

Further Information on Discounting of Housing Sites for the Five Year Housing Supply

1. The five year housing land supply is produced in accordance with government guidance. The requirement for Local Planning Authorities to prepare a SHLAA/5 year supply comes from Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing (PPS3). PPS3 states that “Local Planning Authorities should identify sufficient specific **deliverable** sites to deliver housing in the first five years. To be considered deliverable, sites should
 - Be **Available** – the site is available now.
 - Be **Suitable** – the site offers a suitable location for development now and would contribute to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities.
 - Be **Achievable** – there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years.” (para. 54 PPS 3)
2. The guidance advocates that assessments should be prepared collaboratively and the PPS was accompanied by the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Practice Guidance setting out at length the methodology to be followed. Careful consideration has therefore been undertaken involving a variety of sources of information to ascertain whether sites do have a reasonable prospect of being delivered in the five years. This process has to be repeated in each annual review of the 5 year supply.
3. Despite following this methodology the Council’s five year housing supply has been challenged recently in the consideration of two planning application appeals. The Inspectorate heard evidence from both sides on whether individual sites are **deliverable**. The current review therefore looks afresh at sites, following the advised methodology, and having regard to a range of sources of information. As a result, though some sites may have a valid planning consent, it is considered that they do not have a reasonable prospect of being delivered on the site within five years. These sites could not be considered **deliverable** and therefore can not be considered in the total five years supply. To include these sites would be contrary to government advice and would lead to an increase in challenges and further planning appeals.