DAY 10 | REVISED PROPOSAL 09

One Million New Homes Through Mixed Tenure

A ten-year national programme to enable one million additional homes through social, affordable, intermediate and private delivery - with public finance, conditional incentives and infrastructure planned together.

Public scrutiny has changed this proposal

My original proposal for one million new social homes has been withdrawn following public scrutiny and citizen involvement. Manifesto 1.1 retains the one-million-home ambition, but replaces the all-social pledge with a mixed-tenure programme. This is a change in delivery model, not simply a change of title.

The revised proposal in brief

- **One million additional homes over ten years** across a mix of tenures, with councils, housing associations, partnerships and private builders contributing to delivery.
- **Public and social housing remain part of the programme:** long-term, low-interest development finance, targeted grants and public land partnerships.
- **Private incentives must earn their place:** support linked to verified additional homes, with measurable conditions and clawback.
- **Local need shapes the tenure mix:** no fixed national percentage split has been invented.
- **A revised programme requires revised costing:** the former all-social capital assumptions are retired, not carried across as the price of this policy.

The ambition remains. The delivery model changes.

The test is homes completed, affordability achieved, infrastructure delivered and public value - not announcements or planning permissions alone.

Source: Manifesto 1.1, Part IV, section 12 (Major Promise 10); Housing Budget 3.1; Revision 001. Day 10 / Proposal 09 is the public-release identifier, not the manuscript section number.

THE REVISED COMMITMENT

One programme.
More than one route.

1. What the revised target actually means

Manifesto 1.1 sets a national target of one million additional homes over ten years. It is a national supply target, not a promise that central government will directly finance or construct every home.

> **The wording in Manifesto 1.1**
>
> "The revised national target is one million additional homes over ten years across a mix of social housing, affordable housing, shared-ownership and other intermediate tenures, regeneration schemes, build-to-rent where appropriate, and private homes for sale."

In practical terms, the programme brings different tenures and delivery routes into one framework. Regeneration is a delivery route, rather than a tenure in its own right; the stated target is additional homes, so replacement activity must not be confused with an increase in supply.

2. Public and social delivery

Local authorities and housing associations will be offered long-term, low-interest development finance for viable schemes. Funding will be tied to delivery milestones, transparent land and build costs, appropriate affordability requirements and long-term stewardship.

- Long-term central-government lending at preferential rates for qualifying council and housing-association schemes.
- Targeted grants where genuinely affordable or specialist housing cannot be delivered through lending alone.
- Public land assembly and regeneration partnerships.
- Greater freedom to combine council, housing-association and institutional capital.
- Priority for areas with acute affordability pressures, long waiting lists, regeneration need or weak private delivery.

Withdrawing the one-million-social-homes pledge does not remove social housing from the programme. It changes the tenure composition and the way the national supply ambition would be delivered.

DELIVERY AND CONDITIONAL INCENTIVES

Bring private building into the same programme

3. Private-sector delivery

The former separate policy on private-housebuilding incentives is consolidated into the mixed-tenure programme. Private developers that meet agreed additional-housing targets may receive time-limited preferential treatment.

- **Corporation Tax incentives** linked to verified additional completions rather than land holdings or permissions alone.
- **Business Rates or equivalent development incentives** where they unlock additional supply.
- **Qualifying tax treatment for reinvested development profits** where the reinvestment produces additional UK homes.
- **Planning-related fee or charge relief** for schemes that materially exceed agreed delivery and affordability thresholds.
- **Faster planning routes** for schemes meeting national design, infrastructure and delivery tests.

Public advantage must produce additional homes

Incentives must be conditional, measurable and capable of clawback. A developer should not receive public advantage merely for doing what it had already committed to do.

4. What this does - and does not - carry forward

Manifesto 1.1 brings public and social delivery together with conditional private-sector incentives. It does not carry forward a separate, unqualified promise of developer dividend-tax relief.

The original reference to qualifying dividend-tax reductions is preserved in the master’s source audit. The revised operative housing text instead specifies qualifying tax treatment for reinvested development profits. No decision reinstating the former dividend relief is inferred.

Specific rates, eligibility rules, duration and fiscal effects still need to be modelled. This release does not invent them.

LOCAL NEED AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Build homes that communities can sustain

5. Tenure mix and local flexibility

Manifesto 1.1 does not impose an invented national percentage split before local need and financing have been modelled. National government would set the overall one-million-home ambition and minimum standards, while regional and local plans determine the appropriate mix of social, affordable and market homes.

> **Mixed tenure is not a fixed national formula**
>
> The programme is not presented as a predetermined percentage of social, affordable or private homes. The mix must be justified by local need, financing and delivery conditions.

6. Infrastructure first

Large housing schemes must be planned with transport, schools, primary care, utilities, drainage, digital connectivity and public space. Housing numbers achieved without the infrastructure needed to sustain communities will not count as successful delivery.

7. How the programme should be judged

- **Homes completed:** delivery rather than announcements or permissions alone.
- **Affordability achieved:** whether the homes meet the needs the programme is intended to address.
- **Infrastructure delivered:** the services and connections required by the communities created.
- **Public subsidy per home:** a clear account of the public contribution.
- **Additionality:** whether support produces homes beyond what would otherwise have been delivered.
- **Quality and long-term occupancy:** homes that remain useful and occupied, not just numbers recorded at completion.

These are the assessment criteria in the revised manifesto. The detailed allocation, monitoring and enforcement arrangements remain part of implementation design.

HOUSING BUDGET 3.1

A new delivery model needs a new costing

8. The old assumptions are retired

The original all-social model assumed an average public capital contribution of £200,000 per home, or £200 billion over ten years. Its indicative annual envelope was £20-25 billion. Those assumptions are retired as operative Manifesto 1.1 costings.

Costing question	Manifesto 1.1 position
Is £200 billion the cost of the revised policy?	No. It belongs to the superseded all-social model.
Is there a replacement headline price?	No replacement headline cost has been invented.
Can every home be assigned the same public subsidy?	No. Tenure, finance and delivery routes differ.
What is required now?	A mixed-tenure cost model covering public finance, grants, incentives and privately financed homes.

9. What the revised model must include

- Tenure mix and average council and housing-association loans.
- Targeted grants, borrowing costs and loan duration.
- Land contributions and infrastructure.
- Developer tax expenditure and clawback receipts.
- Homes delivered without direct public capital.

An honest funding position

The revised programme cannot be costed by multiplying one million homes by a single public subsidy. Its financial implications remain to be tested. Neither a claim of a fully funded programme nor an invented saving is made here.

This is a manifesto proposal, not a verified government budget or an independently certified costing. The master’s wider fiscal caveats continue to apply.

PUBLIC SCRUTINY AND THE REVISION RECORD

You questioned. The proposal changed.

10. Why the original proposal was withdrawn

My original proposal was to build 100,000 new social homes a year for ten years: one million new social homes in total. Public scrutiny and citizen involvement challenged whether that all-social scale and financing were sufficiently feasible.

I have withdrawn that original pledge. Manifesto 1.1 retains the ambition for one million additional homes over ten years, but replaces the all-social delivery model with a mixed-tenure programme. It also brings the former separate private-housebuilding incentives into the same framework.

> **A natural evolution from Manifesto 1.0 to Manifesto 1.1**
>
> The purpose of public scrutiny is not simply to collect comments. It is to test whether a proposal is credible and to change it when a better route emerges. The original, the challenge, the decision and the revised wording should remain visible.

11. What remains open to challenge

- Whether the overall target can be delivered at the proposed scale and over the proposed period.
- Whether the locally determined tenure mix meets housing need and produces genuinely affordable homes.
- Whether public lending, grants and private incentives provide value for money and demonstrably additional supply.
- Whether infrastructure, construction capacity and financing can support the programme.
- What the complete mixed-tenure costing shows once the assumptions are tested.

This revision does not mean every criticism has been adopted or every delivery question has been settled. It records a substantive change following public participation and keeps the revised proposal open to further scrutiny.

Source and numbering: Manifesto 1.1, Part IV, section 12 (Major Promise 10), pp. 10-11; Housing Budget 3.1, p. 22; Revision 001, p. 30. The withdrawn Day 09 / Proposal 09 document is the historical comparison. This Day 10 document replaces it as the current housing release.

READ. QUESTION. DEBATE. CONTRIBUTE.
manifesto1.co.uk