

Central Lincolnshire Housing Assumptions Report

October 2019

Updated in June 2022

Please note: this version provides an update to remove some draft wording included in error
(paragraph 2.21 as was)



Central Lincolnshire
LOCAL PLAN

Contents

1. Introduction	1
National Context.....	1
Local Context	2
2. Methodology	2
Source of information.....	2
Categorisation	3
Stages of the Development Process	3
Limitations	4
Consultation	5
Review	5
3. Findings.....	5
Application Process	5
Site Preparation	10
Site Construction	12
Total Process.....	13
4. Conclusions	15
Proposed Assumptions for the Application Process.....	15
Proposed Assumptions for Site Preparation	16
Proposed Assumptions for Site Construction.....	16
Total Timeframes.....	16
APPENDIX 1 – Site details	18
APPENDIX 2 – Slides presented at the Developers and Agents Event 26 June 2019	20
APPENDIX 3 – Comments logged at the Developers and Agents Event 26 June 2019.....	23

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This document is intended to inform analysis of the housing land supply in Central Lincolnshire, including work on the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and Five Year Housing Land Supply calculations.
- 1.2. By using information on the delivery of housing on real sites across Central Lincolnshire, the intention is that it will provide a realistic understanding of what can be expected to be delivered and by when on sites when they are assessed. This includes looking at:
 - the length of time to issue decisions on planning applications;
 - how long it takes to commence construction once permission is obtained; and
 - how long it takes to build out sites and how many homes can be expected to be built each year.
- 1.3. The findings of this document are intended to inform any assumptions made on land supply, but it is not intended to override site-specific information. The Central Lincolnshire authorities will continue to work with developers to understand the anticipated delivery on sites to take account of specific constraints or other circumstances. These assumptions will only be used where reliable information is not available, or to sense check information being received about a development site.

National Context

- 1.4. Following the publication of the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in July 2018, the government issued new guidance in September 2018 in the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) in relation to land supply and how to develop a robust, up to date evidence base to support the production of a local plan. This states that Local Planning Authorities:

“... may develop benchmarks and assumptions based on evidence of past trends for development lead-in times and build-out rates. Testing these assumptions with developers and using them to inform assessments of deliverability can also make deliverability assessments more robust.”¹

- 1.5. Furthermore, and in relation to five year land supply calculations, the PPG goes on to state that:

“Local planning authorities may need to develop a range of assumptions and benchmarks to help to inform and test assessments. Assumptions can include lapse/non-implementation rates in permissions, lead-in times and build rates, and these assumptions and yardsticks can be used to test delivery information or can be used where there is no information available from site owners/developers to inform the assessment. Assumptions should be based on clear evidence, consulted upon with stakeholders, including developers, and regularly reviewed and tested against actual performance on comparable sites. Tables of assumptions should be clear and transparent and available as part of assessments.

¹ PPG Paragraph: 030 Reference ID: 3-030-20180913

Evidence of delivery may need to differentiate between types and sizes of developers and of sites, and of type of product. This approach will ensure the assessment of delivery on sites will be as robust as possible.”²

- 1.6. The assumptions in this note solely relate to lead-in times and build-out rates, with other assumptions relating to windfall and consideration of lapse rates set out in the Central Lincolnshire Five Year Land Supply Report. As such, this note should be read in conjunction with the Five Year Land Supply Report and efforts will be made to integrate these findings with future Five Year Land Supply Reports.

Local Context

- 1.7. Central Lincolnshire is made up of three districts, City of Lincoln, North Kesteven and West Lindsey. Across these districts there is a range of types and sizes of settlements, ranging from Lincoln (the main city in Lincolnshire and the urban extents of which includes parts of West Lindsey and North Kesteven administrative areas as well as the City of Lincoln), the main towns of Sleaford and Gainsborough, the smaller market towns of Caistor and Market Rasen and a large number of villages across an expansive rural area. Policy LP2 of the Local Plan sets out the settlement hierarchy which helps define the status and growth expected for each settlement.
- 1.8. In Central Lincolnshire, the Local Planning Authority for plan-making purposes is the Central Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee, a core Local Plan Team leads on joint planning tasks in partnership with officers at each of the districts being involved in a number of processes.
- 1.9. However, for planning application purposes, each of the districts are the Local Planning Authority, with their own departments and processes for considering planning applications.

2. Methodology

Source of information

- 2.1. Data has been obtained from each of the Central Lincolnshire Districts about a variety of planning applications. The information sought relating to planning applications included:
- The dates of any pre-application advice issued;
 - Submission and decision dates for both outline and detailed applications;
 - Dates for when construction commenced; and
 - Dates of when the first and last dwellings were complete.
- 2.2. Officers at each district obtained this data on a number of sites across Central Lincolnshire using a variety of sources including planning application systems, building control data, information from Council Tax records, and others to establish a baseline position for each site.
- 2.3. Not all information was possible to be obtained retrospectively on all sites, but it is considered that the key information is available to inform sensible and robust assumptions.

² PPG Paragraph: 047 Reference ID: 3-047-20180913

- 2.4. The Glossary of the NPPF defines the term “deliverable” for plan making and land supply purposes. This makes clear that for sites not involving major development (those under 10 dwellings) and with a planning permission it can be assumed that they are deliverable until the permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that homes will not be delivered within 5 years. As such, this note focuses on sites of 10 dwellings or more.

Categorisation

- 2.5. The nature of a site can greatly impact on how long it takes to draw up a planning application (including the amount of supporting evidence needed), to issue a decision on the application, and to start and finish building on a site.
- 2.6. There are a number of ways in which the sites could be categorised in order to develop assumptions, such as the type of location, the type of applicant, or whether the site was previously developed or not. However, these do not necessarily affect the timescales of development and can be very specific to the site rather than suggesting a trend. Furthermore, assessment of this type of information would result in a very small site sample size for a number of criteria and so would not be reliable.
- 2.7. Therefore the categorisation has been limited to the size of site to understand what differences or similarities there are between them and whether different assumptions are needed for each. The size of a site generally affects its complexity and the amount of evidence needed to inform decisions on it. Typically there will be a longer lead in time for larger sites both in drawing up the application and issuing a decision. There may also be longer lead in times and it is likely that there will be differences in build-out rates for different types and scales of builders.
- 2.8. The site size categories to be used in this review are:
- 10-24 dwellings;
 - 25-49 dwellings;
 - 50-99 dwellings;
 - 100+ dwellings.
- 2.9. The thresholds for each of these categories were selected in order to differentiate between the thresholds for allocations in the 2017 Local Plan (25 or more dwellings) and that proposed for the new Local Plan (10 dwellings or more). There are very few sites of over 100 dwellings to use as an example in Central Lincolnshire and so it was not considered suitable to further break up the largest category of 100+ dwellings.

Stages of the Development Process

- 2.10. There are a number of key milestones for the delivery of sites for which data can be obtained in order to understand typical timescales. Whilst the development process is complex and contains many moving parts, by focusing on these key milestones, trends can be identified to inform our understanding of how long a site should reasonably take to progress through the various stages to delivery.

Application process

- 2.11. Data availability typically starts at the submission of a planning application, either in outline or detail, but can also commence with pre-application advice being sought. Each of the Central Lincolnshire Districts has its own internal processes and so a range of applications across each district was reviewed to understand how long it takes to obtain a permission on a site for each area.

- 2.12. The sample sites have been reviewed to understand the typical timeframes involved in securing a permission in each size category. Applications for both full, and outline and reserved matters have been sought and considered where available to obtain a picture of the different approaches taken by developers to secure an implementable permission.

Site preparation

- 2.13. The second key phase is site preparation. This can involve a great number of processes depending on the nature of the site, and many of these processes can be undertaken concurrently or even before permission has been obtained.
- 2.14. Whilst there is overlap with the planning application process, and potentially also the construction phase, by reviewing the length of time between detailed permission being issued and construction commencing, it is possible to develop a broad understanding of the typical timeframes needed to prepare a site for construction to start.

Construction

- 2.15. The final stage of the process is the construction of the development itself. The length of time to develop a site, and the annual completions that can typically be expected are generally dependent on the type of builder and the site size, as well as the number of development companies working on the site.
- 2.16. Whilst other factors such as site-specific constraints or requirements, market conditions, or even availability of labour and materials do affect timeframes, by looking at the sample sites we can start to understand what speed sites are developed at and how long they require to build-out.

Limitations

- 2.17. As well as recognising the value of this information, it is also important to bear in mind that there are limitations to this data, particularly in relation to the following:
- **Availability and accuracy of data** – whilst every effort has been made to secure reliable data, some of the information is reliant on external sources, such as developers, third party building inspectors, and also internal sources that are reliant on external input such as from council tax data or street naming and numbering. Where pieces of information on stages of a site's development was not available these specific elements have not been considered in the conclusions.
 - **Site specifics** – every site has its own unique context and as such will take a different amount of time to bring forward, both through the planning application stage and the site preparation and construction stages. Whilst these complexities cannot be factored into this work, the sample size is considered large enough to account for these variations in a broad sense.
 - **Market conditions** – many of the sample sites (particularly the larger sites) take a long time to come forward and to build out. As such, their delivery is highly subject to market conditions. In Central Lincolnshire, there are a relatively small number of large sites that have come forward in the last few years, but a number of them have progressed over a longer period which includes the recession since the market crash in 2008. This undoubtedly has had an impact in terms of slowing progress on many sites. There is also the uncertainty surrounding Brexit which has been seen to have an effect on some sites, again slowing their progress. However, as these market conditions affecting the sample sites result in slower delivery, it is

considered that they result in a more conservative estimate, and removes risk of underestimating delivery time.

- **Affordable housing delivery** – affordable housing delivery is not subject to market conditions and where grant funding is available can lead to far higher delivery rates than in market housing.
- **Reaching planning stages** – one of the other key phases of the process is obtaining a site, undertaking detailed assessments on the site and its design. Whilst the council are occasionally involved in these early phases, it is not possible to develop a robust understanding of the time it takes to reach planning application stage.

- 2.18. It is important to remember that the trend information in this document is not intended to replace site-specific knowledge obtained through monitoring, but that it is intended to be used as a sense check to ensure that information is accurate, or to provide a benchmark for where information is not readily available from a developer.

Consultation

- 2.19. In accordance with national guidance, the assumptions in this document have been consulted upon with members of the development industry.
- 2.20. The draft findings of the document were presented at a Developers and Agents event held in Lincoln on 26 June 2019. At this event there were 14 representatives from builders, and planning and property consultancies. The information presented at the event is provided in Appendix 2 and the responses received from attendees at the event are provided in Appendix 3. Some of the conclusions of this report have been amended to take account of the comments received at the event.

Review

- 2.21. It is intended that the assumptions of the document will be kept under review against the delivery on sites across Central Lincolnshire, and assumptions may be revised if the latest information is suggesting that there are material differences between the assumptions and a large number of sites.

3. Findings

- 3.1. The findings of this assumptions note have been broken down into the phases of the development process before considering the entire process. These findings solely show the aggregated information by size category. To view the information on all 36 sites obtained, please see Appendix 1.

Application Process

- 3.2. The application process can often include an outline permission being sought before a reserved matters application is submitted, but will also often be through a full application without the need for separate outline and reserved matters applications. The process can be elongated where there are complex S106 issues, or conditions to be discharged. Formal pre-application advice will not be sought on all sites and so has not been included in the data provided.
- 3.3. Table 1 below shows the average, minimum and maximum time taken for the key stages of the application process rounded to the nearest month. It provides the overall

timescales for all sites across Central Lincolnshire and a benchmark for considering the relationship between different site sizes in the categories detailed in section 2 above.

Example Sites


Table 1: Application timescales by site size

Category	Minimum, maximum, average	Months to issue outline permission	Months between outline permission granted and detailed application submitted	Months to issue detailed permission
Central Lincs	Min	3	0	1
	Max	30	40	28
	Ave	20	14	7
	Comments	Of the seven examples where outline permission was sought only two were issued within one year and only two more were issued within two years. All three of the sites of 100 or more homes required more than two years to issue an outline permission.	On one site where outline permission was sought, the detailed application was submitted before the permission was formally issued. Two sites took less than a year for submission of a detailed application and two took slightly longer than a year. The remaining two sites took substantially longer – nearly two years and nearly four years between outline permission and submission of reserved matters.	Of the 36 sample sites, nineteen received detailed permission within six months of submission and a further eight were issued within nine months. Only three sites took longer than one year to issue a detailed permission, one of which took longer than two years.
10-24 dwellings	Min	n/a	n/a	2
	Max	n/a	n/a	28
	Ave	n/a	n/a	9
	Comments	No examples provided.	No examples provided.	Of the eleven example sites, seven received detailed permission within nine months, and two more received permission within one year. One further site took just over one year and the two remaining sites took substantially longer.
25-49 dwellings	Min	11	40	2
	Max	11	40	20
	Ave	11	40	8

Category	Minimum, maximum, average	Months to issue outline permission	Months between outline permission granted and detailed application submitted	Months to issue detailed permission
	Comments	Only one sample site sought outline permission in this category.	Only one sample site sought outline permission in this category.	Of the seven sample sites in this category five were issued with a detailed permission within nine months. One site received its permission within one year and the final site took twenty months to issue a permission.
50-99 dwellings	Min	3	0	1
	Max	23	14	13
	Ave	15	6	5
	Comments	There were only three example sites where outline permission was sought. One of which received permission within three months whilst the other two took nearly two years.	There were only three example sites where outline permission was sought. A detailed application was submitted within six months of the outline permission being issued on two sites, whereas the final site took more than one year.	Eight of the eleven example sites were issued with a detailed permission within six months and two more within nine months. The final site took just over a year to receive a detailed permission.
100+ dwellings	Min	26	9	2
	Max	30	20	19
	Ave	28	14	7
	Comments	All of the three example sites for which outline permission was sought received it between two and three years from submission.	One of the three sites for which outline permission was sought submitted the detailed application in nine months, one took slightly over a year and the final site took twenty months.	Of the seven example sites, five received the detailed permission within six months, and one within nine months. The final site took nineteen months to issue the decision – this was on a large site for which outline permission was not sought.

- 3.4. Table 1 indicates that whilst larger sites tend to have a higher ceiling for the length of time needed to determine an application (particularly at outline) and to progress a proposal from pre-application advice being issued and submitting an application, on average there is not much difference between the individual stages across each category.
- 3.5. It also appears that, whilst outline permission is sought on some sites, the vast majority of them in the smaller two categories and also in most sites in the larger two categories go straight to full applications.
- 3.6. There is significant variation from each site in the time taken between receiving outline permission and submitting the detailed permission, ranging from immediate submission to submission after more than three years.
- 3.7. Overall, the averages across sites in Table 1 are skewed by a small percentage of sites where the amount of time greatly exceeds the general trends. These averages are illustrated in Figure 1 below:

Figure 1: Graph showing the time in months to achieve permissions



- 3.8. This shows how outline permission greatly elongated the planning process in some of the example sites but that these were almost entirely sought on sites of 50 or more dwellings. It also illustrates how the vast majority of detailed permissions for sites are issued within a year, many of which are within six months.

- 3.9. Whilst there will continue to be sites that progress faster and slower than the majority of other sites, for the purpose of this work (understanding realistic timescales) it is important to take account of these anomalies.
- 3.10. Taking this all into account, it is suggested that an assumption of between 6 months and a year for a detailed permission to be issued is reasonable. For sites where outline permission is to be sought, it is proposed that 2-3 years is adequate time for the permission to be issued and for a detailed application to be submitted. Furthermore, given that separate outline and reserved matter application were only sought on less than 20% of example sites it will not be applied as an assumption, unless it is known that an outline application will be submitted on a site.

Site Preparation

- 3.11. Once a detailed permission has been issued there is usually a time period between receipt of the permission and work commencing on the site and the first dwellings being completed.


Table 2: Amount of time between detailed permission being issued and commencing

Category	Minimum, maximum, average	Months between detailed decision and first dwellings delivered	Comments
Total	Min	0	From the information available, it is not clear why one example site was able to start delivering within one month of detailed permission being issued, but this should be treated as an abnormality in the data. Fifteen of the 36 example sites started delivering homes within twelve months of detailed permission being issued and a further nine sites started delivering within eighteen months. All but five of the sites started delivering within two years, with two of these site sites taking nearly five years to start delivering homes.
	Max	59	
	Ave	18	
10-24 dwellings	Min	12	Of the eleven example sites in this category more than half started delivering within eighteen months. Two took longer than two years to start delivering.
	Max	56	
	Ave	21	
25-49 dwellings	Min	0	Of the seven example sites in this size category, four started delivering within eighteen months and only one site took more than two years to start delivering.
	Max	26	
	Ave	15	
50-99 dwellings	Min	8	Of the eleven sites in this category six started delivering within twelve months and four more within eighteen months with the final site taking nineteen months to start delivering.
	Max	19	
	Ave	14	
100+ dwellings	Min	6	Of the seven example sites, four started to deliver homes within twelve months of
	Max	59	

Category	Minimum, maximum, average	Months between detailed decision and first dwellings delivered	Comments
	Ave	22	receiving a detailed permission and one more took nearly two years. The remaining two sites took substantially longer.

- 3.12. This shows that, whilst there may be more work needed to prepare for delivery on sites of 25-49 and 50-99 dwellings than on smaller sites of 10-24 dwellings, they actually start to deliver slightly quicker than the smaller sites, perhaps because they tend to be delivered by regional or national builders where scale can help delivery.
- 3.13. The timescales of all sites between detailed permission being issued and the delivery of the first dwellings is shown in Figure 2 below:

Figure 2: Graph showing months taken from detailed permission to first dwellings being delivered



- 3.14. When looking at the averages in the graph in Figure 2 it is clear that there are a small number of sites which skew the averages in the tables above. When they are included

the average timescale is eighteen months, but this is reduced to fifteen months when the timescales for the three exceptions are excluded.

- 3.15. Given that a number of example sites in each category started to deliver within twelve months and majority of sites started to deliver within 18 months it is reasonable to assume 12-18 months for site preparation.

Site Construction


- 3.16. The final stage of the construction process is the actual construction of the houses.
- 3.17. It is difficult to gauge the annual delivery rates across the sites by taking a simple average as often this will include the first and final year of delivery which often will skew the delivery rate downwards as there are fewer completed in these years. Instead, the maximum delivery rate achieved on each site in a given year has been used to demonstrate the rate at which delivery can be expected to come forward. Clearly, any assumptions made should consider the first and last year of delivery where a reduced figure will likely be delivered.

Table 3: Number of dwellings completed each year (maximum delivery rate)

Category	Minimum, maximum, average	Dwellings per annum	Comments
Total	Min	7	This shows a great variance of delivery rate across all of the sample sites.
	Max	108	
	Ave	34	
10-24 dwellings	Min	7	Only one of the sample sites in this category failed to deliver more than ten dwellings in a given year. Of the eight sample sites that have completed, five completed all dwellings in a single year, with the remaining three completing within two years.
	Max	21	
	Ave	13	
25-49 dwellings	Min	11	Only one of the sample sites failed to deliver twenty or more dwellings in a single year. Of the five sites completed or under construction, three were complete within two years and two were completed within three years.
	Max	26	
	Ave	21	
50-99 dwellings	Min	14	The minimum value in this category is a site that has commenced, but only has one year of delivery so far, so this does not necessarily demonstrate the maximum annual completion rate for the site. Of the eight sample sites that have been built out, two completed within one year, and four more completed within two years. All but two of the sites delivered at least thirty in a single year.
	Max	76	
	Ave	40	
100+ dwellings	Min	34	Only two of the six sample sites failed to deliver more than forty dwellings in a single year and two delivered in excess of eighty in a given year.
	Max	108	
	Ave	58	

- 3.18. This shows that there is a clear correlation between the speed at which sites deliver and their size. Figure 3 shows the delivery rate of the sample sites.

Figure 3: Graph showing the completion rates of the sample site by year



3.19. The sample sites provide fairly consistent patterns for each size category that can be expected:


- 10-24 dwellings – 10-20 dwellings per year (complete within 1 year – 18 months)
- 25-49 dwellings – 20-30 dwellings per year (complete within 2-3 years)
- 50-99 dwellings – 25-40 dwellings per year (complete within 2-3 years)
- 100+ dwellings – 25-40 dwellings per year, per developer on site.

Total Process

3.20. Turning now to the whole process combined, as is demonstrated above, there are clearly a number of variables that can affect timescales of delivery of a site.

3.21. If the stages of the planning and development process are combined we can start to understand how long the overall process can take. Figure 4 below illustrates this.

Figure 4: Length of time in months for sites to progress through planning and construction process



3.22. Table 4 below provides some details and averages of the entire process for the example sites and how this varied in each site category.

Table 4: Total amount of time for development process

Category	Minimum, maximum, average	Months first submission to completion	Comments
Total	Min	14	There is clearly a great variance between the length of time required to deliver different sites, with a range of nearly thirteen years.
	Max	169	
	Ave	49	
10-24 dwellings	Min	14	Eight of the eleven examples took less than three years from start to finish of the process in this category. The remaining three sites took substantially longer than this, more than five years. These three sites significantly skew the averages for this category.
	Max	87	
	Ave	35	
25-49 dwellings	Min	17	Four of the seven sites in this category took less than three years and two more took four to five years to advance through the entire process. The final site took almost twice as long as any other site in this category, again, skewing the average.
	Max	120	
	Ave	47	

Category	Minimum, maximum, average	Months first submission to completion	Comments
50-99 dwellings	Min	19	Six of the eleven example sites took less than three years to advance through the whole process. However four of the sites took more than four years to complete from first submission of an application.
	Max	70	
	Ave	41	
100+ dwellings	Min	49	All sites in this category took longer than four years to complete from submission of an application. Three of them took longer than eight years to complete, whereas three took four to five years.
	Max	169	
	Ave	90	

4. Conclusions

- 4.1. Whilst site specific information obtained through monitoring practices will remain the primary consideration in calculating the expected timeframe for the delivery of each site, the findings of this note sets a benchmark and enables a number of assumptions to be used to test site-specific information against and to fill in any gaps where information is not available.
- 4.2. As these are estimations, it is appropriate to use ranges for the assumptions based on the data available. The position assumed within each ran will depend on what is known about the sites in terms of complexity, sites with fewer barriers or complexities being assumed to the lower end of the range and more complex sites being assumed towards the upper end. Whilst there will be sites which take longer or shorter, this will provide a guide.

Proposed Assumptions for the Application Process

- 4.3. The following assumptions are proposed to be applied against the planning application process should it be needed:

- **Time to determine an outline application and progress to submission of a detailed application – 2-3 years (only applied where an outline application is known to be planned);**
- **Time to determine a detailed application – 6-12 months³.**

- 4.4. It is considered that these ranges provide an adequate check against estimates, whilst allowing for some flexibility to take account of site specifics. As the data shows there is no significant difference between the timescales for determining a detailed permission on sites of different size, these are proposed for sites of all sizes. As outline permission is only sought on a minority of sites, this assumption will only be applied where it is known that outline permission is to be sought.

³ Following on from the Developers and Agents event, this was amended from 6-9 months to 6-12 months in order to reflect the feedback received to suggest that it was slightly optimistic but also to reflect the evidence presented in this report.

Proposed Assumptions for Site Preparation

- 4.5. Moving onto the post-planning permission phase of the process, before dwellings start delivering. As the data has shown little difference across different size of sites a single range is proposed for all sites:

- **Time between issuing detailed permission and delivery commencing - 12-18 months.**

- 4.6. This range will accommodate the majority of cases and is considered suitably flexible to provide a guide.

Proposed Assumptions for Site Construction

- 4.7. This assumption can be broken down into two separate parts, 1. Length of time to deliver on site and annual completion rates. Based on the evidence, this part of the process requires separating out by site size category as follows:

- **10-24 dwellings – 10-20 dwellings per year taking 1 year to 18 months to build;**
- **25-49 dwellings – 20-30 dwellings per year taking 2-3 years to build;**
- **50-99 dwellings – 25-40 dwellings per year taking 2-4 years to build;**
- **100+ dwellings – 25-40 dwellings per year per developer on site.⁴**

Total Timeframes

- 4.8. Taking each of the above into account the proposed assumptions are shown combined in Table 5 below:

Table 5: Proposed assumptions for timescales of delivery

Category	Time for outline permission to be issued and prepare detailed submission	Time for detailed permission to be issued	Site preparation	Construction
10-24 dwellings	2-3 years*	6-12 months	12-18 months	1 year to 18 months / 10-20 dpa
25-49 dwellings	2-3 years*	6-12 months	12-18 months	2-3 years / 20-30 dpa
50-99 dwellings	2-3 years*	6-12 months	12-18 months	2-4 years / 25-40 dpa
100+ dwellings	2-3 years*	6-12 months	12-18 months	3+ years** / 25-40 dpa per developer

* **Note:** outline permission will only be added where evidence shows this will be included in the process for a site and is excluded from total time in Table 8

** **Note:** dependent on size and no. of developers on site.

⁴ The figures for 50-99 dwellings and 100+ dwellings were reduced slightly from 30-40 to 25-40 dwellings per year on sites of 50-99 dwellings and from 40 to 25-40 dwellings per year on sites of 100 or more dwellings to reflect the comments received at the Developers and Agents Event whilst still reflecting the evidence in this report.

- 4.9. These assumptions will only be applied to test site-specific information received from developers, or where information is absent. In cases where there is an absence of information, the known complexity and constraints of a site will be used to determine where in the range of time the site should be assumed to come forward.

APPENDIX 1 – Site details

No	Site Name	Planning Application Reference Number(s)	Size category	Total number of dwellings approved	Outline Application submitted	Outline Application granted	Reserved Matters/ Full Application submitted	Reserved Matters/ Full Application granted	Works Commenced on Site	Date of First Dwelling Completed	Dwellings completed in first year of delivery	Dwellings completed in second year of delivery	Dwellings completed in third year of delivery	Dwellings completed in fourth year of delivery	Dwellings completed in fifth year of delivery	Date of final completion
1	Land North of Kingfisher Close, Cherry Willingham	134507	10-24	21			Jun-16	Sep-16	Feb-17	Oct-17	21					Oct-17
2	Land At Blankney Crescent, Lincoln, LN2 2EP	2015/0903/RG3	10-24	16	N/A		Oct-15	May-16	Apr-17	Jan-18	16					Feb-18
3	Riby Road, Keelby	133301	10-24	18			Jul-15	Feb-16	May-16	Feb-17	18					Mar-17
4	Land Adj Fire Station, High Street, Brant Broughton	15/0854/FUL	10-24	13			Jul-15	Feb-16	Apr-16	Apr-17	13					Apr-17
5	Land At The Shakespeare Public House, 40 High Street, Lincoln, LN5 8AS	2015/0539/F	10-24	10			Jun-15	Dec-15	Jul-16	May-17	10					May-17
6	Land off Kyme Road, Heckington	15/1167/FUL	10-24	22			Sep-15	Dec-15	Jan-16	Dec-16						Dec-16
7	Burton Lane End, Burton Waters	131665	10-24	13			Jul-14	Jul-15	Jul-16	Feb-17	6	7				May-17
8	Land off Gainsborough Road, Scotter	128902	10-24	12			Jun-12	Oct-14	Apr-15	Feb-16	2	10				Feb-17
9	Land At Abbottsford Way, Lincoln	2013/1268/F	10-24	12			Nov-13	Mar-14		Oct-15						Mar-16
10	Pingley Camp, Bigby High Road (Countryside)	129637	10-24	20			Feb-13	Dec-13	Aug-15	Apr-16	9	11				Jan-18
11	Bailey Trailers Ltd, Main Street, Aunsby	07/1155/FUL	10-24	12			Sep-07	Mar-09		Nov-13						Jan-15
12	Land At Westbrooke Road, Lincoln, LN6 7TB	2016/1105/FUL	25-49	27	N/A		Oct-16	Mar-17	May-17	Nov-17	20	7				Jun-18
13	Land At Lincoln Marina, Campus Way, Lincoln, LN6 7GA	2016/0172/F	25-49	44			Mar-16	May-16	May-16	Aug-17						Aug-17
14	Land at Heath Road, Scothern	132027	25-49	30			Oct-14	Jun-15	Feb-16	Oct-16	25	5				Oct-17
15	Land off Hutton Way/Jubilee Avenue, Faldingworth	130717	25-49	41			Nov-13	Oct-14	Oct-15	Aug-16	21	20				Oct-17
16	Cherry Paddocks, Land Adj 4 Hawthorn Road, Cherry Willingham	128773	25-49	42			May-12	Jan-14		Mar-16	13	26	3			Apr-17
17	Land To The Rear Of 41-73 Hykeham Road, Lincoln	2007/0178/O	25-49	30	Mar-07	Feb-08	Jun-11	Sep-11		Oct-11	11	9	9			Mar-17
18	Kyme Road, Heckington	09/0911/FUL	25-49	25			Sep-09	Jun-10	Aug-11	Feb-12						Feb-12
19	"Land At Ingleby CrescentLincolnLincolnshireLN2 2AS"	2016/1184/FUL	50-99	88			Nov-16	Mar-17	Mar-17	Aug-18	76					Sep-18
20	The Former Moorland Primary School, Westwick Drive, Lincoln, LN6 7RP	2014/0840/O	50-99	60	Nov-14	Jul-16	Nov-16	Feb-17	Oct-17	Sep-18	14					Feb-19
21	Former John K King & Sons Plant Liquid Extraction Facility, Skellingthorpe Road, Lincoln	2014/0484/O	50-99	57	Jul-14	Oct-14	Nov-15	Feb-16	Mar-16	Feb-17	38					Apr-17
22	Land off Poplar Close, Ruskington	15/0861/RESM	50-99	67	Aug-13	Jul-15	Jul-15	Dec-15	Jan-17	Jun-17	43	24				Mar-19
23	Land At Westbrooke Road, Lincoln, LN6 7TB	2014/0510/F	50-99	52			Jul-14	Apr-15	Aug-15	Apr-16	21	31				May-17
24	Land at The Hardings, Welton	130995	50-99	50			Feb-14	Mar-15	Jul-15	Apr-16	50					Oct-16
25	Mendip Avenue, North Hykeham	13/1133/FUL	50-99	52			Oct-13	Jun-14	Dec-14	Jun-15	36	16				Feb-17

No	Site Name	Planning Application Reference Number(s)	Size category	Total number of dwellings approved	Outline Application submitted	Outline Application granted	Reserved Matters/ Full Application submitted	Reserved Matters/ Full Application granted	Works Commenced on Site	Date of First Dwelling Completed	Dwellings completed in first year of delivery	Dwellings completed in second year of delivery	Dwellings completed in third year of delivery	Dwellings completed in fourth year of delivery	Dwellings completed in fifth year of delivery	Date of final completion
26	Cell 19, Witham St Hughs	13/1077/RESM	50-99	50			Sep-13	Feb-14		Jan-15	34	16				Jun-16
27	Land South of Murrayfield Avenue/North of Hine Avenue (Phase 5), Greylees	13/0965/FUL	50-99	58			Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Jun-14	58					Apr-15
28	Cell 18, Witham St Hughs	13/0040/RESM	50-99	67			Jan-13	Apr-13	Oct-13	Sep-14	37	28	2			May-17
29	Hunters Place, Willingham Road, Market Rasen	128810	50-99	67			Jun-12	Oct-12	Apr-13	Oct-13	11	26	20	2	8	Mar-18
30	Phase 5, Land Between Newark Road & Mill Lane, North Hykeham	12/1240/RESM	100+	338			Nov-12	Mar-13	Mar-13	Oct-13	59	108	98	73		Jul-17
31	Land North of Station Road, Waddington (Brick Pits)	11/0466/RESM	100+	163	Feb-08	Aug-10	May-11	Dec-11	Nov-13	Apr-15	38	86	39			Oct-17
32	Cell 11	10/1426/RESM	100+	112			Nov-10	Feb-11	Apr-11	Oct-11	29	28	42	13		Feb-15
33	Phase 4, Mill Lane, Newark Road, North Hykeham	10/1424/RESM, 10/1038/RESM & 10/1040/RESM	100+	109			Aug-10	Feb-11	Oct-10	Jan-12	36	46	27			Sep-14
34	E2V Carholme Road Lincoln LN1 1SF	2007/0058/O	100+	255	Feb-07	Jun-09	Jul-10	Nov-10		Nov-11	15	34	57	29	16	Jun-15
35	Land at King Edward Street	08/0532/FUL	100+	145	N/A	N/A	May-08	Dec-09	Sep-13	Nov-14	31	34	30	15		
36	Land North of Foxby Lane, Park Springs Road, Gainsborough	119195	100+	243	Nov-02	Jan-05	Sep-06	Nov-06	Unknown	Nov-08	36	18	20	24		Dec-16

Housing delivery assumptions

- Developing evidence to produce assumptions for use in:
 - Local Plan trajectory and considering the sites needed for allocation
 - Five Year Land Supply Calculations
- How it will be used:
 - It will be used to sense-check information and evidence
 - It will be used where there is no information available
 - It will not replace site-specific evidence / information from developers


Housing delivery assumptions

- Based on 36 sample sites across Central Lincs
- Only considering sites of 10 or more dwellings
- Broken down into size categories of:
 - 10-24 dwellings
 - 25-49 dwellings
 - 50-99 dwellings
 - 100+ dwellings
- Looked at key stages of the development process, including:
 - Achieving permission (outline and detailed)
 - Site preparation
 - Construction

Housing delivery assumptions - Permissions




Housing delivery assumptions – Construction



- 10-24 dwellings
 - 10-20 dpa
 - Complete within 1 year – 18 months
- 25-49 dwellings
 - 20-30 dpa
 - Complete within 2-3 years
- 50-99 dwellings
 - 30-40 dpa
 - Complete within 2-3 years
- 100+ dwellings
 - 40 dpa per developer on site

Housing delivery assumptions – Total time



- Average of A) Time to issue an outline permission
- Average of B) Time between outline permission and detailed submission
- Average of C) Time to issue a detailed permission
- Average of D) Time from detailed permission to first completion
- Average of E) Time from work commencing to first completion
- Average of F) Time from first completion to final completion

APPENDIX 3 – Comments logged at the Developers and Agents Event 26 June 2019

3. Feedback on the draft Housing Land Supply Assumptions

The following comments and discussion points were noted during this section:

General

- Stats presented are really useful to demonstrate.

Planning permissions

- There is a range of issues and circumstances that can affect the length of time for issuing permissions.
- Complexity of achieving outline can be a delay particularly when it is being led by a land owner and agent – should get house builders involved at an early stage.
- 6 months is a little optimistic and 9-12 months might be more accurate.
- Discharge of condition and section 38 often delays things, particularly from Lincolnshire County Council highways, Anglian Water, Gas and Electricity getting on site. Highways and drainage conditions often very complex and time consuming and unnecessary.
- Significant pinchpoint in highways in dealing with reserved matters – s38 and s278 take at least three months to be dealt with.
- Statutory consultees – if no response is received during the consultation period, this should be a lost opportunity for the consultee to help avoid delays.
- Validation can cause confusion with the national and local lists – more explicit validation requirements at the front of the planning portal would help avoid delay.
- These assumptions should be benchmarked with RICS research.

Site Preparation

- Timescales look about right.
- Timescales depends on who is leading the development, the market and the capacity of the developer.
- Each site is bespoke and depends on the circumstances, the seasonal conditions and compliance with conditions.
- Agreeing pre-commencement conditions with the developer before they are issued could speed up the process.

Construction

- Sample size of 36 sites is a reasonable sample to inform this.
- The timescales broadly seem ok.
- 30 market dwellings per year plus affordable is reasonable.
- Difficult to assess accuracy but 25-30 houses per year seems about right, 40 seems too high.
- Affordable housing on site can achieve 40+ dwellings per year.
- Delay from skilled labour and materials can delay construction.
- Should consider the Government's approach to new methods of construction and delivery – modular build and effect on delivery rates. Appetite may be limited in the area due to the rural nature and demography.
- Would be useful to understand what locational factors affect build out rates – supply and demand.
- Could look outside of Central Lincs at locations with similar economic drivers to boost sample sizes – Woodhall Spa, Misterton, Retford, etc.

Total Time

- Generally feels about right.
- The overall proposed assumptions are broadly ok – subject to taking account of site specific issues.
- Could look at per dwelling delivery time.
- Greater understanding of modular build techniques on timescales.