 2028/29

These terms differ from the first SHLAA in that the short term no longer extends to year 6, which makes the 5 year land supply easier to analyse.

5.0 CONDUCTING THE REVIEW

- 5.1 In order to keep the SHLAA as comprehensive as possible it was necessary to ensure that a robust approach was taken in its update and individual site circumstances noted. 701 sites appeared in the first SHLAA and as a consequence much of the task involved in this part of the update was desk based including;
- A comprehensive check of any recent planning history,
 - Reappraisal of planning permissions from last SHLAA to review whether it was still valid / live at the study base date (or whether it had now lapsed);
 - Update of site information if development was known to have started or been completed since the last survey
 - Revision of site information provided available by landowners, agents and others.
- 5.2 When this process was complete, the additional new sites submitted by landowners since the last SHLAA were added to the database together with new sites identified from the planning register. Survey work then began on a settlement by settlement basis involving both existing and new sites. The purpose of the site survey being to assess site characteristics such as any physical constraints, current use and topography. For existing sites this was limited to a review of any progress or notable changes since the first study. For some new sites where the amount of information provided was sometimes sketchy, it was necessary to ensure the land/building was available and to identify a site boundary to be drawn.

- 5.3 Following the survey and in accordance with the first SHLAA, sites were assessed in terms of their suitability (test 1), availability (test 2) and achievability or viability (test 3). In summary, the suitability test categorises sites according to how likely they will be considered for housing development by location, through the consideration of both local and national policy designations as well as physical constraints identified by the survey. In short no fundamental changes were made to the suitability test methodology since the first SHLAA, other than to ensure that the GIS map base layers for such as flood risk zones provided by the Environment Agency were up to date. It was observed that in some areas there was a considerable change in the shape of flood risk zones 3a and 3b which in turn led to changes to the original SHLAA suitability results. Further information on the suitability test can be found in the first SHLAA report.
- 5.4 The availability test seeks to ascertain landowners intentions ie; whether they intend to seek residential use of the site or make it available for new homes. The achievability test looks at the practicalities in bringing the site forward for development, taking into account the previous first tests and other factors particular to the site. These tests in turn determine where the site should be placed in the trajectory. A more detailed description of these tests can be found in the first SHLAA report. Again no fundamental changes were made to the key principles employed.
- 5.5 The SHLAA process involves collecting site information and making a judgement on whether though a series of assumptions the site can be developed for residential use; when it might realistically come forward and given its location; how many homes could be delivered. The experience in carrying out the first SHLAA showed that further improvements could be made in the assessment process to enable the simpler categorisation of sites. This has been addressed by the production of an Assessment Matrix (table 1), with the secondary benefit being a speeding up of the process. The left hand column sets out a list of typical site typologies with the shaded areas along each row illustrating where against each test the site will have been placed. The right hand column illustrates the starting position of the site in the trajectory and negated the need for the use of lead times employed in the first SHLAA which increased the level of inconsistencies. In a small number of cases where site characteristics may not have matched a typology the closest typology will have been used.
- 5.6 Site assessments were conducted using the same principles as the first study. Local Policy has been “switched off” to enable a full appraisal of all available sites to be undertaken. Sites with policy constraints do not feature in the first 5 years of the trajectory. This is due to the fact that there is no certainty that such sites will come forward and secondly that in most cases such sites could only start contributing to delivery of units once the process of changing land designations through the development plan is complete. This contrasts with sites classified as Suitable Now, which were either allocated for housing development in the RUDP, which have a current planning permission or are without constraints where the owner is taking steps to promote the site for development in the near future. The Assessment Matrix sets out the assessment conclusions and trajectory placement of sites falling within a particular category.
- 5.7 The continuing slow take up of sites because of the economic downturn means that the SHLAA update has continued to assume the same low development rates as the previous study of 20 units per annum in first period on sites yielding less than 150 units and 30 per year on larger sites. The only difference being that this period is now 5 years instead of the previous 6. Estimates on buildings without planning permission remain difficult to quantify and the apartment market is less secure, even outside the city and town. Consequently in the absence of information in some cases, a value judgement has been made on whether the potential delivery

of new homes through conversion or by the redevelopment of the site would be more appropriate and this is site specific. These sites will be reassessed when more information becomes available. Further reassessment of take up and lead times will determine whether the economic pace of change needs to be revised in future updates of the SHLAA.

Table 1: ASSESSMENT MATRIX

Typology	SUITABILITY			AVAILABLE			ACHIEVABLE			TRAJECTORY
	Suitable Now	Potentially suitable	Unsuitable	Yes	No	Uncertain	Deliverable	Developable	Un-achievable	START YEAR
Sites with Full planning permission: <i>a: work started,</i> <i>b: Permission secured before 31/03/10</i> <i>c: Permission secured after 1/4/10</i>										a: Yr 1 (2011/12) b: Yr 2 (2012/13) c: Yr 3 (2013/14)
Sites with Outline planning permission										Yr3 (2013/14)
Sites with expired permission (<i>outside of the City Centre</i>) where the owner has been engaging in discussion to bring the site back to the market. (<i>Subject to suitability re test</i>)										Yr 4 (2014/15)
Sites with expired permission (<i>in the City Centre</i>) where the owner has been engaging in discussion to bring the site back to the market										Yr 5 (2015/16)
Former RUDP housing sites where progress is being made to bring the site forward <i>ie recent planning history or information from owner/agent</i>										Yr 4 (2014/15)
Vacant sites submitted for consideration by owner/agent without constraints										Yr 4 (2014/15)
Sites with expired permission where the owners current intentions are presently unknown										Yr 6 (2016/17)
Former RUDP housing sites where there has been no contact re future development.										Yr 6 (2016/17)
Sites submitted by owner but actively in use for something else										Yr 6 (2016/17)
Vacant sites identified from survey work where the owners intentions are not presently known										Yr 6 (2016/17)
Vacant or underused land or buildings where contact with the owner suggests they will not be available										N/A

Typology	SUITABILITY			AVAILABLE			ACHIEVABLE			TRAJECTORY
	Suitable Now	Potentially suitable	Unsuitable	Yes	No	Uncertain	Deliverable	Developable	Un-achievable	START YEAR
Safeguarded Land sites without physical constraints to development										Yr 6 (2016/17)
Safeguarded Land sites with some additional physical constraints that could delay development, <i>ie topography, access</i>										Yr 8 (2018/19)
Policy constrained sites including green belt without physical constraints to development										Yr 6 (2016/17)
Policy constrained sites including green belt with some additional physical constraints including access, topography										Yr 8 (2018/19)
Policy constrained sites including green belt and Safeguarded Land with more significant but resolvable physical constraints										Yr 11 (2021/22)
Other sites with such significant physical constraints which may make the site unfeasible for development during the trajectory										N/A
Sites considered to be unsuitable for housing on account of their location in an area of flood risk area, HSE zone, isolated from urban area etc										N/A
Sites with limited information to be able to properly undertake an assessment										N/A

Table 1 continued

6.0 BACKGROUND TO THE RESULTS

- 6.1 Stage 8 of the Government's methodology for undertaking SHLAA's involves reviewing the results of the site appraisals so that the housing potential of all sites is combined to give a District wide picture of potential supply. In particular it is important to be able to draw comparisons in the potential supply identified by the first study and changes since. The results of this review will further inform where more work needs to be undertaken to identify other sources of potential supply to help meet the future housing requirement.
- 6.2 The results of this update have been arranged into those settlements and boundaries identified in the first SHLAA allowing the comparison across the 3 time periods in the trajectory. What should be noted however is the change made to the length of each time period, in particular the reduction of the short term period from 6 years to 5 years (see paragraph 4.3 above)
- 6.3 The production of the Bradford City Centre (BCC AAP) and Shipley and Canal Road Corridor Area Action Plans (SCRC AAP) has involved the drawing of revised boundaries which are in part different to the settlement boundaries used in the first SHLAA. Further updates of the SHLAA will reflect these and any further changed boundaries applied during the course of production of future DPD'S and the Core Strategy. As a consequence, the main set of tables in Appendix 2, reflect the current sites included in the first SHLAA, to enable comparisons to be made. Additional tables specific to the SCRC AAP boundary together with revised tables for the remaining part of the Shipley settlement excluding sites in the AAP boundary are available separately in appendix 3. The consideration of the total housing requirement for these new areas as they appear in the Core Strategy will be based on these secondary tables.
- 6.4 All figures shown in the tables are average yields. The first SHLAA tables illustrated a low, high and average yield for each of the time periods based on the density categories set out in the report. No changes have been made to these density multipliers. The figures in the new tables compare the average from SHLAA1 with the average figures generated by the update.
- 6.5 Results for individual sites are available in tabular format together with maps for each settlement. The sites tables provide a summary of each site in the settlement and where it has been placed in the trajectory. The maps illustrate the spread of sites across the settlement in terms of their suitability. Suitable now sites (ie sites which could come forward in principle immediately) are shown in green, Potentially suitable sites (ie sites with local or physical constraints and consequently with longer term development potential) are shown as orange or yellow. Shown as red are those sites which were ranked as Unsuitable in the first test or considered to be unavailable or not currently achievable for residential development in the second or third tests. This would not necessarily rule out such sites coming forward in time for development as circumstances change, similarly sites currently coloured green or yellow/orange may also change in future updates following changes in site circumstances over time.

7.0 REVIEWING THE RESULTS OF THE SHLAA UPDATE

7.1 Table 2 below gives a broad overview of the extent, type and timing of supply of all sites included in the review comprising the full 18 year trajectory and any residual potential beyond year 18. The table indicates the extent to which the SHLAA supply could meet the Districts housing land requirement.

Table 2: Total SHLAA Land supply Overview - Comparison Since First SHLAA

	SHLAA 1		SHLAA 2 (update)	
	Yield	%	Yield	%
Suitable Now	16640.5	38%	19362.5	36%
Potentially Suitable – Local Policy constraints	25514	58%	33367.5	62%
Potentially Suitable – Physical constraints	1897	4%	978	2%
Total	44051.5	100%	53708	100%
Short Term*				
Short Term*	7267	16%	8554	16%
Medium Term	21194.5	48%	27432	51%
Long Term	10122.5	23%	13872	26%
Residual	5467.5	13%	3850	7%
Total	44051.5	100%	53708	100%
Previously developed				
Previously developed	11678.5	27%	14918.5	27%
Greenfield	25579	58%	32441.5	60%
Mixed	6794	15%	6348	13%
Total	44051.5	100%	53708	100%

Note – figures not entirely comparable as the SHLAA 1 short term period covered 6 years as opposed to just 5 years in the update – see para 4.3

7.2 It is clear it that even though there has been an overall increase in the number of sites considered and thus an increase in potential supply, there has been very little change in the proportional dispersal of units between land types or time periods since the last study. As with the last study, the overwhelming housing potential is from sites which currently have Local Planning constraints in Greenfield locations. Unsurprisingly also given the current economic climate and local policy constraints the largest proportion of the supply falls within the medium term. More detailed district, local and settlement breakdowns can be found in Appendices 1 and 2.

7.3 Table 3 below, summarises the total potential land supply in all settlements in the District. Appendix 1 includes tables which summarise the timing of supply for groups of settlements making up the District; comprising, the Regional city (main Bradford Urban Area), Principal Towns, Local Growth Centres and Local Service centres as they appear in the Core Strategy Further Engagement Draft. Appendix 2 includes individual settlement tables which show the change in potential units since SHLAA 1, together with a summary overview for each area. Appendix 3 contains timing of supply tables for the Shipley and Canal Road Corridor AAP area and the remaining part of Shipley excluding the AAP area.

7.4 The following bullet points illustrate the main issues:

- The total average development potential of sites in the study falling within the trajectory period could yield around 49,858 new homes. A further 3850 potential units fall outside the trajectory but which could come forward during the trajectory period if economic and housing market conditions improve and therefore allow for an accelerated rate of annual completions.
- Yield from green belt sites makes up 34% of the total supply (excl residual). A further 27% is from sites with other local or physical constraints, but is confined to the middle and longer term periods of the trajectory.
- 8554 units are considered to be deliverable in the first period of the trajectory with the largest majority of these within the Regional City (main Bradford urban area). 68% of these units would be from sites that are previously developed
- The District has a potential capacity of over 17,000 units on sites which have been previously developed. This makes up around 35% of the total supply in the trajectory. Settlements which have the highest potential to deliver new homes proportionally on previously developed sites include the city centre, south west Bradford, Shipley, Cullingworth and Denholme
- 41% of land that is Suitable Now in the first period is Greenfield.
- The District trajectory total of 49,858 represents a 22% increase on the first SHLAA. Most settlements have seen increases in the total amount of land identified with development potential and therefore available and potentially suitable for future development. Some settlements have a significant proportional increase due to landowners and developers submitting large swathes of additional land for consideration and this can be identified from the table 3
- The highest proportion of new homes could be developed in the medium period of the trajectory although over 17000 of these have existing policy constraints.

Table 3 : SHLAA 2 – SETTLEMENT BY SETTLEMENT LAND SUPPLY

		DWELLING CAPACITY (AVG UNITS) BY TIME PERIOD								
		No Of Sites	Hectares	Short 1-5	Medium 6-10	Long 11-18	Total	% change	Residual	Total
REGIONAL CITY - BRADFORD		427	817.35	5816	14160.5	7075	27051.5	23.2	3286	30337.5
	City Centre	31	1512	821.5	1722.5	208	2752	13.2	0	2752
	Bradford NE	98	212.97	1168	2592.5	1135.5	4896	9.3	304	5200
	Bradford NW	66	143.67	845.5	2102	1244	4191.5	27.7	612	4803.5
	Bradford SE	101	214.51	1387.5	2960.5	970	5318	26.6	1289	6607
	Bradford SW	92	100.41	994	3413	1700	6107	29.9	73	6180
	Shipley	28	44.74	485	770	538	1793	14.4	0	1793
	Canal Road	11	85.90	114.5	600	1279.5	1994	40.2	1008	3002
PRINCIPAL TOWNS		144	304.16	1227.5	5102	2736	9065.5	24.3	153	9218.5
	Keighley	86	186.54	763.5	3243	1226.5	5233	14.8	0	5233
	Ilkley	22	63.82	183.5	937.5	515.5	1636.5	51.7	153	1789.5
	Bingley	36	70.80	280.5	921.5	994	2196	26.8	0	2196
LOCAL GROWTH CENTRES		89	279.40	879	3992	2499.5	7370.5	25.2	411	7781.5
	Burley	10	40.22	0	746.5	347.5	1094	49.2	0	1094
	Menston	13	42.12	150	695.5	313	1158.5	36.2	8	1166.5
	Queensbury	21	60.59	254.5	895	411.5	1561	32.5	186.5	1747.5
	Silsden	13	76.60	123.5	641	1044.5	1809	12	216.5	2025.5
	Steeton	11	29.71	155.5	461	268	884.5	8.9	0	884.5
	Thornton	21	30.16	195.5	553	115	863.5	11	0	863.5
LOCAL SERVICE CENTRES		103	228.95	631.5	4177.5	1516.5	6370.5	14.7	0	6370.5
	Addingham	16	39.49	0	921.5	231.5	1153	12.4	0	1153
	Baildon	15	33.87	210.5	352	321	883.5	24.3	0	883.5
	Cottingley	6	26.22	15	439	227	681	2.1	0	681
	Cullingworth	5	6.26	68	173	0	241	4.1	0	241
	Denholme	12	29.86	75	773	0	848	16.3	0	848
	East Morton	7	13.26	18.5	276	6	300.5	38.3	0	300.5
	Harden	4	2.77	8	78	0	86	9.3	0	86
	Haworth	16	21.57	116	506	73.5	695.5	-22.6	0	695.5
	Oakworth	10	18.13	42	178.5	275	495.5	37.2	0	495.5
	Oxenhope	3	1.88	19.5	31	0	50.5	-45.5	0	50.5
	Wilsden	9	35.64	59	449.5	427.5	936	30.7	0	936
DISTRICT TOTAL		763	1629.86	8554	27432	13872	49858	22.6	3850	53708

8.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 8.1 This document reports on the update which has been carried out to the first SHLAA. The update has been carried out to broadly the same methodology as the first SHLAA with the main changes being a reduction in the site size threshold and adjustments to the assessment by use of a matrix to ensure more consistency with site appraisals. As a result of the reduction in the site size threshold and the submission of new sites to the process, the total number of sites assessed has risen by 270.
- 8.2 The 39% increase in sites and resulting 23% increase in the total potential new homes that could be delivered from sites with development potential may, depending on the total housing targets adopted in the Local Plan Core Strategy allow greater flexibility in the future choices that can be made. This will allow decisions on the best most sustainable sites to meet the housing requirement in the Allocations DPD.
- 8.3 Land which has been previously developed which could accommodate future housing demand remains healthy in some parts of the District although this is a declining resource. However overall the majority of capacity is on green field sites, although this figure is skewed by the extent of speculative sites submissions submitted by landowners and developers.
- 8.4 Due to the large number of sites with current planning policy constraints, and the uncertainties over which will be allocated, the delivery pattern of units across the trajectory is only indicative and may not fully reflect the actual pattern of delivery or the trajectory that will be included in the Local Plan. The low proportion of supply in the short term period of the trajectory (Suitable Now) reflects the current weak market conditions. The total potential supply of land in this category totals some 19000 units and could be delivered in theory when market conditions improve with the commitment of the landowners.
- 8.5 The high proportion of supply in the middle and long term periods of the trajectory does not mean that all of these sites will be allocated for development and does not reflect the final decisions to be taken by the Core Strategy and the Allocations DPD. What is clear is the need to release sites in phases over the plan period. This will ensure that delivery targets for new homes can be met and that necessary community facilities and infrastructure can be properly provided.
- 8.6 Stage 10 of the Government's SHLAA Practice Guidance suggests that where justified a SHLAA may include an allowance for windfall development. However the whole purpose of a SHLAA is to identify specific sites and by carrying out and updating SHLAA's on a regular basis, the scope for unforeseen / windfall developments will by definition reduce. For this reason the first SHLAA reported on past windfall completion rates but did not make any allowance for windfall as part of the SHLAA trajectory. The SHLAA update maintains this approach. By reducing the site size threshold within the SHLAA from 0.4 to 0.2ha the scope for small windfall sites to come forward has been even further diminished. Moreover the SHLAA Practice Guidance was published at a time when PPS3 was in place. PPS3

has now been replaced with the NPPF and the NPPF has reduced the scope for local authorities to include a windfall allowance in their supply calculations.

- 8.7 Nonetheless windfall has historically made a very sizeable contribution to the delivery of new homes within the district. Further development opportunities are likely to continue to become available over time as the economy improves, increased finance becomes available and landowners are able to realise more short term plans. Future updates of the SHLAA will ensure such other opportunities are included in advance of the Allocations DPD. The Council will continue to monitor delivery on such windfall sites and report outcomes within the Annual Monitoring Report.
- 8.8 Additional capacity over and above those sites considered already in this update may also be identified from the Growth Study alongside other development opportunities arising through the remodelling of urban areas which will continue to be added for consideration in further updates. Finally when the overall need for employment land has been reassessed in the next draft of the Core Strategy, there may be further limited opportunities on sites currently in use or becoming surplus.

APPENDIX 1
TIMING OF SUPPLY BY SETTLEMENT CATEGORY

Table 4: Timing Of Supply – District Wide

	‘Deliverable Sites’	‘Developable Sites’				
	SHORT TERM 2011/12-2015/16	MEDIUM TERM 2016/17-2020/21	LONG TERM 2021/22-2028/9	TOTAL	RESIDUAL (post 2029)	TOTAL
Trajectory Total	8554	27432	13872	49858	3850	53708
Green Field	2319	16476	10845.5	29640.5	2801	32441.5
Mixed	858.5	2869	1644.5	5372	976	6348
PDL	5376.5	8087	1382	14845.5	73	14918.5
PDL Consolidated*	5806	9521.5	2204	17531.5	561	18092.5
PDL %	67.9	34.7	15.9	35.1	14.6	33.7
Suitable Now	8493	9708	1088.5	19289.5	73	19362.5
Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)	61	17477	12339.5	29877.5	3490	33367.5
Green Belt		8482.5	8378	16860.5	2246.5	19107
Other	61	8994.5	3961.5	13017	1243.5	14260.5
Potentially Suitable Physical Constraints		247	444	691	287	978

Table 5 : Timing Of Supply – Bradford Urban Area (Regional City)

	‘Deliverable Sites’	‘Developable Sites’		TOTAL	RESIDUAL (post 2029)	TOTAL
	SHORT TERM 2011/12-2015/16	MEDIUM TERM 2016/17-2020/21	LONG TERM 2021/22-2028/29			
Trajectory Total	5816	14160.5	7075	27051.5	3286	30337.5
Green Field	1215.5	6622.5	4659.5	12497.5	2237	14734.5
Mixed	243.5	1285	1380	2908.5	976	3884.5
PDL	4357	6253	1035.5	11645.5	73	11718.5
PDL Consolidated*	4479	6895.5	1725.5	13100	561	13661
PDL %	77	48.6	24.4	48.3	17.1	45
Suitable Now	5815	7010.5	785.5	13611	73	13684
Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)	1	6903	5845.5	12749.5	2926	15675.5
Green Belt		2190	3288	5478	1899	7377
Other	1	4713	2557.5	7271.5	1027	8298.5
Potentially Suitable Physical Constraints		247	444	691	287	978

Table 6 : Timing Of Supply – Principal Towns

	'Deliverable Sites'	'Developable Sites'		TOTAL	RESIDUAL (post 2029)	TOTAL
	SHORT TERM 2011/12-2015/16	MEDIUM TERM 2016/17-2020/21	LONG TERM 2021/22-2028/29			
Trajectory Total	1227.5	5102	2736	9065.5	153	9218.5
Green Field	355	2985.5	2128	5468.5	153	5621.5
Mixed	196.5	1043.5	261.5	1501.5		1501.5
PDL	676	1073	346.5	2095.5		2095.5
PDL Consolidated*	774.	1595	477	2846		2846
PDL %	63.1	31.3	17.4	31.4		30.9
Suitable Now	1227.5	1364.5	303	2895		2895
Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)		3737.5	2433	6170.5	153	6323.5
Green Belt		1638	2373	4011	153	4164
Other		2099.5	60	2159.5		2159.5
Potentially Suitable Physical Constraints						

Table 7 : Timing Of Supply – Local Growth centres

	'Deliverable Sites'	'Developable Sites'		TOTAL	RESIDUAL (post 2029)	TOTAL
	SHORT TERM 2011/12-2015/16	MEDIUM TERM 2016/17-2020/21	LONG TERM 2021/22-2028/29			
Trajectory Total	879	3992	2499.5	7370.5	411	7781.5
Green Field	601	3317.5	2496.5	6415	411	6826
Mixed	190	432	3	625		625
PDL	88	242.5		330.5		330.5
PDL Consolidated*	183	458.5	1.5	643		643
PDL %	20.8	11.5	0.6	8.8		8.5
Suitable Now	879	992.5	0	1871.5		1871.5
Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)		2999.5	2499.5	5499	411	5910
Green Belt		2102	1270	3372	194.5	3566.5
Other		897.5	1229.5	2127	216.5	2343.5
Potentially Suitable Physical Constraints						

Table 8 : Timing Of Supply – Local Service centres

	'Deliverable Sites'	'Developable Sites'		TOTAL	RESIDUAL (post 2029)	TOTAL
	SHORT TERM 2011/12-2015/16	MEDIUM TERM 2016/17-2020/21	LONG TERM 2021/22-2028/29			
Trajectory Total	631.5	4177.5	1561.5	6370.5		6370.5
Green Field	147.5	3550.5	1561.5	5259.5		5259.5
Mixed	228.5	108.5		337		337
PDL	255.5	518.5		774		774
PDL Consolidated*	369.75	572.75		942.5		942.5
PDL %	58.6	13.7		14.8		14.8
Suitable Now	571.5	340.5		912		912
Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)	60	3837	1561.5	5458.5		5458.5
Green Belt		2552.5	1447	3999.5		3999.5
Other	60	1284.5	114.5	1459		1459
Potentially Suitable Physical Constraints						

APPENDIX 2
SETTLEMENT SUMMARIES

Appendix 2A : CITY CENTRE

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	55	No of Green Field Sites	1	Short term units	821.5
Total gross Area (Ha)	25.70	No Of PDL Sites	30	Medium term units	1722.5
		Mixed PDL / Green Field		Long term units	208
Suitable Now	53				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	2	Total site area	15.15	Total potential units	2752
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	13.2
Unsuitable				RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

Of 55 sites, 31 are considered to have development potential and could deliver an overall increase in units to the market since the first SHLAA on only an additional 3 sites. The circumstances of other sites in the City may have changed to suggest that new homes would not be achievable, but this could change as the market in the city centre improves. There has been an increase in activity in the city and there are signs that this will steadily improve and may bring forward other opportunities which are not yet accommodated in the trajectory. Further detailed work on the City Centre Area Action Plan will inform future SHLAA updates.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

(Constrained, Unconstrained & Green Belt) *Including sites classified as 'Not Currently Developable' which are included in the trajectory

The following tables are very important as they will demonstrate on a district wide basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

CITY CENTRE	No of Sites (shlaa1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	30 (33)	(14.17)	2523 (2160.5)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	1(1)	(1.46)	229 (229)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites			

CITY CENTRE - Timing Of Supply - Suitability Split

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		172	821.5	649.5	1743	1722.5	-20.5	474.5	208	-266.5	2389.5	2752	362.5
	Suitable Now	172	821.5	649.5	1603	1557	-46	385.5	144.5	-241	2160.5	2523	362.5
	Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)				140	165.5	25.5	89	63.5	-25.5	229	229	0
	Green Belt												
	Other				140	165.5	25.5	89	63.5	-25.5	229	229	0
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											85	0	-85
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)												
	Green Belt												
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											2474.5	2752	277.5

CITY CENTRE - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'						TOTAL		
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM					
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	172	821.5	649.5	1743	1722.5	-20.5	474.5	208	-266.5	2389.5	2752	362.5
Green Field					52.5	52.5					52.5	52.5
Mixed												
PDL	172	821.5	649.5	1743	1670	-73	474.5	208	-266.5	2389.5	2699.5	310
PDL Consolidated*	172	821.5	649.5	1743	1670	-73	474.5	208	-266.5	2389.5	2699.5	310
PDL %	100	100	0	100	96.9	-3.1	100	100	0	100	98	-2
Total Residual Supply*										85	0	-85
Residual – GF												
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL										85		-85
Capacity Total										2474.5	2752	277.5

Nb: Short term in SHLAA1 equated to years1-6 (2009-14/15) in SHLAA 2 this equates to 1-5 years (2011-15/16)

Appendix 2B : CANAL ROAD CORRIDOR

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	19	No of Green Field Sites	5	Short term units	114.5
Total gross Area (Ha)	115.02	No Of PDL Sites	2	Medium term units	600
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	4	Long term units	1279.5
Suitable Now	7				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	10	Total site area	85.59	Total potential units	1994
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	40.2
Unsuitable	2			RESIDUAL TOTAL	1008

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

No new sites have been added to the SHLAA since the first draft, however there is a proportional increase in potential units of around 40%. This is principally due to the contribution of units to the 18 year trajectory formerly accommodated in the residual years. Overall however there is reduction in yield when combining both these totals since the last study. Further work investigating the potential of this corridor and master-planning work will further refine the overall number of units that could be generated from sites in the area with the expectation that on some sites the overall yield will be significantly lower to ensure the retention of some areas which are valuable for open space uses in all its guises.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

(Constrained, Unconstrained & Green Belt) *Including sites classified as 'Not Currently Developable' which are included in the trajectory

The following tables are very important as they will demonstrate on a district wide basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

CANAL ROAD CORRIDOR	No of Sites (shlaa1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	5 (5)	7.47 (7.78)	268 (180)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	6 (4)	78.12 (66.76)	1726 (961.5)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints	0	0	0
Unsuitable Sites	2 (3)	6.33 (8.17)	

CANAL ROAD CORRIDOR - Timing of supply – Suitability split

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		109.5	114.5	5	406	600	194	721.5	1279.5	558	1191.5	1994	802.5
	Suitable Now	109.5	114.5	5.0	166	153.5	-12.5				230	268	38
	Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)				240	446.5	206.5	721.5	1279.5	558	961.5	1726	764.5
	Green Belt												
	Other				240	446.5	206.5	721.5	1279.5	558	961.5	1726	764.5
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											2115	1008	-1107
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)										1927	1008	-919
	Green Belt												
	Other										1927	1008	-919
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											3306.5	3002	-304.5

CANAL ROAD CORRIDOR - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'						TOTAL		
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM					
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	109.5	114.5	5	360.5	600	239.5	721.5	1279.5	558	1191.5	1994	802.5
Green Field	69.5	69.5	0	69	102	33		317	317	147.5	488.5	341
Mixed				240	498	258	600	841	241	840	1339	499
PDL	40	45	5	42.5		-42.5	121.5	121.5	0	204	167	-37
PDL Consolidated*	40	45	5	462.5	249	-213.5	421.5	542	120.5	624	836.5	212.5
PDL %	36.5	39.3	2.8	45	41.5	-3.5	58.4	42.4	16	52.4	42	-10.4
Total Residual Supply*										2115	1008	-1107
Residual – GF										188	32	-156
Residual – Mixed										1927	976	-951
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										3306.5	3002	-304.5

Nb: Short term in SHLAA1 equated to years1-6 (2009-14/15) in SHLAA 2 this equates to 1-5 years (2011-15/16)

Appendix 2C: BRADFORD NORTH EAST

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	114	No of Green Field Sites	38	Short term units	1168
Total Area (Ha)	278.33	No Of PDL Sites	49	Medium term units	2592.5
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	7	Long term units	1135.5
Suitable Now	77				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	32	Total site area	212.97	Total potential units	4896
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)	1			% change since last SHLAA	9.3
Unsuitable	4			RESIDUAL TOTAL	304

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

33 new sites have been assessed in this SHLAA in addition to those considered in SHLAA1 equating to 13.27ha. Of these the majority are sites below 0.4ha meeting the revised site threshold of 0.20ha/6 units and have some existing planning backing, although there are a number of new sites submitted for consideration by landowners, the community or identified from site work. 2/3 of the sites assessed are considered to be *Suitable Now* and thus could come forward for development immediately subject to other local circumstances. Of the total potential yield the estimated forecast of units from suitable now sites in the trajectory is 2266 units and could make a realistic contribution toward new homes in the area. However, parts of the area suffer from weak market and in many cases the landowners intentions toward bringing forward development on some sites is unknown, consequently a large proportion of the units in this category do not appear in the first 5 years of the trajectory. The remaining 1/3 of sites in the trajectory are generally larger and have a greater capacity for bringing new homes to the market which make up the remaining total potential yield. 579 units are on sites currently protected as green belt in the RUDP.

38 greenfield sites appear in the trajectory which could make a total contribution of 2918.5 new homes, just over 2000 of these are on sites already identified for development in the RUDP or may have other open space allocations. The contribution of new homes from previously developed sites assessed so far, amounts to 1632 units which is a modest increase on the previous study, but with a reduction on the amount of units forecast to come forward in the short term given limited knowledge on owners intentions and poor market conditions at outlined above. This aside the contribution of new homes in the first 5 years on brownfield sites remains at over 60%. Intervention and support to landowners to bring development forward on previously developed sites will be carried into the Local Plan, to reduce the reliance on Greenfield sites where possible and new opportunities will continue to be assessed in Bradford North east considered already to be the most urban of all settlements in the Bradford Urban area.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a ‘local policy switched off’ approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

BRADFORD NORTH EAST	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	72 (46)	55.71 (52.73)	2266 (2227)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	25 (17)	135.96 (73.90)	2190 (2028)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints	1 (1)	21.30 (21.30)	440 (200)
Unsuitable Sites	4 (9)	47.81 (11.07)	

BRADFORD NORTH EAST - Timing of supply – Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		1211	1168	-43	1943.5	2593	649.5	1287.5	1135.5	-152	4442	4896	454
	Suitable Now	1142	1168	-26	919	1080	161	167	18	-149	2227	2266	39
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)	70	0	-70	1037	1392.5	355.5	1121	797.5	-323.5	2028	2190	162
	Green Belt					297	297	508	282	-226	508	579	71
	Other	70	0	-70	1037	1095.5	58.5	613	515.5	-97.5	1520	1611	91
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)					120	120	200	320	120	200	440	240
Residual Supply Total											670	304	-366
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)										128	17	-111
	Green Belt										19	0	-19
	Other										109	17	-92
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)										527	287	-240
Capacity Total											5112.5	5200	87.5

BRADFORD NORTH EAST - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	1211	1168	-43	1943.5	2592.5	649	1287.5	1135.5	-212	4442	4896	454
Green Field	363	367	4	1258	1473.5	215.5	1060	1078	18	2680	2918.5	238.5
Mixed	48	126	78	156	180	24	61	39.5	-21.5	265	345.5	80.5
PDL	801	675	-126	530.5	939	408.5	167	18	-149	1497.5	1632	134.5
PDL Consolidated*	825	738	-87	608.5	1029	420.5	198	37.75	-160.25	1630.25	1804.75	174.5
PDL %	68	63.1	-4.9	31.3	39.7	8.4	15	3	-12	36.7	36.9	0.2
Total Residual Supply*										670	304	-366
Residual – GF										655	304	-351
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL										15	0	-15
Capacity Total										5112.5	5200	87.5

Appendix 2D: BRADFORD NORTH WEST

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	83	No of Green Field Sites	31	Short term units	845.5
Total Area (Ha)	233.58	No Of PDL Sites	32	Medium term units	2102
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	3	Long term units	1244
Suitable Now	52				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	26	Total site area	142.62	Total potential units	4191.5
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	27.7
Unsuitable	5			RESIDUAL TOTAL	612

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

New sites added to the Bradford West Urban area could deliver a potential additional 1100 new homes over the trajectory since the last study, split almost equally between Greenfield and brownfield. Just over half of the additional units on previously developed land have planning permission or developer interest and could be delivered in the short term which equates to a 42% increase. 65 sites make up those which could come forward for development of these 48 are suitable now but equate to just under half the total number of units in the full trajectory and are principally on small infill sites. The largest sites in the area have policy constraints including green belt and in order for them to come forward there will need to be local changes in land designations. A further 612 units lie outside of the trajectory beyond year 18.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

(Constrained, Unconstrained & Green Belt) *Including sites classified as 'Not Currently Developable' which are included in the trajectory

The following tables are very important as they will demonstrate on a district wide basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

BRADFORD NORTH WEST	No of Sites (shlaa1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	48 (25)	39.89 (26.94)	2012.5 (1249)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	18 (13)	102.73 (93.48)	2179 (1742)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints	0 (1)	0 (1.00)	0 (41)
Unsuitable Sites	5 (5)	60.80 (51.84)	

BRADFORD NORTH WEST - Timing of Supply - Suitability Assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		590	845.5	255.5	1617	2102	485	825	1244	419	3032	4191.5	1159.5
	Suitable Now	495	844.5	349.5	372	1126	754	0	42	42	1249	2012.5	763.5
	Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	54	1	-53	863	976	113	825	1202	377	1742	2179	437
	Green Belt	0	0	0	486	571	85	679	815.5	136.5	1165	1386.5	221.5
	Other	54	1	-53	377	405	28	146	386.5	240.5	577	792.5	215.5
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)	41	0	-41	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	0	-41
Residual Supply Total											768	612	-156
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)										768	612	-156
	Green Belt											610	610
	Other											2	2
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											3799.5	4803.5	1004

BRADFORD NORTH WEST - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	590	845.5	255.5	1617	2102	485	825	1244	419	3032	4191.5	1159.5
Green Field	184	216.5	32.5	1053	1323	270	825	1082	257	2061	2621.5	560.5
Mixed	56	29	-27	7	42	35	0	120	120	63	191	128
PDL	350	600	250	557	737	180	0	42	42	908	1379	471
PDL Consolidated*	378	614.5	236.5	561	758	197	0	102	102	940	1474.5	534.5
PDL %	64	72.6	8.6	35	36	1	0	8	8	31	34.7	3.7
Total Residual Supply*										768	612	-156
Residual – GF										768	612	-156
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										3799.5	4803.5	1004

Appendix 2E: BRADFORD SOUTH EAST

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	118	No of Green Field Sites	39	Short term units	1387.5
Total Area (Ha)	286.32	No Of PDL Sites	53	Medium term units	2960.5
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	9	Long term units	970
Suitable Now	72				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	40	Total site area	112.66	Total potential units	5318
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)	1			% change since last SHLAA	26.6
Unsuitable	5			RESIDUAL TOTAL	1289

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

The Bradford South east trajectory contains an additional 1400 additional units since the first SHLAA. A proportion of these are in greenbelt locations principally on the edge of the Holme Wood estate on sites that have come forward from landowners on the back of press coverage and local consultation on the Holme Wood Neighbourhood Plan. Given the scale and complexity of some of these sites it is envisaged that if green belt changes are made that new homes will not start to be delivered until the latter part of the trajectory. A further 1200 new homes are outside of the trajectory which demonstrates the relative size of these sites and the length of time it would take to completely build them out. A number of other new sites are in Greenfield locations but are constrained by other policy allocations such as areas of open space in the urban area but do represent opportunities to better use land in the urban area which may be underused for sport and recreation. Other new sites in this SHLAA are on land which has been previously used for development in the past but this is a limited supply often under pressure for other urban uses and this is born out by a minimal increase in the number of potential units that would be considered to be suitable for residential development in all but the short term period.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

(Constrained, Unconstrained & Green Belt) *Including sites classified as 'Not Currently Developable' which are included in the trajectory

The following tables are very important as they will demonstrate on a district wide basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

BRADFORD SOUTH EAST	No of Sites (shlaa1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	62 (47)	69.56 (64.46)	2522 (2731.5)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	38 (19)	140.10 (42.65)	2669 (1174.5)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints	1 (2)	4.85 (5.55)	127 (129)
Unsuitable Sites	5 (5)	62.97 (7.34)	

BRADFORD SOUTH EAST - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		1169.5	1387.5	218	2258	2960.5	702.5	478.5	970	491.5	3906	5318	1412
	Suitable Now	1090	1387.5	297.5	1520	1065.5	-454.5	121.5	69	-52.5	2731.5	2522	-209.5
	Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	79.5	0	-79.5	738	1768	1030	357	901	544	1174.5	2669	1494.5
	Green Belt	0	0	0	339.5	664.5	325	336	882.5	546.5	678	1547	869
	Other	79.5	0	0	399.5	1103.5	704	21	18.5	-2.5	479	1122	643
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)	0	0	0	0	127	127	0	0	0	0	127	127
Residual Supply Total											9	1289	1280
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)										9	1289	1280
	Green Belt										9	1289	1280
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											3915	6607	2692

BRADFORD SOUTH EAST - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	1169.5	1387.5	218	2258	2960.5	702.5	478.5	970	491.5	3906	5318	1412
Green Field	289	318	29	1052.5	1624	571.5	338.5	951.5	533	1680	2893.5	1213.5
Mixed	57	45.5	-11.5	120	242	122	18.5	18.5	0	195.5	306	110.5
PDL	823.5	1024	200.5	1085.5	1094.5	9	121.5	0	-121.5	2030.5	2118.5	88.5
PDL Consolidated*	852	1046.75	194.75	1145.5	1215.5	70	130.75	9.25	-121.5	2128	2262	134
PDL %	73	75.4	2.4	51	41	-10	27	1	-26	54.5	43.2	-11.3
Total Residual Supply*										9	1289	1280
Residual – GF										9	1289	1280
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										3915	6607	2692

Nb: Short term in SHLAA1 equated to years1-6 (2009-14/15) in SHLAA 2 this equates to 1-5 years (2011-15/16)

Appendix 2F: BRADFORD SOUTH WEST

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	106	No of Green Field Sites	44	Short term units	994
Total Area (Ha)	184.69	No Of PDL Sites	42	Medium term units	3413
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	6	Long term units	1700
Suitable Now	62				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	41	Total site area	167.39	Total potential units	6107
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	29.9
Unsuitable	3			RESIDUAL TOTAL	73

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

1800 additional potential new homes have been added to the trajectory for this part of the urban area representing a 29.9% increase in units with 92 sites in the trajectory from 37 in the first SHLAA. Most of this increase is on new sites which fall in the suitable now category and could be delivered with a successful planning permission from the first period. A third of the overall increase has policy constraints including green belt. The majority of new units are forecasted to be developable from the middle period of the trajectory and this total is split almost equally between those on sites which have policy constraints and those which do not with 47% on sites that have been developed previously. The challenge in this settlement is to ensure that previously developed sites are brought forward for new residential development and other new opportunities are fully considered to reduce the pressure on green belt.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

(Constrained, Unconstrained & Green Belt) *Including sites classified as 'Not Currently Developable' which are included in the trajectory

The following tables are very important as they will demonstrate on a district wide basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

BRADFORD SOUTH WEST	No of Sites (shlaa1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	55 (31)	70.09 (53.48)	3280 (2047.5)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	37 (26)	97.30 (75.07)	2827 (2106)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints	0 (2)	0 (3.52)	0 (129)
Unsuitable Sites	3 (0)	2.51 (0)	

BRADFORD SOUTH WEST - Timing of Supply – Suitability Assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		820	994	144	2668.5	3413	744.5	793.5	1700	906.5	4282	6107	1825
	Suitable Now	683	994	281	1245.5	1774	480	119	512	393	2047.5	3280	1232.5
	Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	137	0	-137	1294	1639	345	675	1188	513	2106	2827	721
	Green Belt				258.5	518	259.5	508	1035	527	766	1553	787
	Other	137	0	-137	1035.5	1121	85.5	167.5	153	-14.5	1304.5	1274	-30.5
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)				129						129		-129
Residual Supply Total											97	73	-24
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)										97		-97
	Green Belt										96	0	-96
	Other										1		-1
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											4379	6180	1801

BRADFORD SOUTH WEST - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	820	994	174	2668.5	3413	744.5	793.5	1700	907	4282	6107	1825
Green Field	327	236.5	-90.5	1414	1732	318	518.5	958	439.5	2259.5	2926.5	667
Mixed	77	43	-34	230	149.5	-80.5	192	220	28	499	412.5	-86.5
PDL	416	714.5	298.5	1024.5	1531.5	507	83	522	439	1523.5	2768	1244.5
PDL Consolidated*	454.5	736	281.5	1139.5	1606.25	466.75	179	612	433	1773	2974.25	1201.25
PDL %	55.4	74	18.6	42.7	47	4.3	22.6	36.8	14.2	41.4	48.7	1.3
Total Residual Supply*										97	73	-24
Residual – GF										75	0	-75
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL										22	73	51
Capacity Total										4379	6180	1801

Nb: Short term in SHLAA1 equated to years1-6 (2009-14/15) in SHLAA 2 this equates to 1-5 years (2011-15/16)

Appendix 2G: SHIPLEY

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	38	No of Green Field Sites	9	Short term units	485
Total Area (Ha)	53.09	No Of PDL Sites	2	Medium term units	770
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	17	Long term units	538
Suitable Now	20				1793
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	13	Total site area	44.74	Total potential units	
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)	4			% change since last SHLAA	14.4
Unsuitable	1			RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

9 additional sites appear in the Shipley trajectory since the 1st SHLAA, resulting in a potential increase in new homes in the area of 258. Of these, over 80% are on sites which have been previously developed and are suitable now, a small proportion are on Greenfield sites. The 17 year average PDL contribution in the Shipley settlement based on the sites included remains proportionally high at 58% with almost all units in the short term period expected to be delivered on this type of land. Other opportunities may still arise and become deliverable sooner following more detailed assessment being undertaken in the Shipley and Canal Road Corridor Area Action Plan. There is very little change in the number of units on Greenfield sites, however they remain a valid source of potential future supply at around 1/3 of the total potential total.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

(Constrained, Unconstrained & Green Belt) *Including sites classified as 'Not Currently Developable' which are included in the trajectory

The following tables are very important as they will demonstrate on a district wide basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

SHIPLEY	No of Sites (shlaa1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	18 (6)	13.61 (8.35)	739.5 (425)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	9 (10)	27.50 (21.93)	929.5 (668)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints	1(3)	3.63 (10.19)	124 (442)
Unsuitable Sites	1 (1)	1.56 (1.56)	

SHIPLEY - Timing Of Supply – Suitability Assessment

		SHORT TERM average Years 1-5			MEDIUM TERM average Years 6-10			LONG TERM average Years 11-17			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		376	485	109	553	770	217	605	538	-67	1535	1793	258
	Suitable Now	234	485	251	191	254.5	63.5				425	739.5	314.5
	Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	142		-142	363	515.5	152.5	163	414	39	668	929.5	261.5
	Green Belt				121.5	139.5		163	273	110	285	412.5	127.5
	Other	142		-142	241	376			141	141	383	517	134
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)							442	124	-318	442	124	-318
Residual Supply Total											86	0	-86
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)										14		
	Green Belt												
	Other										14		
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)										72		
Capacity Total											1621	1793	172

SHIPLEY - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	376	485	109	553	770	217	605	538	-67	1535	1793	258
Green Field		8	8	290	315.5	25.5	293	273	-20	583	597	14
Mixed				54	173.5	119.5	188	141	-47	242	315	73
PDL	376	477	101	210	281	71	124	124	0	710	882	172
PDL Consolidated*	376	477	101	237	367.75	130.75	218	194.5	-23.5	832	1039.5	207.5
PDL %	100	98.47	-1.6	43	47.8	4.8	36	36.2	0.2	54	58	4
Total Residual Supply*										80	0	-86
Residual – GF										14		-14
Residual – Mixed										72		-72
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										1621	1793	172

Nb: Short term in SHLAA1 equated to years1-6 (2009-14/15) in SHLAA 2 this equates to 1-5 years (2011-15/16)

Appendix 2H: KEIGHLEY

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY Units	
Total No Of Sites	116	No of Green Field Sites	37	Short term units	763.5
Total Area (Ha)	236.71	No Of PDL Sites	34	Medium term units	3243
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	15	Long term units	1226.5
Suitable Now	53				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	53	Total site area (ha)	169.54	Total potential units	5233
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)	1			% change in yield since last SHLAA	14.8%
Unsuitable	9			RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

29 additional sites have been assessed in this SHLAA review amounting to 33.64ha. One of these new sites is considered to be and unsuitable geographical location away from the main urban area, the rest have been further assessed, with some making a contribution to the trajectory in terms of new potential homes. 31.5 % of potential is on sites considered to be suitable now including land identified for new housing in the RUDP or sites in mixed use areas or unallocated, the largest proportion falling within the medium term period because of unknown owner intentions and the presence of other constraints prohibiting their early deliverability. The majority of such sites are previously developed which makes up a total proportion of 35.4% of units.

Keighley has a large number of Safeguarded Land opportunities which given their policy allocation have been placed in the medium term of the trajectory, however like the successful appeal at North Dean Avenue could come forward sooner, subject to a successful planning application and, around 1000 units could be delivered from these sites. A similar number of potential new homes could also be delivered from land currently protected as green belt in the RUDP. 67.17ha of land is currently considered to be either unsuitable or unfeasible for residential use within the period of the trajectory but could equally be given further consideration after more detailed examination of all sites in the study.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

(Constrained, Unconstrained & Green Belt) *Including sites classified as 'Not Currently Developable' which are included in the trajectory

The following tables are very important as they will demonstrate on a district wide basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

KEIGHLEY	No of Sites (shlaa1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	47 (29)	51.48 (33.81)	1656.5 (1274)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	39 (28)	118.06 (88.91)	3576.5 (2701)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints	0(7)	0 (17.66)	0 (485)
Unsuitable Sites	7 (6)	35.85 (36.38)	

KEIGHLEY - Timing Of Supply and Suitability Assessment

		SHORT TERM average Years 1-5			MEDIUM TERM average Years 6-10			LONG TERM average Years 11-17			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		778.5	763.5	-15	2553.5	3243	689.5	1128	1226.5	98.5	4460	5233	773
	Suitable Now	678.5	763.5	85	595.5	893	297.5	0	0	0	1274	1656.5	
	Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	100		-100	1698.5	2350	651.5	902.5	1226.5	324	2701	3576.5	875.5
	Green Belt				574	574	0	398	1166.5	768.5	1032	1740.5	708.5
	Other	100		-100	1124.5	1776	651.5	504.5	60	-444.5	1669	1836	167
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)	0	0	0	259.5	0	-259.5	225.5	0	-225.5	485	0	-485
Residual Supply Total											33	0	-33
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)												
	Green Belt										8	0	-8
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											4494	5233	740

KEIGHLEY - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	778.5	763.5	-15	2553.5	3243	689.5	1128	1226.5	98.5	4460	5233	773
Green Field	272	254	-18	1222.5	1557	334.5	547.5	908.5	361	2042	2719.5	677.5
Mixed	250	185	-65	884.5	1043.5	159	345	91	-254	1478.5	1319.5	-159
PDL	256.5	324.5	68	446.5	642.5	196	236.5	227	-9.5	939.5	1194	254.5
PDL Consolidated*	381.5	417	35.5	888.75	1164.25	275.5	409	272.5	-136.5	1679	1853.75	174.75
PDL %	49	54.6	5.6	34.8	36	1.2	36.3	22.2	-14.1	37.7	35.4	-2.3
Total Residual Supply*										33	0	-33
Residual – GF										8	0	-8
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL										25	0	-25
Capacity Total										4493	5233	740

Nb: Short term in SHLAA1 equated to years1-6 (2009-14/15) in SHLAA 2 this equates to 1-5 years (2011-15/16)

Appendix 2I: ILKLEY

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY Units	
Total No Of Sites	34	No of Green Field Sites	10	Short term units	183.5
Total Area (Ha)	114.52	No Of PDL Sites	11	Medium term units	937.5
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	1	Long term units	515.5
Suitable Now	14				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	12	Total site area (ha)	63.82	Total potential units	1636.5
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)	0			% change in yield since last SHLAA	51.2
Unsuitable	8			RESIDUAL TOTAL	153

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

34 sites have been analysed in this SHLAA, an increase of 10. Of the 34, 22 are considered to be deliverable or developable and have been placed in the trajectory which is more than a 100% increase on SHLAA 1. Of note, is the increase in sites considered to be Suitable Now which has increased from 6 to 14, which is principally are result of the addition of small sites with planning permission, too small to be included in the first study principally on previously developed sites exhibiting a 20% increase in the first period. The total potential development yield from sites in the Ilkley settlement has also significantly increased. The principal reason for this is the inclusion in the trajectory of the large site to the east side of the town, excluded from the totals in the last study. It has been included in this SHLAA to allow full assessment of the theoretical contribution the site could make should a change to the green belt in this location be considered now the proposed partial use of the site for a replacement secondary has been placed in hold until new funding is available. The trajectory shows increases across all time periods and now displays a long term potential of 515.5 average unit that could be delivered from year 11 onwards with 1636.5 total average. Of concern is the fact that 4/5 of this potential yield is from sites with policy constraints including sites within the current RUDP greenbelt (77%) however a number of such sites are in sustainable locations within and on the edge of the settlement and could

deliver valuable local facilities alongside new affordable homes.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

(Constrained, Unconstrained & Green Belt) **Including sites classified as 'Not Currently Developable' which are included in the trajectory*

The following tables are very important as they will demonstrate on a district wide basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

ILKLEY	No of Sites (shlaa1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	13 (4)	6.96 (3.3)	264 (105)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	9 (7)	63.18(24.83)	1372.5 (686)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints	0		
Unsuitable Sites	8 (7)	44.07 (40.10)	

ILKLEY - Timing Of Supply - Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		150	183.5	33.5	641	937.5	296.5		515.5	515.5	790.5	1636.5	846
	Suitable Now	84	183.5	99.5	21	80.5	59.5				105	264	159
	Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	66		-66	620	857	237		515.5	515.5	686	1372.5	686.5
	Green Belt				587.5	762.5	175		515.5	515.5	588	1278	690
	Other	66		-66	32.5	94.5	62				98	94.5	-3.5
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total												153	153
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)											153	153
	Green Belt											153	153
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											790.5	1789.5	999

ILKLEY - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'						TOTAL		
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM					
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	149.5	183.5	34	641	937.5	296.5		515.5	515.5	790.5	1636.5	846
Green Field	40	7	-33	583	825	242		345	345	623	1177	544
Mixed				37		-37		170.5	170.5	37	170.5	133.5
PDL	109.5	176.5	67	21	112.5	91.5				130.5	289	158.5
PDL Consolidated*	109.5	176.5	67	40	112.5	72.5		85.25	85.25	150	374.75	224.75
PDL %	73	93.2	20.2	6	12	6		16.5	16.5	19	22.9	3.9
Total Residual Supply*											153	153
Residual – GF											153	153
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										790.5	1789.5	999

Nb: Short term in SHLAA1 equated to years1-6 (2009-14/15) in SHLAA 2 this equates to 1-5 years (2011-15/16)

Appendix 2J: BINGLEY

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY Units	
Total No Of Sites	46	No of Green Field Sites	16	Short term units	280.5
Total Area (Ha)	101.25	No Of PDL Sites	19	Medium term units	921.5
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	1	Long term units	994
Suitable Now	21				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	18	Total site area (ha)	70.80ha	Total potential units	2196
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change in yield since last SHLAA	26.8
Unsuitable	7			RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

Bingley has a potential yield of almost 1000 units that could be delivered from sites considered to be suitable now, a number of these are new sites with planning approval and are new to this SHLAA and represents an 18.6% increase. This includes the Sty Lane housing site which could be delivered once suitable access is agreed. The remaining potential yield is from sites currently protected from housing development in the RUDP the large majority being green belt sites. 7 sites are considered to be unsuitable and together with other sites considered to be unfeasible amounts to 30.45ha of land where residential development would not be appropriate. Since SHLAA1 a further 589units have been identified in the trajectory. This figure accounts for a number of additional vacant sites including the Bingley Auction Mart site and neighbouring “Coolgardie” which are currently identified for employment uses in the RUDP but will increase the amount of previously developed land available for residential use if the allocation is changed but also a large proportion is from new and existing green belt sites where circumstances may have changed since the first assessment.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

(Constrained, Unconstrained & Green Belt) *Including sites classified as 'Not Currently Developable' which are included in the trajectory

The following tables are very important as they will demonstrate on a district wide basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

BINGLEY	No of Sites (shlaa1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	21 (9)	29.97 (22.23)	974.5
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	15 (7)	40.83 (32.56)	1221.5
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			0
Unsuitable Sites	7 (3)	17.23 (7.32)	

BINGLEY - Timing Of Supply and Suitability Assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		208	280.5	72.5	954.5	921.5	-33	444.5	994	549.5	1607	2196	589
	Suitable Now	208	280.5	72.5	454	391	-63	131	303	172	793	974.5	181.5
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)				501	530.5	29.5	314	691	377	815	1221.5	406.5
	Green Belt				235	301.5	66.5	314	691	377	549	992.5	443.5
	Other				266	229	-37				266	229	-37
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											91		-91
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)												
	Green Belt										78	0	-78
	Other										13		-13
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											1698	2196	-72

BINGLEY - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	208	280.5	72.5	954.5	921.5	-33	444.5	994	549.5	1607	2196	589
Green Field	84	94	10	740.5	603.5	-137	444.5	874.5	430	1269	1572	303
Mixed		11.5	11.5								11.5	11.5
PDL	124	175	51	214	318	104	0	119.5	119.5	338	612.5	274.5
PDL Consolidated*	124	180.75	56.75	214	318	104	0	119.5	119.5	338	618.25	280.25
PDL %	60	64.4	4.4	22	34.5	12.5	0	12	12	21	28.1	7.1
Total Residual Supply*										91	0	-91
Residual – GF										91	0	-91
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										1698	2196	498

Nb: Short term in SHLAA1 equated to years1-6 (2009-14/15) in SHLAA 2 this equates to 1-5 years (2011-15/16)

Appendix 2K: BURLEY IN WHARFEDALE

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY Units	
Total No Of Sites	12	No of Green Field Sites	7	Short term units	0
Total Area (Ha)	41.40	No Of PDL Sites	3	Medium term units	746.5
		Mixed PDL / Green Field		Long term units	347.5
Suitable Now	1				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	11	Total site area (ha)	40.22	Total potential units	1094
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change in yield since last SHLAA	49.2%
Unsuitable				RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

An additional 4 new sites have been considered in Burley since the last SHLAA and one has dropped out as it is now fully developed. Of these 2 are opportunities on previously developed land and buildings and 2 are Greenfield locations. In addition to these sites an existing site BU/001 has been enlarged in size with a potential yield of 392 units which combined suggests that there could be an available land capacity in the village for the construction of around 1000 new homes. No sites in the settlement are considered to be immediately available for development and this includes both previously developed sites which lies in the adopted green belt. Although policy constraints aside both sites, Greenholme Mills and the Moor Lane Resource centre offer good redevelopment potential subject to the needs of other uses in the area. The majority of other sites in the village are on Greenfield sites in the green belt but on many there are few unresolvable constraints to prohibit their longer term development.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

(Constrained, Unconstrained & Green Belt) *Including sites classified as 'Not Currently Developable' which are included in the trajectory

The following tables are very important as they will demonstrate on a district wide basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

BURLEY IN WHARFEDALE	No of Sites (shlaa1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	0 (1)	0 (0.54)	0 (29)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	10 (6)	40.22 (22.56)	1094 (527)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites			

BURLEY IN WHARFEDALE - Timing Of Supply – Suitability Assessment

	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	64	0	-64	239.5	746.5	507	252.5	347.5	95	556	1094	538
Suitable Now	29		-29							29	0	-29
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	35		-35	239.5	746.5	507	252.5	347.5	95	527	1094	567
Green Belt	35		-35	239.5	670.5	431	252.5	347.5	95	527	1018	491
Other					76	76					76	76
Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total										77	0	-77
Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)										77		-77
Green Belt										77		-77
Other												
Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total										632.5	1094	461.5

BURLEY IN WHARFEDALE - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	64		-64	239.5	746.5	507	252.5	347.5	95	556	1094	538
Green Field				239.5	623.5	384	252.5	347.5	95	492	971	479
Mixed	29		-29							29		-29
PDL	35		-35		123	123				35	123	88
PDL Consolidated*	50		-50		123	123				50	123	73
PDL %	78		0		16	16				9	11	2
Total Residual Supply*										77	0	-77
Residual – GF										77		-77
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										632.5	1094	461.5

Nb: Short term in SHLAA1 equated to years1-6 (2009-14/15) in SHLAA 2 this equates to 1-5 years (2011-15/16)

Appendix 2L: MENSTON

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY Units	
Total No Of Sites	15	No of Green Field Sites	7	Short term units	150
Total Area (Ha)	95.18	No Of PDL Sites	3	Medium term units	695.5
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	3	Long term units	313
Suitable Now	7				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	6	Total site area (ha)	42.12	Total potential units	1158.5
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change in yield since last SHLAA	36.2
Unsuitable	2			RESIDUAL TOTAL	8

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

13 sites in Menston are considered to have development potential and could deliver homes within the trajectory period this includes new sites assessed since the last SHLAA and include sites with planning permission and new sites in the green belt making a total change of 419. Overall the majority of new homes could come forward from sites that are presently Greenfield and this includes sites that are considered to be suitable now and makes up 35% of the overall potential supply.

As before a significant proportion of the land assessed in the study has been deemed to be unsuitable for residential development.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

(Constrained, Unconstrained & Green Belt) *Including sites classified as 'Not Currently Developable' which are included in the trajectory

The following tables are very important as they will demonstrate on a district wide basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

MENSTON	No of Sites (shlaa1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	7 (2)	13.49 (11.66)	400.5 (306)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	6 (4)	28.63 (23.58)	758 (434)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites	2 (2)	53.06 (53.06)	

MENSTON - Timing Of Supply – Suitability

		SHORT TERM average Years 1-5			MEDIUM TERM average Years 6-10			LONG TERM average Years 11-17			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		90	150	60	449.5	695.5	246	200	313	113	739.5	1158.5	419
	Suitable Now	90	150	60	216	250.5	34.5				306	400.5	94.5
	Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)				233.5	445	211.5	200	313	113	434	758	324
	Green Belt				233.5	445	211.5	200	313	113	434	758	324
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											195	8	-187
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)										195	8	-187
	Green Belt										195	8	-187
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											934.5	1166.5	232

MENSTON - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	90	150	60	449.5	695.5	246	200	313	113	739.5	1158.5	419
Green Field	90	110	20	449.5	654	204.5	200	313	113	739.5	1077	337.5
Mixed		33	33		30	30					63	63
PDL		7	7		11.5	11.5					18.5	18.5
PDL Consolidated*		23.5	23.5		26.5	26.5					50	50
PDL %		16	16		4	4					4	4
Total Residual Supply*										195	8	-197
Residual – GF										195	8	-197
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										934.5	1166.5	232

Nb: Short term in SHLAA1 equated to years1-6 (2009-14/15) in SHLAA 2 this equates to 1-5 years (2011-15/16)

Appendix 2M: QUEENSBURY

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	26	No of Green Field Sites	16	Short term units	254.5
Total Area (Ha)	67.12	No Of PDL Sites	2	Medium term units	895
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	3	Long term units	411.5
Suitable Now	10				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	13	Total site area	60.59ha	Total potential units	1561
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	32.5
Unsuitable	3			RESIDUAL TOTAL	186.5

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

7 additional sites have been assessed in this update since the first SHLAA resulting in a potential additional yield across the trajectory 507 units (32.57%) as well as a further 186.5 outside of the trajectory period. Of these potential units the largest majority are on Greenfield and green belt sites, which has resulted in a net decrease in the brownfield percentage in the settlement.

511 units are on sites without policy constraints and could be delivered immediately although owners intentions on some sites will delay their availability to the market. Further development capacity in the settlement will predominantly be on land allocated for other uses in the RUDP and this includes green belt.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

QUEENSBURY	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	9 (6)	16.03 (15.38)	511.5 (468.5)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	12 (7)	44.56 (36.54)	1050 (585.5)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites	3 (2)	5.49 (3.03)	

QUEENSBURY - Timing of supply - Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		193.5	254.5	61	560	895	335	300.5	411.5	111	1054	1561	507
Suitable Now		193.5	254.5	61	274	234.5	-39.5				468.5	489	20.5
Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)					285	660.5	353	300.5	411.5	111	585.5	1072	464.5
Green Belt					132	475	343	275	411.5	136.5	407	886.5	408
Other					153	185.5	32.5	25.5	0	-25.5	178.5	185.5	7
Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)													
Residual Supply Total											406	186.5	-219.5
Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)											406	186.5	-219.5
Green Belt											406	186.5	-219.5
Other													
Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)													
Capacity Total											1460	1747.5	287.5

QUEENSBURY - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'						TOTAL		
	SHORT TERM average Years 1-5			MEDIUM TERM average Years 6-10			LONG TERM average Years 11-17					
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	193.5	254.5	61	560	895	335	300.5	411.5	111	1054	1561	507
Green Field	96.5	116.5	20	321.5	688	366.5	300.5	411.5	111	718.5	1216	497.5
Mixed	50	97	47	238.5	205	-33.5				288.5	302	13.5
PDL	47	41	-6		2	2				47	43	-4
PDL Consolidated*	72	89.5	17.5	119.25	104.5	-14.75				191.25	194	2.75
PDL %	37.2	35.2	-2	21.3	11.7	-9.6				18.1	12.4	-5.7
Total Residual Supply*										406	186.5	-219.5
Residual – GF										406	186.5	-219.5
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										1460	1747.5	287.5

Appendix 2N: SILSDEN

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	15	No of Green Field Sites	12	Short term units	123.5
Total Area (Ha)	88.76	No Of PDL Sites		Medium term units	641
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	1	Long term units	1044.5
Suitable Now	4				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	10	Total site area	76.60	Total potential units	1769
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	12
Unsuitable	1			RESIDUAL TOTAL	216.5

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

412 potential units appeared in the residual capacity for the Silsden area in the first SHLAA in comparison to 216.5 which appear in this update. This has had the result of making a small increase in the amount of new homes that could be delivered before 2028. A small proportion of new homes could come from sites which are considered to be suitable now but the majority are on sites currently allocated as either Safeguarded Land or green belt from the medium period. 93% of new homes on sites considered in this SHLAA would be from Greenfield sites, where other highway and constraints will involve significant improvements to be made to local infrastructure to be undertaken before and during delivery of homes in this area. There is limited potential at present from recycled land, although new sites may still come forward in time from windfall land opportunities.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

SILSDEN	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	3 (4)	7.87 (7.35)	263 (285)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	10 (9)	68.73 (64.21)	1546 (1307)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites	1 (11.48)		

SILSDEN - Timing of supply and Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		145.5	123.5	-22	469	641	172	978	1044.5	66.5	1592	1809	217
	Suitable Now	145.5	123.5	-22	140	139.5	-0.5				285	263	-22
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)				330	501.5	171.5	978	1044.5	66.5	1307	1546	239
	Green Belt				46.5	138.5	92	36		-36	83	138.5	55.5
	Other				283	363	80	941.5	1044.5	103	1224.5	1408	183.5
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											412	216.5	-195.5
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)										400	216.5	-183.5
	Green Belt												
	Other										400	216.5	-183.5
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											2004	2025.5	21.5

SILSDEN - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	145.5	123.5	-22	469	641	172	978	1044.5	66.5	1592	1809	217
Green Field	63	63.5	0.5	408	580	172	978	1044.5	66.5	1449	1688	239
Mixed	60	60	0	61	61	0				121	121	0
PDL	22		-22							22		-22
PDL Consolidated*	52	30	22	31	30.5	-0.5				83	60.5	22.5
PDL %	36	24	12	6	5	-1		0		8	3.3	-4.7
Total Residual Supply*										412	216.5	-195.5
Residual – GF										400	216.5	-183.5
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL										12		-12
Capacity Total										2004	2025.5	21.5

Appendix 20: STEETON

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	14	No of Green Field Sites	8	Short term units	155.5
Total Area (Ha)	57.20	No Of PDL Sites	2	Medium term units	461
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	1	Long term units	268
Suitable Now	4				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	9	Total site area	29.71	Total potential units	884.5
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	9%
Unsuitable	1			RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

Steeton still has existing undeveloped sites including Halsteads Way which has planning permission. 2 additional small sites have increased the potential yield in the settlement since the last SHLAA and this has helped to marginally improve the brownfield contribution of new units on previously developed land to 8% from 1% meaning the significant number of new homes being on Greenfield land as there are limited opportunities in the village. The key employer in the village is the hospital and new homes to meet the needs of key workers are likely to continue to be reliant on Greenfield sites.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

STEETON	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	4 (4)	8.1 (8.13)	293.5 (267)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	7 (5)	21.61 (20.15)	591 (538)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites	1 (1)	26.57 (26.57)	

STEETON - Timing of supply and Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM average Years 1-5			MEDIUM TERM average Years 6-10			LONG TERM average Years 11-17			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		95.5	155.5	60	396	461	65	314	268	-46	805.5	884.5	79
	Suitable Now	91.5	155.5	64	175.5	138	-37.5				267	293.5	26.5
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)	4		-4	220.5	323	102.5	314	268	-46	538	591	53
	Green Belt				57	145.5	88.5	187	83	-104	244	228.5	-15.5
	Other	4		-4	163.5	177.5	14	127	185	58	294	362.5	68.5
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											16	0	-16
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)										16		-16
	Green Belt										16		-16
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											821.5	884.5	63

STEETON - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'						TOTAL		
	SHORT TERM average Years 1-5			MEDIUM TERM average Years 6-10			LONG TERM average Years 11-17					
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	95.5	155.5	60	396	461	65	314	268	-46	805.5	884.5	79
Green Field	86.5	146.5	60	396	364.5	-31.5	229.5	265	35.5	712	776	64
Mixed					81	81	84	3	-81	84	84	0
PDL	9	9	0		15.5	15.5				9	24.5	15.5
PDL Consolidated*	9	9	0		56	56		1.5	1.5	9	66.5	57.5
PDL %	9.4	6	-3.4		12	12		0.6	0.6	1.1	8	6.9
Total Residual Supply*										16	0	-16
Residual – GF										16		-16
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										821.5	884.5	63

Appendix 2P: THORNTON

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	21	No of Green Field Sites	16	Short term units	195.5
Total Area (Ha)	30.16	No Of PDL Sites	4	Medium term units	553
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	1	Long term units	1115
Suitable Now	11				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	10	Total site area	30.16 ha	Total potential units	863.5
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	11%
Unsuitable				RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

5 additional sites were considered in the update of the SHLAA which serve to make a modest increase in total potential yield in the settlement. Around half of the units are on sites that are suitable now in the main from sites identified for development in the RUDP. The remainder are mostly green belt locations on the edges of the settlement.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

THORNTON	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	11 (7)	14.75 (13.28)	425.5 (490.5)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	10 (7)	15.41 (11.89)	438 (328)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites			

THORNTON - Timing of supply and Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM average Years 1-5			MEDIUM TERM average Years 6-10			LONG TERM average Years 11-17			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		159.5	195.5	36	452.5	553	100.5	156	115	-41	768	863.5	95.5
	Suitable Now	159.5	195.5	36	281	230	-51				490.5	425.5	-65
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)				171.5	323	151.5	156	115	-41	328	438	110
	Green Belt				116.5	227.5	111	116	115	-1	232	342.5	110.5
	Other				55	95.5	40.5	40	0	-40	96	95.5	-0.5
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											0	0	
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)												
	Green Belt												
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											768	863.5	95.5

THORNTON - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'						TOTAL		
	SHORT TERM average Years 1-5			MEDIUM TERM average Years 6-10			LONG TERM average Years 11-17					
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	159.5	195.5	36	452.5	553	100.5	156	115	-41	768	863.5	95.5
Green Field	141.5	164.5	23	322	407.5	85.5	156	115	-41	619.5	687	67.5
Mixed				55	55	0				55	55	0
PDL	18	31	13	75.5	90.5	15				93.5	121.5	28
PDL Consolidated*	18	31	13	103	118	15				121	149	28
PDL %	1.1	15.9	14.8	22.8	21.3	-1.5				15.8	17.3	1.5
Total Residual Supply*												
Residual – GF												
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										768	863.5	95.5

Appendix 2Q: ADDINGHAM

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	17	No of Green Field Sites	15	Short term units	0
Total Area (Ha)	45.21	No Of PDL Sites		Medium term units	921.5
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	1	Long term units	231.5
Suitable Now	0				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	16	Total site area	39.49	Total potential units	1153
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	12.5
Unsuitable	1			RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

There has been a modest increase in the number of units in the Addingham trajectory although this is not due to an increase in number of sites, although one site has been enlarged. Given the rural nature of the settlement, opportunities for recycling land are limited and consequently the majority of development opportunities are on Greenfield sites both greenbelt and on land allocated for other use on the RUDP. The best opportunities exist to the southern side of the village. North of Main Street a number of access points are constrained and development in this area will be limited to small infill sites.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

ADDINGHAM	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now			
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	16 (16)	39.49 (35.47)	1153 (1009)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites	1 (1)	5.72 (5.72)	

ADDINGHAM - Timing of supply - Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		84	0	-84	841	921.5	80.5	165	231.5	66.5	1009	1153	144
	Suitable Now												
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)	84	0	-84	841	921.5	80.5	165	231.5	66.5	1009	1153	144
	Green Belt				630	558	-72	165	119	-46	746	677	-69
	Other	84	0	-84	211	363.5	152.5		112.5	112.5	263	476	213
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											27	0	-27
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)										27	0	-27
	Green Belt										27		-27
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											1036	1153	117

ADDINGHAM - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	84	0	-84	841	921.5	80.5	165	231.5	66.5	1009	1153	144
Green Field	40	0	-40	841	877.5	36.5	165	231.5	66.5	965	1109	144
Mixed	44	0	-44		44	44				44	44	0
PDL												
PDL Consolidated*	22	0	-22		22	22				22	22	0
PDL %	26.2	0	-26.5		2	2				2.2	1.9	-0.3
Total Residual Supply*										27		-27
Residual – GF										27	0	-27
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										1036	1153	117

Appendix 2R: BAILDON

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	16	No of Green Field Sites	10	Short term units	210.5
Total Area (Ha)	33.86	No Of PDL Sites	3	Medium term units	352
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	2	Long term units	321
Suitable Now	10				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	6	Total site area	33.87	Total potential units	883.5
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	24.3%
Unsuitable				RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

Baildon has a good supply of land which is considered to be Suitable Now which could come forward in the short and medium periods. New sites since the last SHLAA include sites with planning permission and additional land in the current adopted green belt with development potential. The largest majority of development opportunities are on sites which are Greenfield, previously developed sites do exist but are becoming more scarce.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

BAILDON	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	9 (7)	13.33 (11.69)	335.5 (361)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	6 (3)	20.54 (12.29)	548 (308)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites			

BAILDON - Timing of supply and Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		192	210.5	18.5	283	352	69	193.5	321	127.5	668.5	883.5	215
	Suitable Now	192	210.5	18.5	169	125	-44				361	335.5	-25.5
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)				115	227	112	193.5	321	127.5	308	548	240
	Green Belt				56	168.5	112.5	193.5	321	127.5	249.5	489.5	240
	Other					58.5	58.5					58.5	58.5
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											23.5	0	-23.5
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)										23.5	0	-23.5
	Green Belt										23.5	0	-23.5
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											692	883.5	191.5

BAILDON - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'						TOTAL		
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM					
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	192	210.5	18.5	283	352	69	193.5	321	127.5	668.5	883.5	215
Green Field	50	99.5	49.5	189	286.5	97.5	193.5	321	127.5	432	707	275
Mixed		23	23	95	54.5	-40.5				95	77.5	-17.5
PDL	142	88	-54		11	11				142	99	-43
PDL Consolidated*	142	99.5	-42.5	48	39.75	-8.25				215	137.75	-77.25
PDL %	74	47	-27	17	11	-6				32	16	-16
Total Residual Supply*										23	0	-23
Residual – GF										23	0	-23
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										692	883.5	191.5

Appendix 2S: COTTINGLEY

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	11	No of Green Field Sites	5	Short term units	15
Total Area (Ha)	55.53	No Of PDL Sites	1	Medium term units	439
		Mixed PDL / Green Field		Long term units	227
Suitable Now	1				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	6	Total site area	26.22	Total potential units	681
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	2.1%
Unsuitable	4			RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

In terms of supply there has been little change since the first SHLAA. New sites have been considered in this update adding only 11 potential units on a green belt site. 4 sites are considered to be unsuitable for development at present and all but 15 are considered to be available and suitable for development now, the remainder are on green field and green belt sites with access and other constraints.

The potential for recycling land from other urban uses is limited although there may be some additional infill plots within the community still available that could take a small number of new homes. These aside, new capacity for homes in Cottingley will in the main be from the surrounding green belt.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

COTTINGLEY	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	1 (2)	1.15 (2.20)	15 (45)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	5 (3)	25.07 (23.70)	666 (622)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites	4 (2)	22.10 (5.05)	

COTTINGLEY - Timing of supply and Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		45	15	-30	452	439	-13	170	227	57	667	681	14
	Suitable Now	45	15	-30							45	15	-30
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)				452	439	-13	170	227	57	622	666	44
	Green Belt				452	406	-46	170	227	57	622	633	11
	Other					33	33					33	33
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											0	0	0
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)												
	Green Belt												
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											667	681	14

COTTINGLEY - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	43	15	-30	452	439	-13	170	227	57	667	681	14
Green Field	33	0	-33	452	439	-13	170	227	57	655	666	11
Mixed												
PDL	12	15	3							12	15	3
PDL Consolidated*	12	15	3							12	15	3
PDL %	26.7	100	73.3							1.8	0.2	-1.6
Total Residual Supply*										0	0	0
Residual – GF												
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										667	681	14

Appendix 2T: CULLINGWORTH

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	8	No of Green Field Sites	2	Short term units	68
Total Area (Ha)	11.94	No Of PDL Sites	2	Medium term units	173
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	1	Long term units	0
Suitable Now	4				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	3	Total site area	6.26	Total potential units	241
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	4.1%
Unsuitable	1			RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

3 new sites have been considered in this review with the potential to deliver 26.5 in the short and medium terms. Deductions of units have been undertaken to 2 previously developed sites in the village although these sites do still have the potential to come forward in time which will reduce the need to make changes to the green belt. Other previously developed sites in the village expected to come forward for new residential development will ensure a healthy proportion across the period of new homes on this land source. Further development opportunities will serve to improve on this total.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

CULLINGWORTH	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	2 (3)	2.11 (2.98)	84.5 (113)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	3 (2)	4.15 (11.78)	156.5 (109.5)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites	1	3.66	

CULLINGWORTH - Timing of supply and Suitability assessment

	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	79	68	-11	152	173	21				231	241	10
Suitable Now	39	8	-31	82.5	76.5	-6				113	84.5	-28.5
Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)	40	60	20	69.5	96.5	27				109.5	156.5	47
Green Belt				49.5	86.5	37				50	86.5	36.5
Other	40	60	20	20	10	-10				60	70	10
Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total										0	0	0
Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)												
Green Belt												
Other												
Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total										231	241	10

CULLINGWORTH - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	79	68	-11	152	173	21				231	241	10
Green Field				49.5	86.5	37				49.5	86.5	37
Mixed	40	60	20	20	10	-10				60	70	10
PDL	39	8	-31	82.5	76.5	-6				121.5	84.5	-37
PDL Consolidated*	59	38	-13	92.5	81.5	-11				151.5	119.5	-32
PDL %	74.6	55.9	-62.8	60.8	47.1	-13.7				65.6	49.6	-16
Total Residual Supply*										0	0	0
Residual – GF												
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										231	241	10

Appendix 2U: DENHOLME

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	15	No of Green Field Sites	6	Short term units	75
Total Area (Ha)	40.39	No Of PDL Sites	6	Medium term units	773
		Mixed PDL / Green Field		Long term units	0
Suitable Now	4				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	9	Total site area	29.86	Total potential units	848
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	16.3 %
Unsuitable	2			RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

There has been an increase in 16% of potential supply since the first SHLAA. This is in the main through the addition of 3 new potential sites. Of these 2 had planning permission at the base date, the 3rd site now has planning permission and could come forward sooner than expected to bolster the short term yield in the village. Denholme has a number of exiting development opportunities as both sites with permission and land identified as Safeguarded Land in the RUDP. 514 additional units could be delivered from sites in the SHLAA presently protected as green belt. All of these sites do not have such significant constraints to render them incapable of making a contribution should they be identified for development in the Local Plan.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

DENHOLME	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	3 (2)	3.49 (3.55)	139 (87)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	7 (7)	26.37 (22.5)	709 (610)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites	2 (2)	8.73 (8.73)	

DENHOLME - Timing of supply and Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		177	75	-102	516.5	773	256.5	16	0	-16	709.5	848	138.5
	Suitable Now	87	75	-12		64	64				87	139	52
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)	90	0	-90	504	709	205	16	0	-16	610	709	99
	Green Belt	90	0	-90	309	514	205				399	514	115
	Other				195	195	0	16		-16	211	195	-16
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											0	0	0
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)												
	Green Belt												
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											709.5	848	138.5

DENHOLME - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	177	75	-102	516.5	773	256.5	16	0	-16	709.5	848	138.5
Green Field	17	0	-17	451.5	468	16.5	16	0	-16	484.5	468	-16.5
Mixed												
PDL	160	75	-85	65	305	240				225	380	155
PDL Consolidated*	160	75	-85	65	305	240				225	380	171
PDL %	90.4	100	9.6	12.6	39.4	26.8				31.7	44.8	15
Total Residual Supply*										0	0	
Residual – GF												
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										709.5	848	138.5

Appendix 2V: EAST MORTON

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	11	No of Green Field Sites	6	Short term units	18.5
Total Area (Ha)	18.68	No Of PDL Sites		Medium term units	276
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	1	Long term units	6
Suitable Now	2				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	8	Total site area	13.26	Total potential units	300.5
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	38.3%
Unsuitable	1			RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

6 additional sites have been considered in this SHLAA since the first publication. Of these 4 are considered to have development potential, one small site already has planning permission, the other 3 are all green belt locations. This would represent a potential increase of potential new homes of 38% if all opportunities are advanced through the local Plan. All sites in the middle part of the trajectory have constraints aside of their RUDP allocation and are Greenfield locations. The potential for recycling of land in East Morton is very limited. Sites for new homes will need to be identified on other sites in the village.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

EAST MORTON	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	2 (1)	0.86 (0.49)	18.5 (15.5)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	5 (3)	12.40 (5.87)	282 (170)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites	1	1.63	

EAST MORTON - Timing of supply and Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		15.5	18.5	3	119.5	276	156.5	50.5	6	-44.5	185.5	300.5	115
	Suitable Now	15.5	18.5	3							15.5	18.5	3
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)				119.5	276		50.5	6	-44.5	170	282	112
	Green Belt				119.5	276		50.5	6	-44.5	170	282	112
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											1	0	-1
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)												
	Green Belt												
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											186.5	300.5	114

EAST MORTON - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	15.5	18.5	3	119.5	276	156.5	50.5	6	-44.5	185.5	300.5	115
Green Field		3	3	119.5	276	156.5	50.5	6	-44.5	170	285	115
Mixed	15.5	15.5	0							15.5	15.5	0
PDL												
PDL Consolidated*	7.75	7.75	0							7.75	7.75	0
PDL %	50	41.9	-8.1							4.2	2.6	-1.6
Total Residual Supply*										1	0	-1
Residual – GF												
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										186.5	300.5	114

Appendix 2W: HARDEN

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	10	No of Green Field Sites	3	Short term units	8
Total Area (Ha)	15.22	No Of PDL Sites	1	Medium term units	78
		Mixed PDL / Green Field		Long term units	0
Suitable Now	1				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	5	Total site area	2.77	Total potential units	86
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	9.3%
Unsuitable	4			RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

Harden has seen a small increase in the total number of units appearing the trajectory and these are under construction. The main change has been a shift to all units being developable in the medium term. Other development opportunities exist in the village as before and there is one new site although this is presently not considered to be suitable as it does not adjoin the existing urban edge of the settlement but is available. Other sites identified do not appear in the trajectory for the same reason or because the owners intentions are not presently known. This may change over time to enable the sites to be considered further, although they do appear in the current adopted green belt. Those sites appearing in the trajectory include land identified as Safeguarded Land in the RUDP and village greenspace, so consequently with local constraints meaning they may not be able to provide new homes in the short term.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

HARDEN	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	1	0.30	8
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	3 (3)	2.47 (2.47)	78 (78)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites	4 (3)	10.24 (10.00)	

HARDEN - Timing of supply and Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total			8		49	78	29	29	0	-29	78	86	8
	Suitable Now		8									8	8
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)				49	78	29	29	0	-29	78	78	0
	Green Belt												
	Other				49	78	29	29	0	-29	78	78	0
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											0	0	0
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)												
	Green Belt												
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											78	86	8

HARDEN - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		8		49	78	29	29	0	-29	78	86	8
Green Field				49	78	29	29	0	-29	78	78	0
Mixed												
PDL		8	8								8	8
PDL Consolidated*		8	8								8	8
PDL %											9.3	9.3
Total Residual Supply*										0	0	0
Residual – GF												
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										78	86	8

Appendix 2X: HAWORTH

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	19	No of Green Field Sites	11	Short term units	116
Total Area (Ha)	31.63	No Of PDL Sites	4	Medium term units	506
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	1	Long term units	73.5
Suitable Now	7				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	12	Total site area	21.57	Total potential units	695.5
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	-22.6%
Unsuitable				RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

Despite 3 new sites being considered in Haworth there has been a percentage drop in potential available units since the last SHLAA. This is in part due to the lack of available information regarding 2 sites in the village and consequently they have been removed from the trajectory for this update. Should further information become available then they may return as having development potential with units in the medium and longer term. The proportion of sites considered to be “suitable now” has also dropped in part this is due to the expiry of some permissions and new local constraints identified which could delay when sites could come forward. Haworth does have a number of existing development opportunities on recycled land and other smaller opportunities may also be available, although in some cases the uncertainty of owners intentions on these sites means they are not always achievable, nor available in the short term.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

HAWORTH	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	7 (7)	4.40 (7.77)	191 (355.5)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	9 (6)	17.17 (18.52)	504.5 (497.5)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites	(1)	(0.37)	

HAWORTH - Timing of supply - Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		254.5	116	-138.5	527.5	506	-21.5	71	73.5	2.5	853	695.5	-157.5
	Suitable Now	254.5	116	-138.5	101	75	-26				355.5	191	-164.5
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)				426.5	431	4.5	71	73.5	2.5	497.5	504.5	7
	Green Belt				274.5	43.5	-231	71	71.5	0.5	345.5	115	-230.5
	Other				152	387.5	235.5		2.5		152	390	238
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											0	0	0
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)												
	Green Belt												
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											853	695.5	-157.5

HAWORTH - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	254.5	116	-138.5	527.5	506	-21.5	71	73.5	2.5	853	695.5	-157.5
Green Field	92	34	-38	504.5	380	-144.5	71	73.5	2.5	612	487.5	-124.5
Mixed	47.5	66	18.5	78.5		-78.5				126	66	-60
PDL	115	16	-99		126	126				115	142	27
PDL Consolidated*	138.75	49	-89.75	39.25	126	86.75				178	175	-3
PDL %	54.5	42.2	-12.3	7.4	24.9	17.5				20.9	25.2	4.3
Total Residual Supply*										0	0	0
Residual – GF												
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										853	695.5	-157.5

Appendix 2Y: OAKWORTH

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	15	No of Green Field Sites	6	Short term units	42
Total Area (Ha)	23.01	No Of PDL Sites	2	Medium term units	178.5
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	2	Long term units	275
Suitable Now	4				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	10	Total site area	18.13	Total potential units	495.5
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	37.2%
Unsuitable	1			RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

15 sites were assessed in this update, 6 being additions since the first SHLAA. Of the 6 only 3 are considered to have development potential with units placed in the trajectory. Other site changes suggests that a further 184 new homes could be delivered on available land in the village, however the large majority of these will need to be on green belt sites, the 2 largest having both access and topographical constraints.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

OAKWORTH	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	4 (2)	1.52 (1.19)	42 (19)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	6 (5)	16.61 (10.19)	454 (292)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites	1	2.09	

OAKWORTH - Timing of supply and Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		19	42	23	100.5	178.5	78	191.5	275	83.5	311	495.5	184.5
	Suitable Now	19	42	23							19	42	23
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)				100.5	178.5	78	191.5	275	83.5	292	454	162
	Green Belt				100.5	178.5	78	147	275	83.5	247.5	454	206.5
	Other							44.5	0	-44.5	44.5	0	-44.5
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											0	0	0
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)												
	Green Belt												
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											311	495.5	184.5

OAKWORTH - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	19	42	23	100.5	178.5	78	191.5	275	83.5	311	495.5	184.5
Green Field				100.5	178.5		191.5	275	83.5	311	454	143
Mixed	14	23	9							14	23	9
PDL	5	19	14							5	19	14
PDL Consolidated*	12	30.5	18.5							12	30.5	18.5
PDL %	63.1	72.6	9.5							3.9	6.1	2.2
Total Residual Supply*										0	0	0
Residual – GF												
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										311	495.5	184.5

Appendix 2Z: OXENHOPE

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	5	No of Green Field Sites	1	Short term units	19.5
Total Area (Ha)	4.44	No Of PDL Sites	2	Medium term units	31
		Mixed PDL / Green Field		Long term units	0
Suitable Now	3				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	2	Total site area	1.88	Total potential units	50.5
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	-45.5%
Unsuitable				RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

One additional site was considered in this update and has planning permission for 3 homes. A further site has permission and is under construction although because it was approved after the base date it lies in year 4 of the trajectory but will be removed at the next update. This leaves only one site considered to have development potential in this SHLAA which is currently protected as village greenspace in the RUDP and is available by the landowner. Other sites may still be available although highway issues and lack of information mean they have not been placed in the trajectory at present.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

OXENHOPE	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	2	0.89	19.5
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	1 (3)	0.98 (2.35)	31 (73.5)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites			

OXENHOPE - Timing of supply and Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		17	19.5	2.5		31	31	56.5	0	-56.5	73.5	50.5	-23
	Suitable Now		19.5	19.5								19.5	19.5
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)	17				31	31	56.5	0	-56.5	73.5	31	-42.5
	Green Belt							26	0	-26	26	0	-26
	Other	17				31	31	31	0	-31	47.5	31	-42.5
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											0	0	0
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)												
	Green Belt												
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											73.5	50.5	-23

OXENHOPE - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	17	19.5	2.5		31	31	56.5		-56.5	73.5	50.5	-23
Green Field					31	31	56.5		-56.5	56.5	31	-25.5
Mixed												
PDL	17	19.5	2.5							17	19.5	2.5
PDL Consolidated*	17	19.5	2.5							17	19.5	2.5
PDL %	100	100	0							23	38.6	15.6
Total Residual Supply*										0	0	0
Residual – GF												
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										73.5	50.5	-23

Appendix 2AA: WILSDEN

ALL SITES ASSESSED		SITES WITHIN TRAJECTORY (DELIVERABLE OR DEVELOPABLE)		AVERAGE DWELLING CAPACITY	
Total No Of Sites	11	No of Green Field Sites	7	Short term units	59
Total Area (Ha)	97.21	No Of PDL Sites	1	Medium term units	449.5
		Mixed PDL / Green Field	1	Long term units	427.5
Suitable Now	3				
Potentially Suitable (Policy Constraints)	6	Total site area	35.64	Total potential units	936
Potentially Suitable (Physical Constraints)				% change since last SHLAA	30.7%
Unsuitable	2			RESIDUAL TOTAL	0

HEADLINES / MAIN POINTS

The SHLAA update in Wilsden includes 5 new sites, one of which was under construction at time of survey and nearing completion making the suitable now contribution of 59 homes. Other small previously developed land opportunities may still exist in the village but there will be a need to accommodate further new homes on green field sites, many of which will be in the green belt. Infrastructure issues will need to be considered carefully before new development opportunities are assessed further. In all around 877 new homes could be delivered on sites with current policy constraints including green belt and safeguarded land. Those existing and new sites submitted for consideration to the SHLAA process include sites with highway constraints.

Assessment Of Capacity of Sites Considered Deliverable & Developable Within the SHLAA Period* According To Suitability Category

The following tables are important as they demonstrate on a settlement basis the balance of the potential supply between sites which would broadly be considered acceptable within current RUDP policies and designations and those which would currently conflict or possibly conflict with those designations. The SHLAA study has deliberately adopted a 'local policy switched off' approach because of the scale of the housing requirement and the fact that we knew that the deliverable supply on policy compliant sites would only meet a small proportion of the total requirement. Had such sites been omitted from analysis we would only have had to come back to them later in the study and this would have been an inefficient use of resources.

WILSDEN	No of Sites (shlaa 1)	Hectares	Dwellings
Suitable Now	3 (2)	1.81 (1.59)	59 (52)
Potentially Suitable – Policy Constraints	6 (3)	33.83 (26.41)	877 (596.5)
Potentially Suitable – Physical Constraints			
Unsuitable Sites	2 (1)	61.57 (61.25)	

WILSDEN - Timing of supply and Suitability assessment

		SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
		SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total		52	59	7	363	449.5	86.5	233.5	427.5	182	648.5	936	287.5
	Suitable Now	52	59	7							52	59	7
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)				363	449.5	86.5	233.5	427.5	194	596.5	877	280.5
	Green Belt				363	321.5	-41.5	233.5	427.5	427.5	596.5	749	152.5
	Other					128	128					128	128
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Residual Supply Total											97	0	-97
	Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)										97	0	-97
	Green Belt										97	0	-97
	Other												
	Potentially Suitable (Physical constraints)												
Capacity Total											745	936	839

WILSDEN - Timing Of Supply and Green Field / PDL Split

	'Deliverable Sites'			'Developable Sites'								
	SHORT TERM			MEDIUM TERM			LONG TERM			TOTAL		
	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change	SHLAA 1	SHLAA 2	Change
Trajectory Total	52	59	7	363	449.5	86.5	233.5	427.5	182	648.5	936	287.5
Green Field	11	11	0	363	449.5	86.5	233.5	427.5	0	622.5	888	265.5
Mixed	41	41	0							41	41	0
PDL		7	7								7	7
PDL Consolidated*	20.5	27.5	7							20.5	27.5	7
PDL %	39.4	46.6	7.2							3.2	2.9	-0.3
Total Residual Supply*										97	0	-97
Residual – GF										97	0	-97
Residual – Mixed												
Residual PDL												
Capacity Total										745	936	839

APPENDIX 3

TIMING OF SUPPLY –

Shipleigh and Canal Road Corridor AAP area (SCRC)
and
Shipleigh excluding AAP area

Timing Of Supply – SCRC AAP area

	‘Deliverable Sites’	‘Developable Sites’				
	SHORT TERM 2011/12-2015/16	MEDIUM TERM 2016/17-2020/21	LONG TERM 2021/22-2027/9	TOTAL	RESIDUAL (post 2029)	TOTAL
Trajectory Total	451	788.5	1355	2594.5	1005	3599.5
Green Field	98.5	102	320	520.5	29	549.5
Mixed		686.5	913.5	1600	976	2496
PDL	342.5		131.5	474		474
PDL Consolidated*	342.5	343.5	588.25	1274.25	488	1762.25
PDL %	75.9	43.6	43.4	49.1	48.5	49
Suitable Now	451	153.5		604.5		604.5
Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)		634.5	1356	1990.5	1005	2995.5
Green Belt						
Other		634.5	1356	1990.5	1005	2995.5
Potentially Suitable Physical Constraints						

Timing Of Supply – Shipley excluding sites in the SCRC AAP area

	‘Deliverable Sites’	‘Developable Sites’				
	SHORT TERM 2011/12-2015/16	MEDIUM TERM 2016/17-2020/21	LONG TERM 2021/22-2028/29	TOTAL	RESIDUAL (post 2029)	TOTAL
Trajectory Total	308	578	397	1283		1283
Green Field	8	243	273	524		524
Mixed		83.5		83.5		83.5
PDL	300	251.5	124	675.5		675.5
PDL Consolidated*	300	293.75	124	717.25		717.25
PDL %	100	51	31	56		56
Suitable Now	308	171.5		479.5		479.5
Potentially Suitable (Policy constraints)		406.5	397	803.5		803.5
Green Belt		139.5	273	412.5		412.5
Other		267		267		267
Potentially Suitable Physical Constraints			124	124		124

APPENDIX 4
5 YEAR LAND SUPPLY ASSESSMENT

5 YEAR LAND SUPPLY ASSESSMENT

The requirement to maintain a rolling 5 year supply of deliverable land for housing was established within PPG3 and has been reaffirmed within the new National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states,

“To boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should:

identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements”

Further advice, in particular regarding the correct methodology for calculating the 5 year land supply position, has been provided by the CLG and Planning Inspectorate.

There are three main stages to assessing the 5 year land supply:

1 ESTABLISH THE HOUSING DELIVERY TARGET FOR THE 5 YEAR PERIOD

The Government advises that housing provision figures in adopted development plans are to be used, adjusted to reflect the level of housing that has been already been delivered in the lifetime of the current plan. The housing targets within the RUDP adopted in October 2005 were superseded by the RSS. Although the RSS for the Yorkshire and Humber Region was revoked in February the Council will not have a new alternative housing target in place until it has adopted its Core Strategy. Moreover the base date of this SHLAA is April 2011 at which point the RSS was still in force. The RSS annual requirement will therefore continue to be used as the benchmark against which the 5 year land supply will be assessed.

The RSS set an annual requirement of 1560 dwellings for the period 2004-2008, increasing to 2700 for the period 2009-2026.

The base requirement for the five years 2011/12 to 2015/16 is therefore 13500 dwellings which when adjusted to reflect under delivery over the period 2004-2011 gives a final 5 year requirement of 18,241. This calculations is illustrated in the table below:

The 5 Year Land Supply Requirement For The District Annual Requirement For 2011-16 (+ or - Historic Surplus / Deficit)		
RSS Requirement April 2004 – April 2008	1560 x 4	= 6240
AMR Reported Completions April 2004 – April 2008		= 6464
Surplus / Deficit For the Period April 2004 – April 2008		= +224
RSS Requirement April 2008 – April 2011	2700 x3	= 8100
AMR Reported Completions April 2008 – April 2011		= 3135
Surplus / Deficit For the Period April 2008 – April 2011	8100 - 3135	= - 4,965
Overall 2004-9 Deficit	4965 - 224	= - 4741
RSS Annual Requirement 2011 - 2016	2700 x 5	13,500
Total 5 Year Requirement	4741 + 13,500	18, 241

2 Identify sites that have the potential to deliver housing during the 5 year period

These are made up of sites from within the SHLAA as follows:

- Sites Under Construction
- Sites with Planning Permission not yet implemented
- Unimplemented housing allocations from the RUDP
- Unallocated sites with the potential to make a contribution to housing delivery during the 5 year period.

3 Assessing the deliverability of the identified potential sites

This stage has been carried out by utilising the results of the SHLAA – thus all sites within the 5 year land supply have been subject to robust assessments of their suitability, availability and achievability, and all reflect the agreed position with the SHLAA Working Group. The process has thus included a significant input from the development sector.

Schedule of Sites within the 5 Year Land Supply

A series of SHLAA tables relating to land supply within each settlement have been produced.. The tables outline the full 18 year trajectory from 2011 to 2029. Appendix 5 sets out solely those sites which are expected to contribute to the 5 year land supply..

5 Year Land Supply Position Based on Expected Delivery

No. of Sites	313
Total Delivery Capacity 2011-16	8,554
% Of Required 5 Year Land Supply	46.9%
No of Years of Supply*	2.3

This represents the formal NPPF land supply position based on the methodology advocated by the Government.

Total Capacity of Sites within the 5 Year Land Supply (including delivery beyond year 5)

No. of Sites	313
Total Delivery Capacity 2011 +	13,484

This table represents the supply of land based on the total capacity of all 313 sites which are considered by the SHLAA Working Group as delivering some or all of their supply within the 5 year period. This larger figure reflects the fact that many of the sites within the 5 year land supply are expected to have started delivering new homes within the 5 year period but will not have been fully developed until after it. Further supply could theoretically come forward in future 5 year land supply assessments from the following sources:

- From new sites which gain planning permission after the base date of the current 5 year land supply assessment.
- Current sites in the SHLAA where the owner takes steps to bring the site forward for development, where currently they appear in year 6 as “uncertain”

Of course it is equally possible that the circumstances of some sites which are currently within the 5 year land supply calculation could change leading to their delivering less housing within the relevant period.

Conclusion

The SHLAA shows that as of the base date of April 2011 there was a supply equivalent to only 46.9% of the required amount . There is still currently a significant shortage of deliverable housing land in the district. The scale of the shortfall is caused not just by the availability of land but due to weak market conditions which lead to extremely pessimistic expectations of how quickly sites will be built out on the part of the market / volume house builders on the SHLAA Working Group.

Appendix 5 sets out in tabular form those sites which contribute toward the 5 year supply and is available separately from this report.

APPENDIX 6

SHLAA WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP

SHLAA WORKING GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Membership of the Working Group for the update was as follows:

Bradford Council Planning Service X 2		
Bradford Council Housing Service X 2		
Bradford Council Asset Management Service		
Social Housing Providers		
	InCommunities	
Market House Builders		
	Persimmon Homes	
	Barratts / David Wilson Homes	
	Redrow	
	Dacre Son & Hartley (Planning & Property Agents)	
Calderdale Council*		

Notes

Not all members were involved in the site appraisal process.

* Calderdale's involvement was in observatory capacity only.

Bradford Council wish to express their thanks to those members of the group who gave up their time in undertaking individual site assessments over the course of 2012.