

Affordable Housing

- Robust viability exercise
- Of course will always be argument about precise figures on inputs
- But have tested variables on 2 of 9 sites (time available)
 - Sales values
 - Code for sustainable homes
 - Increased discount rate
 - Still show minimum return of 10% Thrapston, 20% Ashton Road
 - What return is needed depends on the economic climate

Sub.

- Our work supports minimum 20%
- Alt “up to 40%” justified on need basis
- Imp is flexibility for site by site viability (see EDAW note)

H.L.S. and Oundle

- 5 year supply robust
- 10 year supply exists district wide – see trajectory
- 15 year supply
 - Plan period is to 2021
 - 10 years takes us to 2019
 - 15 years takes us to 2024 – 3 years beyond plan period
- Is an active review of C.S.S.
- Reg. 25 consultation done
- We have longer term sites available will take us beyond 2021
- Most important is the robust Tym analysis which no-one challenges and is accepted as giving you an adequate basis to report
- Oundle sites
 - We have filled the 6 – 10 year gap
 - Sites are robust
 - You could put another in either as a substitute or additionally – but we say no need
 - Creed road – changes in timetabling is NOT abandonment of phasing – never was phasing – was expectation of delivery
 - 43 inconsequential – reduced by 20 already (Creed Road) and sites come in at more than minimum density assumptions

Settlement boundaries

- Overall criteria sound and applied consistently

Overall

Changes are well within the current view of what can be properly done post submission to render the plan sound. My support for that is Sheffield report (Wakefield) where could be said much of the guts of the plan had to be changed to render the plan sound.

We look forward to your report, thank you for your courtesy, for the thoroughness applied to the task, and most particularly for the opportunity to re-visit key areas and come back to resumed hearings.