Appendix 13: Technical note on calculating housing need

Appendix 13. Technical note on calculating housing need

A13.1 Introduction

This technical appendix seeks to provide further background to, and confidence in, the methodology and data sources used in the SHMA, particularly in calculating the need for affordable housing.

Some notes are provided in Chapter 27, Identifying housing need, however further queries raised during consultation and subsequently led us to provide more detail.

As a general principal the methodology always chooses the conservative approach, and the data source, which produces the lowest estimate of need so as to try to avoid over-stating the need for affordable homes.

For demographic and household projections, the Cambridgeshire County Council Research Group (CCCRG) Demographic and Household Projections 2006 have been used. The CCCRG figures are based on a housing model. Such models work on the assumption that the size and structure of the resident population of any area will be governed mainly by the available housing and planned housing. The model takes account of a number of other factors such as overcrowding and of armed forces, students and other institutional populations, but the major part is the housing provision. Over time, the CCCRG figures have proved more accurate for Cambridgeshire than other projections, such as where the CCCRG figures proved to be closer to the population figures derived from the 2001 Census than the Office of National Statistics (ONS) figures. This is not a criticism of the ONS methodology, which is a population trend based model from a given starting point such as the latest Census. The ONS produce figures at the national level and the CCCRG model will only work at a local level.

Part of the first SHMA methodology included commissioning an interview survey across the housing sub-region, which was completed in 2007. A summary of that survey has been published in Appendix 2, The Household Survey. The figures in Appendix 2 are not weighted, which reflects the brief given to the research company when producing that report. It is essential to be aware that **the figures used in the affordability calculations are weighted** according to the population structure in each district (age and gender) and, any County-wide figures weighted by the relative sizes of population in the districts.

Formulae – mathematical notation has been kept to a minimum. For example, the notation for the sum of a number of years is shown as:

$\sum$ (y1…yn)

rather than:

$\sum$ ($I = 1…n$)

Numbers in the examples may vary very slightly from numbers in the SHMA because of rounding.

For each element of the CLG formula, the following notes have been provided:

- Overall methodology
- The formula used

- Example
- Reasoning (where needed)
- Notes on sources from guidance
- Data source(s)
- Chapter in SHMA for further background

A13.2 **Guidance**

The CLG guidance on SHMAs goes into its suggested process to assess housing need.

This chapter gives details of what the guidance suggests, and how we have used the guidance in the Cambridge sub-region to calculate our housing needs.

There are several important messages to absorb before looking into the detail, which are:

- The SHMA is designed to be built on and updated as time passes and information either changes or improves. So this iteration is bound to change, adjust and improve as it's foundation data does the same.
- The Guidance is written as just that – guidance, rather than a detailed roadmap of "how to" do it. For example, some sources of data do not provide the detail or the cross-tabulations needed to work out the figures for a specific sub region or district. For this reason, we have supplemented the secondary sources of data with our MRUK household survey where necessary, to try to provide a more realistic picture of housing need for our sub-region.
- There are numerous ways to tackle the housing needs "part" of the guidance. For the Cambridge sub-region we have tried to follow the guidance and supplement where we feel it is necessary. However in the future we are looking to evolve our approach further, to investigate more frequently updated sources of housing price information, ways to analyse data using mapping and GIS systems, and data systems to track changes in the housing market and in factors such as inflation, land prices and incomes. All these possibilities will add to the flexibility and responsiveness of our assessment of the market in the future, based on this current (2007) foundation of research.

To see the full CLG guidance, please go to:

- http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/strategichousingmarket
- Identifying sub-regional housing market areas: Advice note, at http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/323693
- Identifying Submarkets at the Sub-Regional Level in England, at http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/identifyingsubmarkets
- Planning for Housing: Market Signals - Summary of Research, at http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/planningforhousing
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment: Practice Guidance, at http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/StrategicHousingLandAvailability

A13.3 **Stage 5.1: Total current housing need**

5.1.1 Priority homeless households and in temporary accommodation

Overall methodology

Duty to accommodate only arises once accepted as homeless and in priority, so only these households in temporary accommodation included to give a robust indicator.

Use HSSA Sec E question 2, number of homeless priority in temporary accommodation.

Use average figure over 6 years to account for year-by-year variations.

The formula used

h = $\sum$ (y1…y6) / 6

Where

h = homeless households in priority need

y = homeless households in priority need at end of each financial year (i.e. 31 March)

Example

Year	Number
2000/01	121
2001/02	84
2002/03	140
2003/04	130
2004/05	108
2005/06	119
Total	**702**

h = $\sum$ (y1…y6)/6

h = (121+84+140+130+108+119) / 6

= 702 / 6

= **117**

Homeless households in priority need in temporary accommodation = **117 a year** on average in this district.

Reasoning

The decision to use only those accepted as homeless and in priority need rather than all households in temporary accommodation was made because that is a more conservative estimate than using all households in temporary accommodation. It is also more robust as it avoids potential double counting of those in temporary accommodation but not accepted as priority homeless.

The decision to average the figures over 6 years was made to use the largest possible divisor while ensuring that the earliest data used were still relevant.

Notes on sources from guidance: Homeless agencies data, priority homeless in temp accommodation.

Data source

HSSA Section E (Homelessness) question 2 – Homeless households (and homeless at home) in priority need in temporary accommodation at 31st March.

Chapter in SHMA for further background:

Ch 18, *Homelessness*

5.1.2 Overcrowded and concealed households

Overcrowding

Calculated separately for overcrowded owner-occupiers, private rented and social housing.
Concealed households are considered separately in the spreadsheet.
Use CCRG household numbers for 2006 and apply % for each tenure group.
Calculate % of the tenure group overcrowded using average SEH East of England figure for 2003/4 to 2005/6.
Then apply % unable to afford using MRUK household survey results.
Remove % on housing needs registers to avoid double counting.
Result = number of households in the relevant tenure likely to be overcrowded, unable to afford and NOT on the HNR.

Defining overcrowding

A household is overcrowded if the total number of people living the property minus the number of couples living in the property is greater than the number of bedrooms in the property:

a – b < c

Where

a = total number of people living in the property

b = number of couples living in the property

c = number of bedrooms in the property

Example 1

A household with 1 couple and two other people, and with three bedrooms.

a = 4

b = 1

c = 3

4 – 1 = 3

3 ~< 3

(where '~' = 'not', so '~<' = 'not less than')

This household is not overcrowded.

Example 2

A household with 2 couples and two other people, and with three bedrooms.

a = 6

b = 2

c = 3

6 – 2 = 4

4 > 3

This household is overcrowded.

Overall methodology

(a) Overcrowded owner-occupiers

There were two possible sources of base data for these calculations:

Source 1: Finding the proportion of owner-occupiers identified in the MRUK household survey as being overcrowded, then applying that proportion to the tenure structure of the district in question.

Source 2: Applying the proportion of overcrowded owner-occupiers identified in the Survey of English Housing (SEH) 2003/04 to 2005/06 to the tenure structure of the district in question.

The second of these was chosen because:

- it was the more conservative estimate in every district
- the SEH has a larger sample size
- using the SEH is in line with the spirit of the Guidance as it uses published data rather than primary research.

The formula used

For each district, overcrowded owner-occupiers who cannot afford to buy and are not on the housing needs register (HNR) was worked out using the following formula:

a = b x (c x 100 / d) x (e x 100 / f) x (g x100 / e) x (h x100 / f)

Where

a = overcrowded owner occupiers (who cannot afford to buy and are not on the HNR)

b = number of households in the district

c = number of dwellings which are owner occupied

d = total number of dwellings in the district

e = number of overcrowded owner occupiers in the MRUK survey1

f = total number of owner occupiers in the MRUK survey (note that this is after weighting according to tenure structure of the district)

g = number of overcrowded owner occupiers who cannot afford to buy now

h = number of owner occupiers not on the housing needs register

Example

a = b x (c x 100 / d) x (e x 100 / f) x (g x100 / e) x (h x100 / f)

= 66,500 x (76%) x (0.9%) x (71%) x (89%)

= **287**

The number of owner-occupiers in this district who are overcrowded, who cannot afford to buy in the current market and who are not on the HNR = **287**

Calculating affordability for owner-occupiers

The affordability test was based on household incomes from the MRUK household survey and from Land Registry data on house prices for the fourth quarter of 2006. The four-times income figure was generated by dividing the average lower quartile price in a particular district from the Land Registry by four to give the income required to furnish a mortgage at four-times that income.

This note demonstrates how those overcrowded owner-occupiers who are unable to buy at current prices were identified. It should be noted that it cannot be assumed that an overcrowded owner-occupier household is mortgage-free or that increase in value of their existing property would allow them to buy another property without a substantial mortgage.

An overcrowded owner-occupier cannot afford a mortgage at current prices the annual household income is less than that required to furnish a mortgage. The annual income required to furnish a mortgage was based on mortgages of four times the annual household income being available. This formula can be represented by:

a $\supset$ (b < c)

where

a = an overcrowded owner occupier cannot afford a mortgage at current prices

$\supset$ = if and only if

b = monthly household income

c = monthly income required for a mortgage (based on four times the household income)

Example

a $\supset$ (b < c)

a $\supset$ (£3,550 < £3,989)

[1] Strictly this is overcrowded owner-occupiers who are planning to move within five years and where an in-situ solution is not appropriate, to give a more realistic and conservative estimate. These minor refinements are not shown separately as they would make the formula unnecessarily complicated.

In this district, the household in question has an income less than that required for a mortgage on the average lower quartile property price. Clearly, any other households with the same or a lower income will be unable to afford a similar mortgage.

Reasoning

The tenure structure was based on the Census 2001. The percentage of households in the Census that were owner-occupied was applied to the total number of households in the district based on the CCCRG Demographic and Household projections 2006. This approach uses data from 2001 against data from 2006 and equates a dwelling with a household. The reasons for doing this are: the 2001 Census remains the most comprehensive assessment of tenure split available and, importantly, a proportion (percentage) is used rather than a number which, in the case of tenure, is less open to change in the short to medium term than an absolute number would be; the household projections are numbers rather than proportions, so the most up to date is the most appropriate; this part of the SHMA – demand - is concerned about households rather than dwellings, making it more appropriate to use the household rather than dwelling figure; the household figure gives a more conservative estimate of need than does the dwelling figure.

Multiplying the total number of households in a district by the proportion of owner occupied dwellings in that district gives the estimate of owner occupying households in the district. This is then multiplied by the proportion of owner occupying households who are overcrowded to give the estimate of the number of overcrowded owner occupying households in the district.

Some of those overcrowded owner-occupiers could afford to buy other properties on the open market. To remove these, the MRUK household survey was used as the only source of data available. This is in line with the spirit of the Guidance – to use published data where possible, but to use survey data if no reliable published data can be found. Cross-tabulations were run giving the percentage in each district of owner-occupiers who were overcrowded based on the number of bedrooms and number of people in the household, and those owner occupied households who could not afford to buy at current prices, based on the possibility of mortgages of four times the monthly household income and on lower quartile mortgages in the district in question. Four times the household income was used in preference to 30% of income because estate agents reported mortgages were available at four times income and to give a more conservative estimate of those who could not afford to buy than using 30% of income would have done. The resulting figure is the minimum income required for a mortgage of four times income. Using the average lower quartile house price from Land Registry Data divided by four to give that minimum income required allowed us to assess the proportion of households who had less that the required income. This approach also had the benefit of tying the income required to an existing source of house price data. The value of the existing property was not taken into account as the fact that the household was overcrowded meant that either two or more properties, or a larger property, or both these options, were required. Whichever of these was the case, a substantial mortgage would be required, particularly as it cannot be assumed that overcrowded owner-occupiers are mortgage-free. Any contribution from the value of the property is likely to be offset by our use of four times the household income to assess affordability rather than 30% of household income. This approach is strengthened by our use of average lower quartile property prices, for two reasons: simply because of taking the lowest priced group (lower quartile); because fewer larger properties will be represented in that quartile, which means that overcrowded owner-occupiers looking to move as a household will need to look in other quartiles. Taking for example a household which is overcrowded in a three-bedroom property and needs another two bedrooms. Generally, buying a five-bedroom property would require that household to extend their mortgage considerably. Finally, if an overcrowded household could afford to buy an addition or larger property (or both), then it is assumed that most would do so.

The cross tabulations only included those who were planning to move in the next five years. This gave a more realistic estimate than including the full group as the situation in five years time may be very different. It also gave a conservative estimate. Also, those overcrowded owner-occupiers planning top move in the next five years and for whom an *in-situ* solution was appropriate were excluded from the figures. For simplicity, these minor refinements are not shown separately in the calculations above. Applying these two minor refinements had only a small effect on the overall numbers

The number of overcrowded owner-occupying households in each district was multiplied by the percentage of overcrowded owner-occupiers in that district who could not afford to buy. This approach gave a conservative estimate of the number of owner-occupiers in each district who were overcrowded, by including only those who could not afford to buy at current prices.

The result of the above calculation was multiplied by the percentage of owner-occupiers who were overcrowded but not on the HNR. This ensured that there was no double counting against the HNR.

(b) Overcrowded private renting households.

The same approach was followed for overcrowded private renters and overcrowded social housing, as per owner-occupiers, with similar principles applied (such as using the more conservative figure from the SEH rather than MRUK survey data to estimate the proportion overcrowded), with the following exceptions:

- No adjustment was made for those who do not state they are planning to move as this is a backlog situation.
- CACI data was used for the affordability test rather than MRUK household survey data. This was because the survey data showed a range of affordability of between 71% and 86% being unable to buy, depending on various factors. The CACI data was in the centre of that range. CACI indicated 78% of private renters cannot afford to buy. The criteria used for affordability was to be able to buy rather than to be able to rent as these were already in private rented and it is assumed that many wish to leave the private rented sector for home ownership, possibly including intermediate housing.

(c) Overcrowded social renting households

The same approach was followed for overcrowded private renters and overcrowded social housing, as per owner-occupiers, with similar principles applied (such as using the more conservative figure from the SEH rather than MRUK survey data to estimate the proportion overcrowded), with the following exception:

- The affordability test was based on MRUK survey data and the test applied was households who cannot afford to buy in the market nor to rent privately.

(d) Concealed households

Use CCRG household numbers for 2006 and apply % for number concealed using MRUK survey.
Then apply % unable to afford to buy or rent using MRUK household survey results.
Remove % on housing needs registers to avoid double counting.
Result = number of households in the relevant tenure likely to be concealed, unable to afford and NOT on the HNR.

The main source of data for this group was the MRUK household survey. In line with the Guidance, the survey was used in the absence of reliable published data on concealed households that could be extrapolated for the local area.

Cross tabulations of the survey responses in each district produced the percentage of all households with at least one concealed household, based on those households which were overcrowded and included at least two couples. To give a conservative estimate, it is assumed that only one of those (two or more) couples is a concealed household. The proportion from the survey was applied to the CCRG household projections for the district in question. Then an affordability test was applied to pull out only those concealed households who were overcrowded and who were unable to buy or rent in the open market. Finally, any overcrowded concealed households unable to buy or rent in the market and who said they were on the HNR or on an RSL waiting list were excluded.

The overcrowding test used was as specified above: a household is overcrowded if the total number of people living the property minus the number of couples living in the property is greater than the number of bedrooms in the property.

The formula used

a = b x (c x 100 / d) x (e x 100 / d) x (f x 100 / e)

Where

a = concealed households who are in overcrowded housing, who cannot afford to rent or buy in the market and who are not on the HNR register or an RSL list

b = number of households in the district

c = number of households in the MRUK survey in that district which have more than one couple and which are overcrowded

d = number of households in that district in the MRUK survey

e = number of overcrowded two-couple households in the MRUK survey, in that district who cannot afford to rent or buy in the market

f = number of overcrowded two-couple households in the MRUK survey in that district who cannot afford to rent or buy and are <u>not</u> on the HNR or an RSL list

Example

a = b x (c x 100 / d) x (e x 100 / d) x (f x 100 / e)

= 56,500 x (1.07%) x (81%) x (93.5%)

= **457**

In this district, the number of concealed households who are in overcrowded housing, who cannot afford to rent or buy in the market and who are not on the HNR register or an RSL list is **457**.

Reasoning

The method defines a concealed household as a couple within an overcrowded household that includes more than one existing couple. This overcrowding condition ensures that an element of need is present and gives a conservative estimate as compared to using all households with more than one couple. The test of overcrowding is the test used throughout this analysis: a household is overcrowded if the total number of people living the property minus the number of couples living in the property is greater than the number of bedrooms in the property. By including only existing couples, this method excludes the majority of newly forming households as the fact that a couple are living under another household's roof indicates that they are already in some sense a "household", though without their own home. The method is conservative in having the overcrowded condition and also as it only takes

one couple from any household, irrespective of the number of couples living there, although there were few households with more than two couples. Being conservative in this way, particularly the overcrowded condition, will offset and perhaps over-compensate for households with more than one couple, but who are living together by choice, such as a family with older parents living with them. In should be noted that examples such as this – a family with older parents living with them – still have an element of need as they will be overcrowded according to the number of bedrooms in the property. Therefore, any such households which have been included still have a need, though possibly for a single larger property. It is expected that there are few such examples included.

The affordability test then excludes all those who were able to buy or rent in the market, based on overcrowded households who were unable to afford to buy or rent in the market in the MRUK survey. This was the only information available. This data does not apply only and directly to those within the household who are the concealed households. However, it is assumed that the existing couples within a household will have some similar economic characteristics, particularly as they are overcrowded in this case. Because it is likely that a smaller number of the hidden households will be able to buy than the 'host' couple, this method again produces a conservative final estimate as it will tend to estimate that more concealed households are able to afford to rent or buy than is actually the case.

Those who said they are registered on the HNA or an RSL waiting list were also excluded. Again this data does not apply only and directly to those within the household who are a concealed household. However, those who are overcrowded and on the HNR can be considered as looking to move and, in numeric terms, it is largely irrelevant whether it is the host household or the concealed household are looking to move – if the host household move out and the concealed household remain then the problem is, numerically, solved. It is probably more likely that the concealed households rather than the host household will be looking to move. Should they both move then both be looking for alternative housing, but the property they were in will become vacant. In this case, the method holds in producing a conservative estimate as it will include only one of those households. Because of this, removing those registered on the HNR is a robust approach.

Notes on sources from guidance: Census, Survey of English Housing, Local Housing Registers.

Data sources

Census 2001, SEH for East of England, MRUK survey, Land Registry Data on house prices for the fourth quarter of 2006

Chapter in SHMA for further background: Ch 11, *Dwelling profile and occupation*

5.1.3 Other groups

Overall methodology

Number on housing needs register excluding transfers, as at 1 April 2006 from HSSA section C (excludes transfers).

Transfer figure from HSSA section D, which includes transfers, mutual exchanges and tenants transferring to RSLs through the nominations process; and CORE table 13 showing transfers within RSL stock

These were summed to give a total figure which included priority homeless. Therefore, the average figure over the previous 6 years for priority homeless in temporary accommodation was subtracted from the total (see stage 5.1.1). It is assumed that the majority of those requiring move-on from hostels would be registered on the HNR or on the LA or RSL

transfer list. All other double counting was taken account of in estimating overcrowded and concealed households and no further adjustment of the HSSA figure was required.

All HNRs except Huntingdonshire DC excluded transfers. The Huntingdonshire DC HNR was adjusted to remove transfers based on information from Huntingdonshire DC on what proportion of the list were transfers.

South Cambridgeshire DC underwent a review of the HNR during the writing of the SHMA. This led to an immediate fall in the numbers on the HNR, to about a half of the original number, followed by a more gradual increase to around two-thirds of the original number, as people realised they were no longer on the HNR and re-registered. This second stage happened over a few months. It should be noted that South Cambridgeshire DC informed everyone on the HNR about the refresh. Therefore, the South Cambs figure at the end of this – in practice "two-stage" - review process (April 2007) was used as being the most accurate.

The formula used

a = b – c – d + e

where

a = the number on the Housing Register, Local Authority/ RSL Transfers or having hostel move-on needs

b = the number on the HNR

c = transfers included on the HNR where applicable

d = average number of priority homeless in temporary accommodation (see above)

e = the number of LA/RSL transfers per year

Example

a = b – c – d + e

= 2,032 – 0 – 81 + 37

= **1,988**

In this district, the number on the Housing Register, Local Authority/ RSL Transfers or having hostel move-on needs is **1,988**. In this example, transfers were already excluded from the number given in the HSSA.

Reasoning

A single year is used for the number on the HNR rather than an average over several years because the Registers are reviewed periodically. The South Cambridgeshire experience suggests that the point that a register is at its most accurate around three to six months after a review. A register would be at its most accurate, when, for example, it had the maximum number of 'active' applicants (those actively seeking accommodation) and the minimum number of out of date applications where social rented accommodation is no longer required and which can be removed.

The average priority homeless figure over the previous 6 years was used in preference to the single figure on the same HSSA form (Section E) that the number of people on the HNR was lifted from (Section C). This was in order to use the most accurate figure available on

priority homelessness over time so as to iron out fluctuations. For the same reason, the average figures from local authority HSSA returns and CORE for transfers were used.

Notes on sources from guidance: Housing Register, Local Authority/ RSL Transfer Lists, Hostel Move-On Needs

Data sources

HSSA Section C. Question 1a – Number on Housing Needs Register as at 1st April 2006, excluding transfers

HSSA section D – transfers taken place (including transfers, mutual exchanges and tenants transferring to RSLs through the nominations process; and CORE table 13 showing transfers within RSL stock). Questions 2, 3 and 10a3 plus CORE table 13.

Chapter in SHMA for further background: Ch 17, *Social rented housing turnover, housing registers and lettings*

Annual Need to Reduce Backlog over 5 years

Overall methodology

Adopted approach of reducing backlog over a 5 year period, so aim to meet 20% of need per year. The total backlog of need was calculated by summing the need for:

- Priority homeless in temporary accommodation
- Overcrowded and concealed households
- "Other groups" (those on the HNR and transfers)

The formula used

a = (b + c + d) / 5

where

a = The total backlog of need in this district

b = Priority homeless

c = Overcrowded and concealed households

d = HNR and transfers

Example

a = (b + c + d) / 5

= (52 + 1,000 + 1,454) / 5

= **501**

In this district, **501** households need to be rehoused each year to clear the backlog of need.

Reasoning

Aiming to reduce the backlog to zero over 5 years ensured that the SHMA fit with previous policy, where reduction to zero over 5 years is the most common approach taken in the Cambridge sub-region. In this case, irrespective of the change of approach from Housing Needs Surveys to the SHMA, it is important for this figure to be to be roughly in line with

those previous used as policy and practice have been built on the assumption. The important test here is that there is no good reason to move away from the previously used figure (5 years) and, independent of this, there is a good reason to maintain it. The reason to maintain it is that it is a realistic balance between achievability and unrealistic waiting time. Reducing the backlog by 20% each year is usually an ambitious target for a local authority, but to set the figure higher than 5 years would be unrealistic in terms of the waiting time for those on the HNR.

Notes on sources from guidance: Version 2 of the Guidance says:

"The quota should be based on meeting the need over a period of five years, although longer timescales can be used. In particular there may be merit in linking quotas to adopted housing policies in plans."

Earlier versions of the Guidance were worded differently, although the five-year period was mentioned.

A13.4 Stage 5.2: Total newly arising housing need per year

5.2.1 New household formation

Natural growth

New growth refers to new households forming from within existing population.

Calculate change in households projected between 2006 and 2011. Divide by 5 for annual growth figure.

Use CCRG nil net in-migrant model for annual natural growth figure.

In-migrant households - by tenure

Calculate in-migrants by tenure, by owner-occupied, private rent, social rent and other (low affordability).

Remove CCRG nil net in-migrant model for annual natural growth figure from projected growth in households (see above).

Difference then apportioned by tenure using MRUK survey results.

Result = number of in migrants projected per year by tenure group.

5.2.2 Proportion of new households unable to buy or rent in the market

Number of households unable to afford

For each tenure group, calculate the % likely to be able to afford the appropriate tenure using MRUK household survey results, except for low affordability where CACI data (more reliable than MRUK results for this group). Multiply number of new households (natural growth and in-migrant for each tenure from 5.2.1) by likely affordability (5.2.2) to give number of new households unable to afford

Overall methodology

The sources of data that were used were the CCCRG Population Projections for 2006 to 2011 and the MRUK survey.

The population projections were used to estimate the average growth in households each year between 2006 and 2011 from natural growth and from in-migration for each of the districts.

The MRUK survey was used to apportion the in-migrant figures between the different tenures.

An affordability test was then applied to each of the resulting figures. Different tests were applied to each case.

For natural growth from existing households in-migrant owner-occupiers and in-migrant social renters, the tests were based on MRUK survey data. In each of these cases, the results from the survey of affordability by that particular group was compared to CACI data to assess whether the survey results were realistic. Where there was a large difference between the survey results and CACI data, the survey results were used where they produced a conservative estimate of need. For example, in some districts the survey results indicated that a smaller proportion of in-migrant social renters were able to buy or rent in the market than that showed by the CACI data and the total number was multiplied by the smaller rather than the larger proportion, producing a lower figure to be taken forward to the total need.

The affordability tests used were:

- Natural growth (newly forming households from existing households): the % of newly forming households in the survey who could not afford to rent or buy in the open market.
- In-migrant owner occupiers: by definition, recent in-migrant owner occupiers can afford to buy in the open market, therefore zero% cannot afford to buy. Therefore none of this group are carried forward to the total need figure.
- In-migrant private renters: the proportion of in-migrants in the survey who could afford to rent, but not to buy in the open market.
- In-migrant social renters: the proportion of in-migrants in the survey who could not afford to buy or rent in the open market.
- In-migrants – other (low affordability): the proportion of low-income households unable to buy or rent in the market from CACI data.

The formula used

Calculating numbers of in-migrant households

For each district, the average number of in-migrant households per year = increase in households per year – the natural increase in households per year.

Where

The increase in households per year = (the projected number of households 2011 – the number of households 2006) / 5

The natural increase in households per year = (the projected number of households in 2011 from the CCCRG nil net in-migration model - the number of households in 2006 from the CCCRG nil net in-migration model) / 5

a = ((b – c)/5) – ((d – c) / 5)

Where

a = the average number of in-migrant households in this district per year

b = the projected number of households at 2011

c = the number of households in 2006

d = the projected number of households based on nil net in-migration at 2011

Apportioning the in-migrant households to tenures

For each district, the number of in-migrant households in a specific tenure = the number of in-migrant households per year x (the number of in-migrant households in that tenure responding to the MRUK survey x 100 / the total number of in-migrant household responding to the MRUK survey)

a = b x (c x 100 / d)

where

a = the number of in-migrant households in each tenure per year for that district

b = the average number of in-migrant households each year

c = the number of in-migrant households in the tenure in question in the MRUK survey

d = the total number of in-migrant households in the MRUK survey

Affordability

For each district, for a specified tenure, the number of in-migrant households who cannot afford one or more specified housing options* = the number of in-migrant households in that tenure x the proportion of in-migrant households in that tenure who cannot afford the specified housing option.

* See “Overall Methodology” above for details of specified housing options for each tenure group. In the example used below, of owner occupiers, the specified option is the proportion of in-migrant owner occupiers who cannot afford to buy in the open market.

a = b x (c x 100 / b)

where

a = the number of in-migrant households in that district in the tenure in question who cannot afford the specified housing options

b = the number of in-migrant households in that tenure

c = the number of in-migrant households in that tenure who cannot afford the specified housing option

Example

Calculating the total number of in-migrant households

a = ((b – c)/5) – ((d – c)/5)

= ((63,100 – 56,500)/5) – ((59,900 - 56,500)/5)

= 1,320 – 680

= 640

In this district, on average there will be **640** in-migrant households per year.

Apportioning the in-migrant households to tenures

a = b x (c x 100 / d)

= 640 x (105 x 100 / 165)

= 640 x 63.64%

= **407**

In this district, an estimated **407** in-migrant households each year are in this tenure (owner occupied).

Affordability

By definition all in-migrant owner occupiers can afford to buy as have done recently (as opposed to existing long-term households who might not be able to afford to buy in today's market).

a = b x (c x 100 / b)

= 407 x (0 x 100 / 407)

= 407 x 0

= **0**

In this district, **no** in-migrant owner occupiers cannot afford to buy in the open market. Therefore no in-migrant owner occupiers are included in the housing need figures.

Reasoning

The CCCRG Population projections are dwelling-led. This approach is based on the local situation and avoids some of the problems of trend-based projections. It has proved robust in the past. For example, the population growth in Cambridgeshire between 1991 and 2001 was more accurately reflected in the CCCRG projections than in the ONS trend-led figures, which were widely reported in the national press as having 'lost' hundreds of thousands of people. This point is not intended as a comment on the press reports or accuracy of the ONS figures (at the national level, it would be impossible to use a dwelling-led approach), but to demonstrate the robustness of the CCCRG approach using facts that are in the public domain.

The figures for different tenures are apportioned according to the situation at the time of writing. It is assumed that that apportionment is a reasonable approximation which will apply in the near future. Given the house building programme in the Cambridge sub-region, there is no reason to expect in-migration tenure patterns to change in the near future other than specific cases such as migrant workers.

There are two aspects of the affordability tests to consider: which of the possible alternative tenures to apply in testing the current tenure groups for affordability and which figures to use for that affordability test. These are considered in turn.

Considering which possible alternative tenures to apply, the following tenure groups all use the test of whether the household can afford to buy or rent in the open market:

- Natural growth (newly forming households from existing households)
- In-migrant social renters
- In-migrants – other (low affordability)

It is assumed those households in these three groups who cannot afford to rent or buy in the market will have a need for some form off social housing as no other option is available.

For in-migrant owner-occupiers, the affordability test is more stringent - whether they can afford to buy in the open market. As stated above, this is self-evidently true for all of them. It should be noted that there is a difference between recent home buyers and those who bought some time ago and may not be able to buy to move should they wish – i.e. those who would be unable to afford to buy in the current market. Recent home buyers includes all recent in-migrant home buyers and those home-buyers moving house recently within the Cambridge sub-region. For this, the definition of "recent" need not be precise as long as common sense is applied, but it will take into account the rate of rise in house prices and incomes over the last few years.

In-migrant private renters. This is probably the only contentious test. The less stringent test used was of those who could afford to rent, but not to buy in the open market (rather than being unable to afford to buy or rent), meaning that those who could afford to rent were considered to be in need. This decision was based on comparing the MRUK survey results with CACI data. While the two sets of data usually gave a broadly consistent picture, in this case there was a difference. The CACI data generally gave a higher proportion of this group who could not afford either to buy or to rent in the open market than the survey gave for those who could afford to rent, but not to buy. Therefore, using the survey figures for those who could afford to rent, but not to buy were used to give a conservative estimate to be carried forward to the total need figures. The figures for those who could not afford to buy or to rent in the open market would be too low to be realistic as many that group was covered by those in social rented housing. Therefore this figure can be considered as the need of those in private renting who may struggle to afford to rent. It is recognized that this method is not ideal, but again, it gives a conservative estimate of this area of need.

In-migrants – other (low affordability). Considering which figures to use, the MRUK household survey figures were used for all but one tenure group because those figures could reflect the groups precisely, whereas some of the CACI data was not available for those specific groups, but with a comparison made against the CACI data to assess whether, in each case, the two sets of figures gave a broadly consistent picture. The one exception to that is dealt with above (in-migrant private renters). CACI data was used for the in-migrants – other (low affordability) group as it was the only data available.

Notes on sources from guidance: Affordability for natural growth in existing households

Data sources

CCCRG Population Projections for 2006 to 2011

MRUK survey

CACI income data

Chapters in SHMA for further background: Ch 10, *Demographic context and forecasting* and Ch 21, Current a*ffordability and income*

5.2.3 Existing households falling into need

Overall methodology

Used all LA dwellings let to new secure tenants, including introductory lettings, other tenancies, total RSL lettings, tenants transferring to RSL homes and new additional LA and RSL rented dwellings.

Used average over 4 years (2002/3 to 2005/6) to avoid peaks and troughs. Used HSSA D and N.

The number of households who enter the register and are housed within the year is not readily available. An approach has been taken which uses the average total number of lettings per year calculated over the previous 3 (or, where possible, 4) years, including transfers and new build. The number of households who have fallen into need is then calculated through the following approach: if the number of households on the HNR is rising or remains constant over the previous 3 years, then the number of new lettings is taken to be equal to the number of households falling into need and being housed within the year; if the number of households on the HNR is falling, then the number of households falling into need and being housed within the year is taken to equal to the total lettings per year minus the average annual decrease in number of the HNR over the previous 3 years. The total number of lettings in each year is calculated by summing HSSA Section D

The formulae used

a = b + c + d + e + f + g

Where

a = total number of lettings

b = dwellings let to new secure tenants

c = dwellings let to new tenants on an introductory tenancy

e = dwellings let to tenants on other tenancies

f = number of additional local authority dwellings (outturn figures)

g = number of additional RSL-rented dwellings (outturn figures)

The annual average lettings = (total number of lettings for year 1 + lettings for year 2 + lettings for year 3) / 3

a = ∑(y1…y3) / 3

Where

a = the annual average lettings

y = total number of lettings for year

The average annual decrease in the HNR = (number on HNR in year 1 – number on HNR in year 3) / 3

a = (b - c) / 3

Where

a = average annual decrease in HNR

b = number on HNR in year 1

c = number on HNR in year 3

Note that in every case of lowering HNR the underlying trend led to a lower figure in year 4 than in year 1. This approach is broad, but tends towards taking account of the underlying trend.

If the HNR is *increasing* (or remains exactly constant) then the number of households who enter the register and are housed within the year = the annual average of lettings.

Otherwise, if the HNR is *decreasing* then the number of households who enter the register and are housed within the year = the annual average of lettings – the average annual decrease in the HNR

$(a =< b) \supset (c = d)$

else

$(a > b) \supset (c = d - e)$

Where

a = HNR in year 1

b = HNR in year 3

c = Number of households who enter the register and are housed within one year

d = mean annual lettings

e = mean annual decrease in the HNR

Example

$(a =< b) \supset (c = d)$ else $(a > b) \supset (c = d - e)$

a = 1,737

b = 1,442

(1,737 > 1,442) therefore

c = d – e

= 341 – 32

= **309**

In this district, the number of households who enter the register and are housed within one year is **309**.

Reasoning

This calculation involves several stages, but is mostly self-explanatory. Averages (mean) are used to iron out fluctuations over time. The calculation of the average decrease between year 1 and year three (HNR in year 1 – HNR in year 3)/3 is based on the fact that in all districts where the HNR lowered there was a decrease between year 1 and year 2 as well as year 2 and year 3.

The test of which figures to use as a proxy for households entering the HNR and being housed within the same year can be demonstrated by the following example:

100 households enter the HNR each year and 50 of those households are rehoused within the year (including to new build). No other lettings are made. Under these circumstances, the list would grow by 50 each year.

As the number of lettings to households who entered the list in the previous 12 months is not available, the best proxy of that figure under the circumstance of the list growing is the total number of lettings.

However, if the list is shrinking then a more accurate proxy than the total lettings is to subtract from the total the number by which the list is decreasing as those households can be assumed to be households who have not entered the list in that year.

Notes on sources from guidance: Housing Register/ LA and RSL data, tenants surveys. "Households who have entered the register and been housed within the year as well as households housed outside the register (such as priority homeless household applicants)"

Data sources

HSSA Section D. Question 4 – Dwellings let to new secure tenants. Question 5 – Dwellings let to new tenants on an introductory tenancy. Question 6 – Dwellings let to tenants on other tenancies.

HSSA Section N. Question 1 – Number of additional local authority dwellings (outturn figures). Question 2 – Number of additional RSL-rented dwellings (outturn figures).

Chapter in SHMA for further background: Ch 21, Current a*ffordability and income*

A13.5 Stage 5.3: Annual supply of affordable housing

5.3.1 Affordable dwellings occupied by households in need - overcrowded

Overall methodology

Calculated 1/5th Social Rented Tenants in Overcrowded Properties (From 5.1.2). This provides a total backlog to be met over 5 years, this figure needs to be an annual one. The figure may be slightly high as in some cases, only part of the household will move out to ease the overcrowding. In others the whole household will move to a larger property. No adjustment has been made so as to provide a conservative final estimate.

Reasoning

Overcrowded households are defined in Step 5.1.2. The decision to use social rented properties as “affordable dwellings” in this Step is based on two factors: Most importantly it is to ensure that these households are in need; secondly, it avoids grey areas of what should be included within “affordable dwellings”, particularly in the light of the intermediate market in much of the Cambridge Sub-Region.

Notes on sources from guidance: Housing Register, Local Authority and RSL transfer lists, over-crowding data

Chapter in SHMA for further background: Ch 11, *Dwelling profile and occupancy*

5.3.1 Affordable dwellings occupied by households in need - underoccupying

Overall methodology

"Partnerships should assess the figures identified in step 1 to estimate the number of dwellings vacated by current occupiers that are fit for use by other households in need".

This figure could be improved by a detailed analysis of moves from larger to smaller properties within the social rented sector, including moves into sheltered, but only where the

whole household moves. However given the complexity of this work and the low numbers involved, decided best to proceed using published data and refine in future as appropriate. Used HSSA Section D3a1 - Social tenants moving to homes with fewer bedrooms, average over 4 years from 2002/3 to 2005/6.

The formula used

a = $\sum$ (y1…y4) / 4

where

a = the number of affordable dwellings vacated by current occupiers that are fit for use by other households

y = tenants transferring to a dwelling with fewer bedrooms for the year

Example

a = (17 + 13 + 18 + 12) / 4

= **15**

In this district, each year and average of **15** affordable dwellings become vacant that are fit for use by other households

Reasoning

The number of affordable dwellings becoming vacant that are fit for use by other households is averaged over four years to iron out fluctuations.

Again, the decision to use social rented properties as "affordable dwellings" in this Step is based on two factors: Most importantly it is to ensure that these households are in need; secondly, it avoids grey areas of what should be included within "affordable dwellings", particularly in the light of the intermediate market in much of the Cambridge sub-Region. In this case, it has the additional advantage of being able to identify those who have moved to a property with fewer bedrooms.

As mentioned above, the figure lifted from the HSSA is for vacated properties within the local authority stock, which fits with the guidance that partnerships should "estimate the number of dwellings *vacated by current occupiers that are fit for use by other households in need*".

It is recognized that this method excludes authorities which have transferred stock entirely to an RSL. This figure could be improved by a detailed analysis of moves from larger to smaller properties within the social rented sector, including moves into sheltered, but only where the whole household moves. However, such an analysis would be complex and there are low numbers involved. On the basis of efficiency it was decided best to proceed using published data and to refine the approach in future as appropriate. The low numbers involved mean that this will have little effect on the total.

Notes on sources from guidance: "Partnerships should assess the figures identified in step 1 to estimate the number of dwellings vacated by current occupiers that are fit for use by other households in need" (Guidance P.47)

Data source

HSSA Section D. Question 3a1 – Tenants transferring to a dwelling with fewer bedrooms. Section D3 of the HSSA relates to "Dwellings let to existing tenants within the authority's own stock".

Chapter in SHMA for further background: Ch 11, *Dwelling profile and occupation*

5.3.2 Surplus stock

Overall methodology

Good practice allows for 3% of social stock to be vacant at any one time. The worksheet 5.3.2 Surplus stock compares the number of vacant homes with the number of social homes in the district, and denotes if there is more than <3% of the total social stock, vacant. If not, surplus stock value = 0. If there is a surplus of vacant homes, the number of vacant homes above the 3% threshold will be used.
Used HSSA Section A. Vacant dwellings in Social Sector compared to social stock as at 1 April 2006.

The figures under HSSA section A, Question 7a – Totals of vacant dwellings for local authority and RSL are summed to give a total of local authority and RSL stock vacant for more than 6 months.

The figures under Question 1 – Total dwelling stock for local authority and RSL are summed to give a total of local authority and RSL stock.

The percentage of the total local authority and RSL stock vacant for more than 6 months is calculated. Anything in excess of 3% is included in the calculation, any figures up to 3% are excluded. This was under 3% for all districts.

The formula used

Vacant dwellings

a = b + c

where

a = total local authority and RSL dwellings vacant (for more than six months)

b = local authority dwellings vacant (for more than six months)

c = RSL dwellings vacant (for more than six months)

Total dwelling stock

d = e + f

where

d = total local authority and RSL dwelling stock in the district

e = total local authority dwelling stock in the district

f = total RSL dwelling stock in the district

Calculation of percentage

The percentage of local authority and RSL dwelling stock which has been vacant for more than 6 months = total local authority and RSL dwellings vacant (for more than six months) / total local authority and RSL dwelling stock in the district

g = a x 100 / d

where

a = total local authority and RSL dwellings vacant (for more than six months)

d = total local authority and RSL dwelling stock in the district

g = percentage of local authority and RSL dwelling stock which has been vacant for more than 6 months

Assessing the figure to go forward to the calculation of housing need

If the percentage of local authority and RSL dwelling stock which has been vacant for more than 6 months is over 3% then the number of vacant units to be included in calculating housing need = total local authority and RSL dwellings vacant (for more than six months) - the number of units of vacant stock constituting 3% of the total stock of local authority plus RSL dwellings (i.e. percentage of local authority and RSL dwelling stock which has been vacant for more than 6 months - g – expressed as a number rather than a percentage).

Else

If the percentage of local authority and RSL dwelling stock which has been vacant for more than 6 months is equal or less than 3% then the number of vacant units to be included in calculating housing need = zero.

$(g > 3\%) \supset (h = a - i)$

Else

$(g <= 3\%) \supset (h = 0)$

Where

a = total local authority and RSL dwellings vacant (for more than six months)

g = percentage of local authority and RSL dwelling stock which has been vacant for more than 6 months

h = the number of vacant units to be included in calculating housing need

i = the number of units of vacant stock constituting 3% of the total stock of local authority plus RSL dwellings (i.e. g as a number rather than a percentage).

Example

a = b + c

= 127 + 119

= 246

d = e + f

= 7,600 + 3,526

= 11,126

g = a x 100 / d

= 246 x 100 / 11,126

= 2.2%

$(g <= h) \supset (i = 0)$

(2.2% <= 3%) therefore i = 0

In this district, less than 3% of the local authority plus RSL stock has been vacant for more than 6 months. The total taken forward to the calculation of housing need is zero.

Reasoning

The calculation of the percentage of local authority plus RSL stock which has been vacant for more than 6 months is straightforward and assumed to be uncontroversial.

Allowable level of voids = c.3% to allow for movement and work. If the rate is more than this and properties are empty for long periods, these should be counted as surplus stock.

Notes on sources from guidance: Local Authority and RSL records. Allowable level of voids = c.3% to allow for movement and work. If the rate is more than this and properties are empty for long periods, these should be counted as surplus stock.

Data source

HSSA Section A, question 1 – Total dwelling stock and question 7a – Totals of vacant dwellings

Chapter in SHMA for further background: Ch 11, *Dwelling profile and occupation*

5.3.3 Committed supply of new affordable housing

Overall methodology

Used the average of plans for homes in 2006/7 and 2007/8.

Used HSSA sec N - new rented and shared ownership but NOT "other" affordable private sector as unlikely to be affordable as defined in PPS3

Question 4a – Total additional LA/RSL dwelling. This is the total of Questions N1, N2 and N3: number of additional local authority dwellings plus number of additional RSL rented dwellings plus number of additional RSL shared-ownership dwellings.

The figures under two columns in Question 4a – the number planned for the current year and the number planned for the next year – are averaged a single figure for Total additional LA/RSL dwellings planned.

The figure that this sum gives can be seen as the committed supply of new affordable dwellings for any one year for the immediate future. The word ‘immediate’ is important here; this figure will change year by year.

The formula used

$$a = (y1 + y2) / 2$$

where

a = the committed supply of new affordable dwellings

y1 = total number of planned LA plus RSL dwellings in the district for the current year

y2 = total number of planned LA plus RSL dwellings in the district for the next year

Example

Example year: 2006/07

Planned 2006/07 (the current year) = 188

Planned 2007/08 (the next year) = 165

a = (y1 + y2) / 2

= (188 + 165) / 2

= 353/2

= 177

In this district, the committed supply of new affordable dwellings is **177** per year for the immediate future.

Reasoning

The average of the current and next year planned LA and RSL provision is used to help smooth out variation year by year. It is recognized that taking an average over only two years is not ideal. However, the HSSA data is probably the most reliable unified source of planned additional LA+RSL housing and only two years data are available at any one time. Past data could not be used for this figure as it is supposed to represent 'committed' supply rather than past supply.

It could be argued that planned provision is not committed provision. We accept this argument as being strictly true, but believe that the Guidance should be read as 'committed' meaning 'planned' in this case, as long as a figure for planned provision is contained within a formal document such as the HSSA returns. To take the argument strictly would mean that hardly any provision could be taken as committed at any one time as an irreversible commitment only occurs late in the development cycle.

The final figure is the committed supply of new affordable dwellings 'per year for the immediate future'. This slightly stilted expression is used to be specific about what the figure shows.

Notes on sources from guidance: Development programmes of affordable housing providers, Regeneration schemes, including conversions and intermediate housing products

Data sources

HSSA Section N. Question 4a – Total additional LA/RSL dwelling.

The figures under two columns in Question 4a – the number planned for the current year and the number planned for the next year – are averaged a single figure for total additional LA/RSL dwellings planned.

Chapter in SHMA for further background: Ch 23, *Past and future housing delivery*

5.3.4 Units to be taken out of management

Overall methodology

Used 2005/6 Annual Monitoring Return as published by County Council. Average over the years provides a falsely high number, rate of demolition of social stock generally low in recent years so 2005/6 figure judges best snapshot to use.

The Annual Monitoring Return is updated and submitted to CLG in October/ November each year. The figures used are the most up to date and apply to the previous financial year.

Reasoning

Occasional demolitions of a number of properties can occur, such as if a block of flats is demolished. These occasional figures will significantly distort the average. For example, the figures in one district for 5 years are: 2, 39, 4, 0, 4. Clearly, the 39 is an outlier and should be discarded. No average of the remaining 4 years figures (mean, mode, median) is any more meaningful than simply using the figure for the previous year.

Notes on sources from guidance: Demolition and conversion programmes of LA/RSLs HSSA Data

Source

2005/6 Annual Monitoring Return as published by County Council

Chapters in SHMA for further background: Ch 11, *Dwelling profile and occupation and Ch 23 Past and future housing delivery*

5.3.6 Annual supply of social re-lets

Overall methodology

Used HSSA average number of lettings over 2001/2 to 2005/6. Includes all new lettings to local authority stock, and RSL lettings, all excluding transfers.

The figures were taken from the HSSA as below:

D4 LA Dwellings let to new tenants

D5 LA Dwellings let to new tenants on an introductory tenancy

D6 LA Dwellings let to new tenants on other tenancies (e.g. non-secure, but not introductory)

D9 Total RSL lettings (including LA nominations but not transfers within or between RSLs)

D10(3) LA tenants transferring

N1 Number of additional local authority dwellings

N2 Number of additional RSL rented dwellings

The supply of social re-lets for each district can be found by adding the four figures for lettings to the local authority and RSLs. From this the number of transfers within LA stock is subtracted (the RSL figure does not include transfers). Finally, from this total is subtracted the total of new provision as given by adding the two figures for additional dwellings (LA and RSL). This is based on the fact that a letting new provision is not a re-let. The annual supply is calculated by taking an average of the results over 5 years.

The formula used

$$a = (b + c + d + e - f) - (g + h)$$

where

a = The annual supply of social re-lets

b = LA Dwellings let to new tenants

c = LA Dwellings let to new tenants on an introductory tenancy

d = LA Dwellings let to new tenants on other tenancies

e = Total RSL lettings (including LA nominations but not transfers within or between RSLs)

f = LA tenants transferring

g = Number of additional local authority dwellings

h = Number of additional RSL rented dwellings

The average annual supply of social re-lets for each district = The total of the annual supplies of social re-lets for 5 years / 5

i = ∑ (y1…y5) / 5

where

i = The average annual supply of social re-lets

y = The annual supply of social re-lets for year 1 … to year 5

Example

a = (b + c + d + e - f) – (g + h)

= (427 + 0 + 102 + 247 - 81) – (0 + 81)

= 695 – 81

= 614

In this district in this year, the number of social re-lets was 614. This is the annual supply of social re-lets.

i = ∑ (y1…y5) / 5

= (495 + 614 + 657 + 704 + 704) / 5

= **635**

The average annual supply of social re-lets for this district is **635**.

Reasoning

This approach is fairly straightforward. The two areas of possible debate are on transfers and our subtracting new-build properties. On transfers, the Guidance says (step 3.6, pp 48-49): "This should not include transfers of tenancies to other household members – only properties that come up for re-let to a new household should be counted." The subtraction of new provision is done because this figure is meant to be of 're-lets' rather than all lets.

Notes on sources from guidance: Lettings/voids systems for providers, LA and RSLs, CORE data for RSLs, HSSA data

Data source

HSSA Section D, questions 4, 5, 6, 9 and 10(3) and HSSA Section N, questions 1 and 2

Chapter in SHMA for further background: Ch 17, *Social rented housing turnover, registers and lettings*

5.3.7 Annual supply of intermediate affordable housing available for re-let or resale at sub-market levels

Overall methodology

This figure is simply the total of re-sales over the previous year taken from CORE data for 2006/7.

Reasoning

No average can be taken because new organizations from Cambridge sub-region joining CORE in year by year would distort that average. At some point in the future it should be possible to improve on this by taking an average over several years.

Notes on sources from guidance: LA/ RSLs and other providers on re-sales of sub-market LCHO or shared equity schemes

Data source

CORE, part C section 1 (Shared ownership / shared equity), Question 22 – Is this a re-sale?

Chapter in SHMA for further background: Ch 19 and 20, *Intermediate Housing - applications and sales*