

**Tracey Smith**

---

**From:** Tracey Smith  
**Sent:** 14 September 2015 20:14  
**To:** Ceri Morris; Lana Beynon  
**Subject:** Inspectors' Supplementary Questions on Affordable Housing  
**Importance:** High

**Tracking:**   **Recipient**   **Read**  
Ceri Morris   Read: 15/09/2015 07:49  
Lana Beynon   Read: 15/09/2015 08:52

Hi Ceri and Lana,

As previously mentioned the Inspectors have asked me to send you the following supplementary questions for response by 24<sup>th</sup> September if possible:

Q1. The AHVS (EB10) includes commentary and analysis of a number of key assumptions required to inform the DAT, high level testing and the scenario and sensitivity analysis. This includes data in respect of housing market areas; land values; construction costs; external costs and contingencies; developer profit; house types and sizes; site densities and mixes; market value RSL contributions; house prices; s106 contributions; cost of fire sprinklers and the CfSH etc. Can you confirm that this information, in its current form, is equally applicable to both the GDV and percentage of units approach?

Q2. The findings of the high level testing have been partially updated by the additional information provided by the Council 4 September 2015. The tables provided show the amount of affordable housing, based on a percentage of units, which could be achieved on the notional site if it were to be developed at 30 and 35 dph in the CCSA and at 20 and 25 dph in the VSA. A comparison between the original and updated tables suggests that 20% GDV in the CCSA equates to between 24 and 25% of units on site and that 5% GDV in the VSA equates to approximately 8.5% of units on site. No updating has been undertaken of the data in the Scenarios Testing or Sensitivity Analysis Section of EB10 however, it seems reasonable to conclude that the results for the percentage of units approach would be largely the same as that for the GDV approach. Can you confirm that this is correct?

Q3. Comparison between the original and updated tables suggests that 'headroom', where it is achieved, is the same for the GDV and the percentage of units approach in the CCSA and the VSA. Is this correct?

Q4. It appears that the reason for the difference between the percentage figure for the GDV and the units on site approach is attributable to the way in which houses are secured. In essence the revenue secured from the GDV approach would allow an RSL, based on the development mix contained in on EB10 (page 33), to purchase 25 houses on a 100 unit site. Any variation in the amount of houses secured would be as a result

of the variation in house prices in an area. Can you confirm that this is correct?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

***Tracey Smith***

**LDP Programme Officer**

Neath Port Talbot CBC

Room 220, Civic Centre

Port Talbot

SA13 1PJ

**T:** 07855 215249

**E:** [t.smith1@npt.gov.uk](mailto:t.smith1@npt.gov.uk)

**W:** [www.npt.gov.uk/ldpexamination](http://www.npt.gov.uk/ldpexamination)