

**ADAMS
INTEGRA**

Wiltshire Council



**AFFORDABLE HOUSING
VIABILITY ASSESSMENT**

FINAL REPORT

December 2011

Contents

Introduction	3
What the Appendices show	5
Methodology and Assumptions	7
The Policy Context	22
Our Findings	23
Conclusions	31
Recommendations	33

Appendices



Adams Integra
55 West Street
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1RP

T: 01243 771304

F: 01243 779951

E: enquiries@adamsintegra.co.uk

W: www.adamsintegra.co.uk

Introduction

Adams Integra was instructed by Wiltshire Council to produce an Affordable Housing Viability Assessment that would address a number of issues, namely:

- Test the policy position of the Core Strategy. In particular, we will be addressing those core policies that are concerned with affordable housing and sustainability.
- Test the viability of a number of specific strategic sites.
- Test the viability of a number of notional residential sites.
- Test the cumulative impact of the proposed core policies.
- Recommend a mechanism to test for viability in the future, allowing for differing market conditions.

At subsequent meetings with the Council more detailed parameters were agreed for the study and these will be highlighted further below.

The structure of the report is arranged as follows: we begin by explaining briefly the nature of the various appendices that are attached. We then go on to set out the methodology and assumptions that have been adopted for both the specific and notional sites. Under this section we discuss the valuation method that is used, together with the assumptions made in respect of the different valuation inputs, such as sales values and profit. We also discuss the concept of viability and the different ways in which it needs to be considered in different circumstances, for example between the strategic sites and the notional sites.

Following on from the methodology and assumptions, we discuss our findings in relation to the various sites. We do this by specific reference to the attached appendices. At the end of the Findings section, we address specifically the issue of the cumulative impact of core policies on the viability of both the strategic and notional sites.

We then propose a means by which the Council can make its own future assessment of viability in relation to changing market conditions.

From the findings, we then draw our conclusions and final recommendations.

We list below the specific strategic sites that we were asked to consider:

Westbury	250 units
Warminster	900 units and 6 hectares employment land
Trowbridge	2,600 units and 15 acres employment land

Bradford on Avon	150 units and 3 hectares employment land
Ludgershall	475 units and no employment land
East Chippenham	700 units and 6 hectares employment land
South West Chippenham	800 units and 18 hectares employment land
North East Chippenham	750 units and 2.5 hectares employment land
Marlborough	220 units and no employment land

We have made reference above to both specific sites and notional sites. We will explore the assumptions made in respect of the notional sites later in the report, but at this stage it is worth noting that we consider notional sites as a means of testing viability, without the site-specific issues that can obstruct the production of more generic policy. To this extent the notional sites should be considered as speculative housing developments that exclude any specific design requirements or abnormal costs.

The purpose of producing the land valuations is to identify land values per hectare for different scenarios and compare them with the viability thresholds, which are also expressed as sums per hectare.

By way of an introduction to the attached appendices, we should point out that the study is based upon the outcome of a series of valuations, each of which reflects a particular scenario, such as unit numbers, mixes and proportions of affordable housing. These scenarios were agreed with the Council at the outset. The appendices build up, therefore, to valuation outcomes, from which we can make assessments of viability. They are divided between those that relate to the specific strategic sites (Appendices 2 to 6) and those that relate to the notional sites (Appendices 7 to 11).

The study has a reporting date of December 2011, although the sales research was carried out in September 2011. It is in the nature of studies such as this to reflect a viability position at a single point in time, whereas policy decisions will relate to a much longer timeframe. It is necessary, therefore, to be able to adapt any recommendations coming out of the study to differing market conditions. In this way the Council will be able to ensure that it receives a fair contribution to affordable housing and infrastructure, while also maintaining a supply of new housing that will make these contributions.

It is worth affirming that the report's methodology focuses upon two means of assessing viability that merit explanation and qualification at this stage. First, it will be seen that we are calculating land values through the residual method of valuation. Whilst this is common practice in the context of viability exercises, it relies upon a number of inputs, changes to which will result in varying degrees of change to the end land value.

Second, we are comparing resultant land values to viability thresholds that represent an overview of the value of alternative land uses, in the context of both the strategic and notional sites. These viability thresholds are not intended to represent market values that might apply to individual developers' sites.

What the Appendices show

Attached to this report is a series of appendices that illustrates both background assumptions in respect of the sites, as well as viability outcomes.

Appendix 1 shows the outputs from our sales research, carried out to inform the valuation appraisals that form the basis of the study.

Appendix 2 sets out the assumed land areas for the specific strategic sites. These areas are taken from information provided to us by the Council and are relevant when attributing land values per hectare, which are then compared against viability thresholds.

Appendix 3 is a schedule of residential accommodation for the strategic sites. It sets out numbers of units, of specified floor areas, for each site, divided between affordable and market housing. The housing mixes were provided by the Council for each site. This information then forms the basis of the subsequent valuations.

Appendix 4 sets out proposed infrastructure contributions for each site. These consist of information provided by the Council in the form of Infrastructure Delivery Schedules, which identify the infrastructure needs of the locality and attribute, where possible, costs to the individual strategic sites as a contribution to these needs. For each site we have then arrived at a total cost from those that can be identified on the schedules. In most instances, it has not been possible to identify costs attributable to certain items, such as major service reinforcement and we have, therefore, made our own assessment of these absent costs. For sites of less than 1,000 units, we have assumed these costs at £5,000 per unit. For sites of more than 1,000 units, we have assumed these costs at £3,000 per unit. It will be seen that these costs are adding approximate sums of between £1 million, at Bradford on Avon, and £8 million, at Trowbridge, to the costs. We have not, however, carried out detailed assessments of these costs as part of this exercise. These infrastructure contributions are then set out as costs in the appraisals.

With regard to Westbury and Marlborough, we have been informed of all the infrastructure costs and have not, therefore, needed to make any further assumptions.

Appendix 5 shows the valuation outcomes for the strategic sites, assuming affordable rent and shared ownership as the affordable tenures.

Appendix 6 shows the valuation outcomes for the strategic sites, assuming social rent and shared ownership as the affordable tenures.

Appendices 5A and 6A show the impact of adding extra costs for code levels 4 and 5 of the Code for Sustainable Homes to the strategic sites, relating separately to affordable rent and social rent. The imposition of these costs is covered by the Council's core policy 26 of the draft Core Strategy, as will be discussed later. These costs are over and above the report's base position of code 3. In connection with the additional code levels, we understand that the current energy elements of codes 4 and 5 will be eventually covered by the building regulations, such that these elements will not be part of the policy impact, which will take effect from 2013 and 2016 respectively. We have assumed, therefore, that the energy elements of codes 4 and 5 will only be incurred as costs by developers at these future dates.

Appendices 7 to 9 show the valuation outcomes for the notional sites, being 5, 15 and 50 units respectively. These particular valuations do not include any sums for infrastructure requirements.

Appendices 7A, 8A and 9A then test the same scenarios as in 7, 8 and 9, but with the addition of infrastructure costs at different rates. In some instances, the infrastructure levels are set at zero, where there was already a viability issue. In other instances, the infrastructure level will vary. On sites where there is an affordable housing provision, the infrastructure cost will be between £5,000 and £10,000 per unit.

Appendix 10 then introduces the concept of financial contributions instead of on-site affordable provision, in the context of sites of 3, 5 and 15 units.

Appendix 11 consists of four sheets relating to the notional sites. It shows the cumulative impact of affordable housing, CIL/infrastructure costs and extra costs for code levels 4 and 5 in the three locations chosen to represent the notional sites.

It will be seen that the appendices illustrating land values do so as three different figures. The first is the land value produced by the specific scenario, for example 50 units at 20 dwellings per hectare, with a particular affordable housing proportion.

The second figure expresses this land value as a percentage of the project's total Gross Development Value (GDV). This percentage is sometimes used to give a feel of the site's viability but, in reality, we do not believe that it is as robust a measure as the comparison with a potential alternative use value. The reason for this is that it is very difficult to say that, at a particular moment in time, there is a percentage to GDV that would apply to all sites in all circumstances. We show it,

however, as an approximate measure of a development's performance, that is recognised by the housebuilding industry.

The third figure shows the site's land value, expressed as a sum per hectare. For each of the three locations being tested, we are modelling three different densities of development. With a fixed number of units on the site, the site area will reduce for a higher density. For example, 5 units at 40 dwellings per hectare will occupy a smaller site than 5 units at 20 dwellings per hectare. This third figure is the most significant of the three for the purpose of this study, since it compares directly with the viability threshold, also measured as a land sum per hectare, that we use to assess the viability of a particular scenario.

In connection with this third figure, we have also colour-coded the resultant land values, depending upon the extent to which they match the proposed viability threshold. We should point out that this threshold is taken at the level of alternative employment uses. We discuss, below, alternative viability thresholds.

Methodology and Assumptions

In this section we discuss the means by which we have sought to respond to the Council's brief in testing viability across a range of scenarios.

The first fundamental point to make is that we are testing both specific sites and notional housing scenarios. The implication of this is that we are considering both anticipated numbers and mixes from the actual sites, alongside proposed numbers and mixes for the notional sites.

The advantage of notional sites is that they can be created to represent a full spread of scenarios, in such a way that maximises the chances of the outcomes reflecting most situations.

One of the considerations in assuming notional sites is to ensure that the valuation inputs reflect the situation on the ground in the area. We have addressed this through our own local research and through agreement with the Council on the appropriate density levels to be used.

Housing Numbers and mixes

Housing numbers and mixes need to be relevant to the local area, while also reflecting local aspirations and policy. It was agreed with the Council that we would test notional sites of 5, 15 and 50 units at densities of 20, 30 and 40 dwellings per hectare. For each number of units at the varying densities, we produce a housing mix that seeks to be consistent in the resultant floor area per hectare, with house types that would be appropriate to the location. For the market housing on notional sites, we have adopted the following house types and floor areas:

- 1 bed flat 47 sq m
- 2 bed flat 57 sq m
- 2 bed house 65 sq m
- 3 bed house 86 sq m
- 4 bed house 111 sq m
- 5 bed house 158 sq m

Appraisal Modelling

In order to assess the viability of the different sites, we use a valuation toolkit that carries out a residual land valuation, the result of which is then compared to either existing or alternative land values. The residual appraisal is, essentially, a calculation of land value that deducts all anticipated costs of a project from the expected revenues to leave a “residue” that will be available for the land purchase. It needs to be remembered that this residue will include the costs of acquiring and financing the land, so it is the net land figure that is of interest, when comparing to other potential uses for viability purposes. This is discussed further below.

The residual land valuation relies upon a series of inputs. These inputs would set out:

- The number, mix and floor area of the units to be built.
- The values attributable to these units, leading to a total sales revenue.
- The build costs of the units, leading to a total build cost.
- The professional fees and pre-start site investigations that would be required.
- The finance costs.
- The required profit.

These inputs should relate to the same moment in time, since many of the values will vary with market conditions.

By agreement with the Council, we are using the appraisal toolkit of the Homes and Communities Agency.

With regard to methodology around the appraisal inputs, we would make the following comments:

Sales Market Locations

A study such as this can either recommend a single level of affordable housing across the plan area, or adopt a more scientific approach and make recommendations that apply to more specific locations. The latter would apply where there is a broad range of property values, such that a single recommendation would risk viability in some locations. This study adopts, therefore, different geographical locations for the notional sites. Furthermore, these locations have been chosen to provide scenarios in areas that are apart

from the strategic sites, which are located, with the exception of Ludgershall, in the western part of the plan area.

These were agreed with the Council as being Marlborough, Devizes and Tidworth.

Having carried out our own sales research, we concluded that these locations could be applied to this study since, between them, we find the full range of housing values that might be found in Wiltshire as a whole, assuming the style of speculative housing development, that forms the basis of the study.

Basis of Assessing Viability

Viability is at the heart of a study such as this and it is, therefore, important that we define what we mean by the term.

In essence, viability is the measure by which a project will be judged to be worth pursuing. The way in which viability is measured will depend upon individual circumstances, which will vary between, for example, a landowner and a developer that might be interested in purchasing the land.

From the developer's point of view, the main measure of viability will be the profit generated by the project. Sufficient profit is required in order to provide an incentive to proceed with a project, while also being necessary to attract funding. The attitude of lenders will relate to risk and the required profit level will rise and fall with the assessment of that risk. In times of economic difficulties, such as we are currently experiencing, there will be a perception that sales will be slower and at, possibly, falling levels, with the result that more profit is required.

The landowner, on the other hand, has other considerations when deciding to bring his land forward for housing, the main ones being an existing use value or the value of an alternative use that might receive planning permission. The levels of any alternative value will vary, depending upon both locational factors and the specific alternative use that might be feasible.

It is usually the case, however, that viability implies not only matching an existing or alternative use, but also exceeding it to allow, for example, for such matters as moving costs, interruptions to business, etc to be taken into account. There is no industry-wide premium that is applied in these instances, but we have seen reference to an additional 20% in other similar studies. On the basis that this premium needs to act as an incentive for the landowner to release a site for development, we believe that this represents a reasonable level. We have, therefore, adopted this premium as part of our viability thresholds, as will be seen later in the report.

Alternative value and viability thresholds

In order to establish the thresholds between viability and non-viability, we have consulted with local property agents as to the land values that would apply to

different uses in the Wiltshire plan area. The agents' comments were framed in general terms, but they do lead us to land values for alternative uses.

Specifically, we discussed land values that might relate to industrial/warehousing and to offices. This was to reflect the potential uses that might secure planning permission as an alternative to residential, while also bearing in mind the three geographical areas that were to form the basis of the study. In central Marlborough, there might be a greater likelihood of achieving an office consent, so the viability threshold here would reflect more this use value. In outlying areas, there might be a greater likelihood of a warehousing/industrial permission in an edge-of-town location, whilst within the town an office permission might still be a realistic alternative to residential. We have, therefore, considered a range of alternative values to cover these different scenarios.

We spoke with local commercial agents, specifically asking for their views on land values that would relate to both industrial/warehousing land and offices. The views on industrial/warehousing land were all in the region of £350,000 per acre, or £865,000 per hectare. Agents quoted the Solstice Park development on the A303 at these levels. Views on office land values were more widespread and uncertain, resulting from the lack of commercial land deals. In these circumstances, we established with agents prevailing levels of office rents and investment yields, with which to make our own assessment of office land values, through a residual approach. On the basis of rents at between £10 and £12 per square foot, and yields of 8%, we are not, however, seeing a positive land value from this use. This reflects, no doubt, the current market and will vary as market conditions change.

The Valuation Office Agency produces an annual property report, which includes estimates of land values for different uses in different parts of the country. Whilst they do not produce figures for office uses, we can see figures for industrial and warehousing use. The nearest locations to Wiltshire in the report are Bristol and Southampton, for which they show industrial land values of £800,000 per hectare and £1,145,000 per hectare respectively, as at 1st January 2011. These compare to our more locally researched figure of £865,000 per hectare, as mentioned above.

We have also made enquiries as to the likely viability levels on the strategic sites, where the existing use would be agricultural and where there would be no planning alternative to residential. These enquiries were made of developers who work in the more strategic land market, as well as solicitors who act for them in drawing up longer-term land purchase documents such as option agreements. These option agreements will usually set a minimum land value to be paid by the developer, such that the landowner is not obliged to proceed with a sale below this level. It is usually the case, however, that this minimum value is arrived at through negotiation, as opposed to anything more scientific. It is therefore difficult to say that any particular value is right or wrong in all circumstances.

It is necessary to take into account, however, the fact that a strategic site will need to bear the cost of extensive infrastructure works, whereas it would be assumed that the smaller notional sites would be in locations where this infrastructure was already in place. The land values per hectare will, therefore, be lower on the strategic sites, but this is compensated by the fact that the viability threshold will be lower, coming from an agricultural base.

On this basis we are proposing the following viability thresholds, per hectare:

Notional sites:	£865,000 per ha plus 20%:	£1,038,000 per ha
Strategic sites:	£450,000 per ha	

These figures will be compared to the land value outcomes in the appraisals when assessing viability.

At this point it is also necessary to address the potential for a residential use to constitute the viability threshold. In the context of this study, this will relate particularly to our consideration of the notional sites. It is likely that, in most instances, a residential threshold would be higher than the above threshold for notional sites.

Some new development sites will arise on land that is currently in residential use, in which case a landowner will measure viability against either the value of the existing property, if the whole site is to be developed, or against any fall in value of the main house, if only part of the site is to be developed.

An analysis of the impact of a residential viability threshold is limited by the fact that site-specific issues will have a significant bearing upon the viability outcome. For example, if only part of a residential property is being developed, then the extent of any fall in the value of the remainder will depend upon a number of factors. These will include the value and condition of the existing property, whether the new development enjoys a separate access and the physical impact of the new development upon the existing.

On the other hand, if the entire property is being redeveloped, then the viability of the proposal will be dictated by the value of the existing in relation to the value of the completed development. If the existing house is in a good condition in a high value location, then viability is likely to be difficult. If the existing property is either in a poor condition in a good location, occupies only a small part of the site, or both, then the value of the new development in relation to the existing will be higher and viability will be improved. In most instances, we believe that viability will be better where only a part of a residential property is taken for development.

For example, a scenario might arise where a developer is looking to redevelop three 4 bedroom houses, each sitting on plots of, say, 0.1 hectares and having

values of £300,000. In order to persuade the owners to sell, we would expect the developer to have to pay around £360,000 for each house, giving a total land value of £3.6million per hectare.

Alternatively, the landowners might accept sums of, say, £100,000 each for a part of their gardens. If this amounts to half the plot in each case, then the total site area would be 0.15 hectares, with a cost of £300,000, equating to £2million per hectare.

Whilst we accept that existing residential uses will have to be taken into account in many instances, we believe that they will all be so site-specific, as to make it difficult to make blanket policy recommendations on this basis. It is an issue, however, that the Council will need to bear in mind in specific circumstances. We will comment further on this subject of residential thresholds in the Findings section.

Within the study, we are considering viability thresholds in connection with two specific areas. The first is in connection with the land values per hectare that are produced by the individual valuations, as discussed above. Here, we are looking to at least match the viability threshold in order to say that a scheme is viable. The second area is in connection with the addition of infrastructure charges, especially those that might form part of a longer-term policy position, in the form of Community Infrastructure Levy.

The Government's guidance on CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy Guidance: Charge Setting and Charging Schedule Procedures) published in March 2010, suggests that "charging authorities should avoid setting a charge right up to the margin of economic viability." The idea behind this statement is that there should be some scope for changes in market conditions to be accommodated within the charge level.

Later in the study, we will discuss the impact of infrastructure costs/CIL on viability and we will be seeking to allow for a viability "buffer" as part of these considerations, especially on the smaller, 5 unit sites, where we would anticipate a good possibility that the alternative use value could be residential.

Profit

As discussed above, profit is vitally important to a project, as a means of assessing its viability. We have seen that profit requirements will vary according to market conditions and that current conditions are leading to higher profit expectations, particularly from lenders. Since profit is, perhaps, most associated with anticipated sales risks, it is common to express it as a percentage of the anticipated sales revenue.

On the other hand, sales risk is greater from the market housing than from the affordable housing. We adopt, therefore, different profit levels for each sector.

The appraisal model produced by the Homes and Communities Agency is commonly used as a tool for carrying out residual land valuations. This assumes profit levels of 17.5% for market housing and 6% for affordable housing. In our experience, required profit levels will vary between 17.5% and 20%. For the purpose of this study, we have therefore adopted profit levels of 18% for the market housing and 6% for the affordable housing.

Build Costs

The application of a particular level of build cost will depend upon a number of factors. When we talk about a level of build cost per square metre, we are taking into account such matters as:

- Unit size
- Location
- Specification
- Abnormal costs resulting from site-specific factors

This exercise is looking at two different types of site. The first is a number of larger, specific, strategic sites, currently in agricultural use, where there will be a number of different cost issues to take into account. The second is a number of smaller, notional sites where, due to their size, the number of cost implications will be less.

With regard to the larger, strategic sites, the cost bases can be divided into the following areas:

1. The units themselves, along with their local distributor roads and services, otherwise referred to as external works.
2. The larger infrastructure roads and services that would serve the more local network.
3. On-site infrastructure items, such as public open space, landscape buffers and children's play areas.
4. Other infrastructure that is required to support the development, while also mitigating any adverse impact upon the wider community.

The cost bases of the smaller, notional sites will be restricted to item 1, above, being the units themselves together with their associated external works.

Our more detailed methodology in respect of build costs can, therefore, be set out in the following way:

Larger, Strategic Sites

In our experience, the costs for the units themselves, along with their associated external works, will fall in the range of £1,000 to £1,200 per square metre,

depending upon the location and resultant specification. For most of the strategic sites, we have adopted costs at the lower end of this range, reflecting both their location and the provision of less expensive materials. In the case of Bradford-on Avon and Marlborough, however, we have increased the build costs by £100 per square metre, assuming a need for more expensive materials and specification.

The build-up of these base costs starts with the BCIS cost index, produced by the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors, which acts as a cost benchmark for both house builders and in connection with studies of this nature. It is possible to refine the research within the index, to take into account both the style of development and broad location. In this instance, for example, we have looked at the category of General Estate Housing, weighted for locations in Wiltshire.

It should be noted that the quoted cost figures are based upon a sample of actual developments. They include prelims costs, but exclude the cost of external works. The latest figures relate to December 2011.

Whilst the precise basis of the BCIS costs is not stated, we have assumed that they take into account Part L of the Building Regulations 2010, which relate specifically to energy efficiency. In addition to these, we have therefore added sums for external works, Lifetime Homes and code 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. The resultant sums are as follows:

➤ Cost from BCIS per square metre	£901
➤ Add 15% for external works	£135
➤ Add for Lifetime Homes	£ 10
➤ Add 3% for code 3	£ 30
Total per square metre:	£1,076

In connection with the above allowances, we would make the following points:

- The figure of £901 per square metre is taken from the 7th decile of the range of costs in the BCIS samples. The most common rates were between £700 and £800 per square metre. The assumed rate corresponds more closely to our experience in the south of England.
- The figure of 15% for external works has been used elsewhere in studies such as this and is a figure that we would consider as reasonable, corresponding to some £13,500 for an average house of 100 square metres.
- With regard to Lifetime Homes, many of the necessary design criteria are relatively low cost, but our allowance assumes a figure of around £1,000 for an average home.

- The extra costs to achieve code 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes are taken from the CLG publication "Cost of Building to the Code for Sustainable Homes. Updated Cost Review", dated August 2011.

The costs that would relate to item 2, above, would include the larger infrastructure roads and services that would serve the individual sites. We have made assumptions for these, relating to the total residential site area, of around £275,000 per hectare.

Costs relating to item 3 above have been estimated from the varying land uses shown on the site plans provided by the Council. From these, we have estimated the area of strategic open space and have made assessments of the number of play areas, on-site POS areas that might be required.

If we refer to the summaries of strategic sites valuations, attached as appendices 5 and 6, these items are shown on the Abnormals line.

Costs relating to item 4, above, would be such items as schools and surgeries, along with the off-site infrastructure costs, some of which were provided by the Council.

Professional Fees

We have adopted different positions on professional fees for the notional and strategic sites, on the basis that there will be a ceiling for these fees, which makes a single percentage inappropriate. We have adopted 5% of the build cost for the notional sites, but have taken a much lower percentage for the strategic sites, depending on their size. We made enquiries of developers in connection with fees on larger, strategic sites. There was a prevailing view that these fees will rarely exceed £500,000 on even the largest site. We have, therefore, generally kept our suggested design fees at or about this level for the strategic sites, with the exception of Trowbridge and SW Chippenham (1,500 units), where we have adopted higher levels due to their size. These fee levels for the strategic sites can be seen in Appendices 5 and 6.

Affordable Housing

It was agreed with the Council that we would test the strategic sites at 40% affordable housing, with tenures of affordable rent/shared ownership and social rent/shared ownership. In all the valuations of strategic sites, the rented proportion is 60% of the affordable element.

The revenues that we adopted for the various affordable housing tenures were provided by a registered provider that operates throughout the Wiltshire area and their figures are shown below at Figure 1:

Figure 1

Affordable Housing Revenues

Unit type	Size sq m	Affordable rent/sq m	Social rent/sq m	Intermediate/sq m
1 bed flat	45	£1,439	£1,013	£1,605
2 bed flat	67	£1,439	£1,013	£1,605
2 bed house	71	£1,439	£1,013	£1,605
3 bed house	82	£1,439	£1,013	£1,605

With regard to the notional sites, we adopted different proportions and tenures as follows:

We tested 3 unit sites for the purpose of financial contributions, at 25% affordable housing, based on both affordable rent and social rent.

We tested 5 unit sites at affordable housing proportions of both 25% and 40%, each on the basis of affordable rent and social rent.

We tested sites of 15 units and 50 units at 40% affordable provision, on the basis of both affordable rent and social rent. The outcome of these valuations can be seen at Appendices 7 to 9.

Commuted Payments

The Council asked us to consider the circumstance in which a commuted payment might be considered in lieu of on-site affordable provision. We will distinguish between “commuted payments” and “financial contributions”. The methodology that we adopted for this part of the study was to let the cost of the commuted payment equal the cost to the developer of on-site provision. We therefore considered the impact on the land value of the on-site provision, compared to the land value with no on-site provision.

As seen below, Core Policy 28 of the Council’s Core Strategy Consultation Document, June 2011, provides for financial contributions to be made on sites of 4 units and below. In these circumstances a financial contribution is accepted, therefore, through policy, as an acknowledgement of the practicality of having just one or two affordable units on a site. As part of this study, we consider the levels of financial contribution that might be appropriate for these sites.

Whereas financial contributions might be accepted through policy as a means of receiving contributions towards affordable housing from small sites, commuted payments will be treated by most Councils as a “second best” option. They would normally occur where there would, otherwise, be a policy position of on-site

affordable housing, but specific circumstances dictate that a commuted payment towards off-site provision is made. In such cases, a Council will wish to ensure that a commuted sum will allow it to purchase serviced land for replacement affordable housing and it might also seek an additional sum that would make the commuted route less attractive for the developer.

Whether we are talking about financial contributions or commuted sums, however, the intention with both is to generate funds for affordable housing, while also maintaining viability. To this end, we propose testing for these sums in the same way, using methodology that has been adopted elsewhere. The principle of this methodology is that sufficient sums should be generated to allow the Council to purchase land for affordable housing elsewhere in the plan area.

The methodology involves calculating a land value, assuming a percentage of land to Gross Development Value (GDV), on sites with no affordable housing provision. We then add a sum that reflects the cost of acquiring and servicing the land. The resultant figure is then multiplied by the affordable housing proportion which, in this case, would be 40%.

Furthermore, in modelling the sites, we have also assumed an infrastructure charge of £10,000 per unit. We discuss infrastructure payments later in the report, where it will be seen that the most appropriate infrastructure cost is around £10,000 per unit.

For this exercise we are applying a land:GDV percentage of 23%. This derives from the valuations, illustrated in Appendix 10, for 3, 5 and 15 units at 30dph, with infrastructure at £10,000 per unit, but excluding any commuted payment. This reflects the position of a developer, prior to any agreement on the commuted sum to be paid. In justification of the 23% land percentage, we illustrate below the land:GDV percentages, prior to the addition of the commuted payment and with no on-site affordable housing, for the scenarios in Appendix 10.

Marlborough:	3 units	25%
	5 units	25%
	15 units	24%
Devizes	3 units	24%
	5 units	24%
	15 units	23%
Tidworth	3 units	23%
	5 units	23%
	15 units	21%

The detail of this exercise is illustrated in Appendix 10, but we set out below an example of the methodology, based upon 5 units at 30 dwellings per hectare in Devizes. In this instance, we are applying the land: GDV percentage of 23% and an acquisition/servicing cost of 15%. The calculation of the commuted sum would, therefore, be as follows:

GDV: £1,425,000

Take land value @ 23%: £ 327,750

Add 15% £ 49,162

Total £ 376,912

Affordable proportion 40% 0.4

Commuted sum £ 150,765

The on-site requirement with 5 units would be 2 affordable units. The commuted sum equates, therefore, to £75,383 per unit.

We believe that this methodology benefits from being relatively simple, with only one figure that will change as a result of market movements, being the land value:GDV percentage. This relates to land values with no affordable housing contribution and it will vary with rises and falls in the sales market. It would be necessary, therefore, to monitor the market to assess whether this percentage should rise or fall. It is worth noting that, at the height of the market in 2006/2007, this figure would have been around 40% for a speculative development site with planning permission.

At Appendix 10 we are testing sites of 3, 5 and 15 units at 30 dwellings per hectare in the notional locations of Marlborough, Devizes and Tidworth, assuming an infrastructure cost of £10,000 per unit. It will be seen that Marlborough could take a land:GDV percentage of 25%, reflecting the town's higher values, Whilst 23% would be more appropriate for other locations.

It should be noted that the land:GDV figure of 23% relates to greenfield sites with no abnormal build costs. It cannot be assumed as a percentage that will apply to all specific circumstances.

Whilst we have suggested a methodology for calculating commuted sums around the 23% land figure, we understand that the Council intends to develop the subject of commuted payments further, outside the scope of this report.

Sales Values

Since a large proportion of the Council's affordable housing supply will come from new developments, we seek to apply values to our appraisals that are based on new homes research. These values derive from our own on-the-ground research,

supplemented by online research through websites such as Rightmove. From information gained, we make an assessment of the prices at which new homes are being sold. Furthermore, since some locations will have a larger supply of new homes evidence than others, we look also at modern houses and flats from the second hand market in arriving at our pricing conclusions.

This study is dealing with both specific sites and notional sites. The notional sites are, however, in broad geographical areas, being Marlborough, Devizes and Tidworth.

Where possible, we will gain a good sample of new homes sales from a particular location, that allows us to then form a view of the value of the proposed units. As always, new homes will be offered at an asking price, which may or may not be the price that is eventually paid by the purchaser. In our experience, it would be normal for a developer to inflate asking prices, with the expectation of receiving a "net" price for the home. The difference between asking prices and net prices will generally be a function of supply and demand, so that the difference might be smaller in a buoyant market and greater in a slower market.

The prices we adopt for the appraisals need to reflect today's slower market. We have, therefore, considered the asking prices that we have obtained and have reduced them, in general, by some 5%.

The outcome of our sales research is shown at Appendix 1.

Employment Land on Strategic Sites

On most of the strategic development sites, with the exception of Ludgershall, Westbury and Marlborough, there is an element of employment use. This includes what are described as neighbourhood hubs. At this stage it is not possible to define exactly what these uses will include, but we need to make a provision for them in the appraisals, if we are to arrive at a realistic land value for viability purposes. The way in which we have done this can be seen on Appendices 5 and 6. From these it can be seen that the main valuation is based on the residential element, for which we have the numbers and mixes, arriving at a residential land value. To this we have added the employment land area at a rate of £865,000 per hectare, as discussed above, assuming an element of industrial/distribution uses. In this context we had envisaged something similar to the Archers Gate/Solstice Park relationship at Amesbury. The total land value is then expressed as a land value per hectare, based on the total land area, including the employment land. This is the land value that we then relate to the viability thresholds set out above.

Infrastructure/Community Infrastructure Levy

In connection with the strategic sites, we have applied levels of infrastructure cost to each site, as indicated by the individual infrastructure tables and supplemented by our own assessment of the likely total sums. These sums are

shown in Appendices 5 and 6 under the heading “s106 off-site costs” being costs that could be incurred directly in connection with the development. Equally, these costs could also be considered as Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), outside any s106 agreement, although this study is not designed to recommend specific CIL levels. The study is limited to a consideration of residential land uses, whereas a CIL charging schedule would relate to both residential and other uses.

With regard to the notional sites, these are set out in Appendices 7 to 9 on the basis of zero infrastructure cost, but with varying affordable housing provisions. In Appendices 7A to 9A we then explore the extent to which infrastructure costs can be added to the different affordable housing scenarios, while still remaining within the viability thresholds.

For the purpose of this study, we shall refer to these costs as Infrastructure costs. As above, they could be assumed for either s106 or CIL purposes. The intention of including them in this study is to arrive at a viable cost level under the “Infrastructure” heading.

In these later appendices we see, therefore, the cumulative effect of both affordable housing and infrastructure costs on the different scenarios.

At this point, we should say that we have deliberately sought to avoid pushing the land values down to the viability limit. If the Council is considering the production of a CIL charging schedule, to which these figures might contribute, then there needs to be scope for some movement in the market and prices to be accommodated.

In addition, we are mindful of the possibility that smaller development sites could come out of existing residential uses, with the implied need to match a higher viability threshold. This is a further reason not to push land values to the extreme of viability.

At Appendix 7A we are testing 5 units, at Appendix 8A we are testing 15 units and at Appendix 9A we are testing 50 units.

Code for Sustainable Homes

One of the core policies to be tested, Core Policy 26, concerns the requirement that code 4 should be adopted as standard from 2013 and code 5 from 2016. At the same time, we have agreed an assumption with the Council that the energy section of these code levels will become part of the building regulations, with which developers will have to comply, irrespective of the policy. We are considering, therefore, the specific impact of Core Policy 26, being those parts of the codes that exclude the energy element.

It still needs to be assumed, however, that a developer will incur the cost of the energy element, but through the building regulations as opposed to the policy.

Furthermore, we need to consider the methodology of incorporating costs into the appraisals, that will be incurred from 2013 and 2015, while the study relates to today's date. In order to fully understand the viability of these costs being incurred in the future, we would need to apply other valuation inputs that might be relevant at the time. However, we do not believe it to be good practice to second guess such aspects as sales values and build costs in years to come and we feel that we can only advise against the known costs and values as of today. We will, therefore, examine the impact of the Core Policy in relation to codes 4 and 5, as if these code levels were being imposed today. The more detailed methodology in respect of the additional code level costs is as follows:

We have tested the increased code costs against both the strategic sites and the notional sites. The source of the additional costs was the publication by the Department of Communities and Local Government, entitled "Cost of Building to the Code for Sustainable Homes Updated Cost Review" dated August 2011. This document provides the extra costs of building to particular code levels for a number of different housetypes, each with a specified floor area. Within each code level, the costs are broken down into the individual cost categories that combine to make up the total cost of complying with the code.

The document sets out the code costs for individual housetypes, assuming different building scenarios. We have separated out the energy costs for codes 4 and 5, relative to each housetype, and then identified the remaining code costs in the same way. These costs are then represented as sums per square metre of the housetypes in the CLG document.

These costs per square metre are then applied to the housetypes and housing mixes that relate to each of the sites. In this way we calculate the costs of meeting code 4 and code 5 for each site. These costs are then added to the base, code 3, appraisals for each site, with the land value outcomes for the strategic sites being shown in Appendices 5A and 6A, representing the positions with affordable rent and social rent respectively. The land value outcomes for the notional sites are shown at Appendix 11.

Testing for Future Viability

The viability of a project can be affected by any of the inputs into a residual land valuation. The greatest impact, however, will arise from variations in sales values, build costs and profit levels. In addition, there could also be movement in the value of the alternative uses that are being assumed for the purpose of the viability threshold.

In these circumstances we would seek to provide for the Council, on a regular basis, a recognised form of appraisal, such as the HCA toolkit, together with a series of default values for such areas as alternative use value, build cost, finance rates, fees and profit. Unit numbers and values would need to be provided by the user, as would a basic timeframe, but the output would be calculated from this

information. This would then put Council officers in the same position as developers, with the same means to assess land values. Furthermore, we would provide a list of referrals that could be accessed to update the information. For example, the BCIS index for build costs and analysis of local developments for sales values.

This would be the subject of training sessions to address the most likely situations that might be faced by officers.

As will be seen later in the report, we are identifying scenarios with the notional sites, in which viability will be marginal in some geographical locations, in the current market. In such circumstances, a judgement needs to be made as to whether these, hopefully temporary, market conditions should be reflected in more cautious policy decisions, or whether more ambitious policy targets should be proposed, at the risk of short term, viability issues.

The recommendations of this study will not satisfy all development scenarios that might arise during the Council's plan period. The reason for this will relate to the market conditions which would, for example, point to viability difficulties at Tidworth.

It is necessary, therefore, for the Council to be aware of market changes that could result in improved affordable housing contributions and improved viability. We believe that this could be achieved through the action described above.

The Policy Context

The brief asks us to assess "the cumulative economic viability of the core policies contained within the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy, including an informed assessment of the economic viability of the affordable housing thresholds and proportions of affordable housing proposed in the core strategy and SHMA".

Government guidance, in respect of studies such as this, is contained within both PPS3 (Housing) and PPS12.

PPS3 (June 2011) sets out the Government's key housing policy objectives, including the provision of both market and affordable housing, taking into account need and demand. Amongst the principles that are designed to achieve these objectives is an Evidence-Based Policy approach, of which the subject study would be part.

Paragraph 29 of PPS3 states that Local Authorities should set a plan-wide target for affordable housing, taking into account the economic viability of land.

PPS12 sets out the Government's key policies on how local spatial plans should be prepared, including the preparation of core strategies. Paragraph 4.37 of PPS12

confirms the role of the evidence base in the production of core strategies. It states that "evidence gathered should be proportionate to the job being undertaken by the plan, relevant to the place in question and as up to date as practical, having regard to what may have changed since the evidence was collected".

In the local context, Wiltshire Council is currently working towards a plan-wide core strategy. The Council produced its Core Strategy Consultation Document in June 2011. Of particular relevance to this study is Core Policy 28 – Providing Affordable Homes.

The policy states that, on sites of 15 or more dwellings, there should be an affordable housing provision of 40%. On sites of 5 to 14 dwellings the provision should be 25%. On sites of 4 dwellings or less, a financial contribution will be sought towards the provision of affordable housing. Tenure will be negotiated on a site-by-site basis to reflect need.

Core Policy 29 seeks to meet housing need through housetypes and mixes that accord with the findings of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment for Wiltshire.

Core Policy 30 addresses the ageing population of the County and states that all new residential development will accord with Lifetime Homes Standards.

Core Policy 26 states that new homes should achieve code 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and then achieve code 4 from 2013 and code 5 from 2016.

The most recent Strategic Housing Market Assessment was carried out by David Couttie Associates for South Wiltshire in 2010. In paragraph 10.13 it identifies a particular need for 2 bedroom properties for market sale. With regard to affordable housing, the report recommends that 65% of future affordable housing supply should be 1 and 2 bedroom, while 35% should be 3 and 4 bedroom.

Our Findings

We will begin this section by considering the outcomes of the relevant appendices. We will then address the Council's specific requirement of the cumulative impact of the core policies.

With regard to the strategic sites, our findings are illustrated in Appendices 5 and 6. The information in these tables is extracted from a series of appraisals that we have carried out, using the HCA toolkit. They are set out in this tabular form for ease of reference.

We have proposed a viability threshold for these sites of £450,000 per hectare. This is on the basis that the sites would have no alternative use, other than that suggested by the proposed residential and employment scheme, and that the current use is agricultural. In these circumstances, we are assuming that the

landowner would negotiate a minimum land value per hectare, with the benefit of planning permission, taking into account the additional off-site infrastructure that would be required as part of the development. In practice, this minimum sum would be negotiated as part of a land purchase contract, such as an option agreement, acknowledging such issues as the low existing value of the agricultural land, the high potential land value with planning permission and the high infrastructure costs associated with sites of this nature. There is no prescribed method by which this minimum sum is valued, other than by negotiation, and it is not possible, therefore, to be definitive about the level at which it would be set.

If we look at Appendix 5, assuming affordable rent and shared ownership as the affordable provision, we see that the sites are either very close to the threshold or exceed it. Ludgershall, Warminster and Westbury are just below the threshold, but not by a significant degree.

If we then look at the land values per hectare arising from Appendix 6, with social rent and shared ownership, we see that Warminster, Westbury and Ludgershall fall below the viability threshold, while Bradford on Avon and Marlborough are significantly above the borderline. Whilst relative values in each location will have a bearing on land values, it appears that the costs of the abnormals and off-site infrastructure, in relation to the floor areas, are also having a significant impact. At Warminster and Ludgershall, these items equate to £333 and £427 per square metre respectively, while at Bradford on Avon and Marlborough they equate to £266 and £178 per square metre respectively.

We should point out, however, that we have had to make some significant assumptions as to infrastructure costs in relation to the strategic sites. These are typically in relation to the off-site requirements of the utility companies. These costs are usually established by the companies, following extensive modelling of the impact of a development. A more definitive viability view could be given once these outstanding costs are known.

With regard to the notional sites, we can see the land value outcomes in appendices 7 to 9, without any allowance for infrastructure costs. Appendix 7 looks at 5 units in the three locations and at the different densities of 20, 30 and 40 dwellings per hectare.

For the notional sites we are comparing land values to a viability threshold of £1,038,000 per hectare. This arises from a base value of £865,000 per hectare, plus a 20% premium to act as an incentive to the landowner, as is commonly applied in these circumstances.

In Appendix 7 we can see that there are viability issues to varying degrees, in all three locations, when we assume 40% affordable provision and social rent. This is particularly pronounced at the lower densities. Furthermore, Devizes and

Tidworth are also showing viability problems at lower densities on the reduced affordable requirements for both affordable rent and social rent tenures.

In this connection, however, we need to consider the extent to which developers might undertake low density developments in Devizes and Tidworth at 20 dwellings per hectare, particularly in the current market. We believe that higher density developments would be more popular in these locations, in the current market.

The reduced viability at lower densities is likely to be a result of lower sales values per square metre on the larger properties. At the same time, the omission of one or more of these larger units, to provide for an affordable unit, will result in a significant drop in sales revenue. This would not be experienced to the same degree in the medium and higher density locations, where the market unit types will be closer in size to the affordable types.

At Appendix 8, it will be noted that we have assumed 4 units of social rented housing for both the 60:40 proportion and the 75:25 proportion. This is due to the rounding of the resultant figure when doing the calculations.

The outcomes at Appendix 8, for 15 units, show the same trend towards viability difficulty at the lower densities at Tidworth and Devizes, for both affordable rent and social rented tenures.

A similar situation arises at Appendix 9 in relation to 50 units, where the higher proportion of social rented units impacts most significantly at the lower densities.

Bearing in mind our comments above in relation to the market, we would not, however, consider this finding to be particularly significant. We would expect the majority of developments to be at the medium and higher densities, where viability is improved.

With regard to infrastructure payments, Appendices 7A, 8A and 9A consider the cumulative impact of infrastructure costs at different levels of affordable housing. These appendices add the stated level of infrastructure charge to the same scenarios that were tested in appendices 7, 8 and 9.

At Appendix 7A we are looking at notional 5 unit sites. We are testing affordable housing at proportions of both 25% and 40% and separately for affordable rent and social rent.

For Marlborough we see that, with 25% affordable housing based upon affordable rent, an infrastructure charge of £20,000 per unit would be viable. This would fall to £10,000 per unit at 40% with an assumption of affordable rent. It is only at a 40% proportion, including social rent, that we see any sign of viability coming under pressure. It does not appear to be viable to add infrastructure cost to the

lower densities at 40% with social rent, but at 40dph we could see a charge of £5,000 per unit.

At Devizes the table shows that, in most instances, a charge of £10,000 per unit would be viable. The exceptions would be at the lower density and also where a 40% affordable proportion with social rent is proposed. In these scenarios there would be a viability problem in imposing any infrastructure charge.

In connection with the lower densities, however, we believe that, in the current market, it is possible that developers would be reluctant to build at low densities in these mid to lower value locations, as suggested above.

At Tidworth, the same comments would apply as at Devizes, in that a charge of £10,000 per unit would be viable in most instances.

At Appendix 8A we are testing notional sites of 15 units in the same locations and with the same affordable proportions as previously. Again, we are looking at the cumulative affect of imposing infrastructure cost on sites with on-site affordable housing. At these higher unit numbers, we are also considering two levels of social rented housing, being 60% of the total affordable element, as before, and 75% of the total. In the case of the 15 unit sites, however, we have assumed 4 units of social rent in both scenarios, given the outcome of the mathematical calculation.

At Marlborough, we see that, with 40% affordable, based on 60% being affordable rent, there is viability at all densities, with an infrastructure charge of £10,000 per unit. This same charge could apply to the medium and higher densities with a more onerous affordable requirement, but not to the lowest density, where no infrastructure charge has been assumed.

At Devizes, we have not assumed any infrastructure charge at the lowest density, but we can consider a charge of £10,000 per unit at the medium and higher densities. There is, however, some viability pressure being seen with social rent.

At Tidworth we see limited viability on the basis of a charge of £10,000 per unit, at 40% affordable with affordable rent. In other scenarios, we are assuming zero infrastructure charge, since the viability will be seen as marginal.

At Appendix 9A we are testing the same scenarios as above, but with 50 unit sites. At this number of units we see more clearly the impact of varying the social rent proportion between 60% and 75% of the affordable total.

At Marlborough we can justify an infrastructure charge of £10,000 per unit at 40% affordable and assuming social rent. As before, however, this would not apply to the lowest density with social rent as the rented tenure.

At Devizes, there is insufficient viability to impose an infrastructure charge at 20 dwellings per hectare. Otherwise, we can see a charge of £10,000 per unit at medium and higher densities, with affordable rent. With social rent the viability is looking marginal, but we have modelled £5,000 per unit at the medium density and £10,000 per unit at the higher density. At these levels of charge, there would be no buffer against more difficult market conditions if these levels of charge were adopted on the basis of a longer term CIL.

At Tidworth, the Council could consider a charge of £5,000 to £10,000 per unit, but this would be on the assumption that the majority of sites coming forward would be higher density. We do not see an opportunity for an infrastructure charge, along with on-site affordable housing, at the lowest density.

We have stated above that these infrastructure costs could be developed further, in connection with creating a charging schedule for a Community Infrastructure Levy. Whilst this levy needs to be supported by viability, it is also the product of a calculation of infrastructure need, as generated by new development. When considering the level of infrastructure cost that the Council might impose on new development, it would be useful to understand the extent to which other authorities are seeking to impose the charge.

Information from the Planning Inspectorate shows that, to date, three local authorities have approved charging schedules for CIL. It should be borne in mind that CIL is represented as sums per square metre of new development. The charges quoted below are all for residential uses. The three authorities are:

Newark and Sherwood	£45 to £75 per sq m
Shropshire	Towns £40 per sq m, rural areas £80 per sq m
Redbridge	£70 per sq m

In addition, we understand that preliminary draft charging schedules have been produced by the following authorities, but that these have not yet been formally approved:

Torbay	£100 per sq m
Havant	£84 per sq m to £105 per sq m

It will be seen from Appendices 7A, 8A and 9A that the infrastructure costs, when applied alongside on-site affordable housing, vary between £5,000 and £20,000 per unit, depending upon location and the extent of on-site affordable housing. The most commonly applied charge in these tables is £10,000 per unit. If we assume an average unit to be around 100 square metres, then this would equate to £100 per square metre as a CIL charge. If adopted, we believe that this level of CIL would seem appropriate for Wiltshire, when taken alongside these other

authorities. We would see this in the context of medium to high density developments, based on affordable rent as the rented tenure.

At Appendix 10, we are looking at the opportunity for commuted sums/financial contributions in lieu of affordable housing. As part of the methodology, we have suggested two levels of land percentage, being 25% at Marlborough and 23% elsewhere. For the sake of simplicity, we could see a single rate at 23%, although this would clearly benefit those sites in more expensive locations. On the other hand, the Appendix shows that it would be difficult to impose this level of commuted sum on Tidworth in the current market.

At this point we need to bring together the above findings into an assessment of the cumulative impact of core policies. In particular, we are looking at the impacts of affordable housing, CIL/infrastructure costs and Code for Sustainable Homes. We can consider separately the strategic sites and the notional sites.

At Appendices 5A and 6A, we are looking at the viability of the strategic sites on the basis of both affordable rented tenure and social rent, against a viability threshold of £450,000 per hectare. In both instances, we begin with the land values at the base position, being code 3 build costs. We then add the extra costs of code 4, excluding energy, and finally add the extra cost of code 5, also excluding the energy element. We then add the value of any employment land to the residential land value, to arrive at a total land value that is expressed as a sum per hectare and compared to the viability threshold.

We should repeat our previous comment that we have not included the energy elements of the different code levels, as it is assumed that these will be part of the building regulations. We have, however, included the energy elements as costs that will be incurred by developers, albeit not as a direct result of the Council's Core Policy 26.

With regard to the scenario of affordable rent as the rented tenure, in Appendix 5A, we see that, at code 3, the sites are all showing viability against the viability threshold, with the exception of Westbury and Warminster where the land values are only marginally below the threshold. When we add in the costs relating to code 4, we see the same pattern, i.e. viability for all the sites except Westbury and Warminster. When we add the costs relating to code 5, however, we see that there are significant falls in land value, below the viability threshold, in all instances except Bradford-on-Avon and Marlborough.

It should be remembered, however, that the code 4 and code 5 requirements would not be introduced until 2013 and 2016 respectively and that we have not assumed any growth in sales prices over the intervening period. Likewise, we have not assumed any growth in build costs over the period.

Appendix 6A looks at the cumulative effect of the same code level increases on the same strategic sites, where social rent is assumed as the rented tenure. Here, we see that code 3 is presenting viability issues for Westbury, Warminster, Ludgershall and NE Chippenham. When we add the costs of code 4, the only sites showing continuing viability are Bradford-on-Avon and Marlborough. When we add code 5 costs, it can be seen that it is only Bradford-on-Avon that is showing viability.

The tables enclosed as Appendix 11 are looking at the cumulative impact of the various cost elements on the notional sites. For this part of the exercise, we have looked at sites of 15 and 50 units, at densities of 30 and 40 dwellings per hectare. We have made the comment earlier that we consider it likely that most sites will come forward at these densities, rather than at the lower density.

For each of the 15 and 50 unit sites, we have looked at both affordable rent and social rent as the rented tenure. All scenarios assume 40% affordable housing, of which 60% is rented tenure.

At this point, we should confirm that the viability threshold for the notional sites has been taken at £1,038,000 per hectare, on the basis that they are more likely to have existing or alternative use values that would reflect either employment or residential uses.

If we are to consider a cumulative impact for the notional sites, then the starting position should be the land value with no affordable housing or CIL/infrastructure and code level 3. This is the scenario in the first line of each of the tables. In the next line, we are adding affordable housing at 40%, but there is still no infrastructure cost. This cost is then added in the third line. From this point, the affordable housing proportion and infrastructure costs are constant, with the incremental addition of code 4 and code 5 costs.

It will be seen that, in relation to affordable rent, there is generally good viability up to the inclusion of code 4 costs. The addition of code 5 costs, however, result in significant falls in viability below the threshold.

When we look at the impact of social rent, we see that there is already a viability issue at code 3 costs in the lower value locations. When we add the code 4 costs with social rent, it is only the highest value locations that see land values above the viability threshold. The addition of code 5 costs sees significant viability issues in all locations, with social rent.

In connection with the notional sites, we should comment, also, on the impact of adopting residential viability thresholds, as discussed above. We put forward the scenarios where, in the first instance, a development involved the demolition of existing houses and, secondly, the development involved no more than some back garden land, leaving the main house intact with a smaller garden. In the

first scenario, we were looking at a potential land value of £3.6million per hectare and, in the second, we were looking at a potential land value of £2million per hectare.

If we look at the outcomes shown in Appendix 11, we see that a land value per hectare of £2million can be seen in the more valuable locations, such as Marlborough, with the inclusion of affordable rent at code 3. In these locations, viability starts to be borderline at the £2million threshold with both affordable rent and CIL at £10,000 per unit. These tables also show that the less valuable locations could be viable at £2million per hectare, but without affordable housing or CIL.

As stated above, it should be remembered that the extra code costs would be incurred in 2013 and 2016 and that we have maintained sales values at today's date.

Conclusions

This study is being undertaken at a time when the UK housing market is facing a lack of new homes, following a tightening of the requirements of lenders. This has resulted in a significant reduction in the supply of affordable housing, while need remains constant.

At the heart of a study such as this are the conclusions that are reached in respect of viability thresholds. Whilst it is common practice to adopt industrial/employment land values as alternative use values, it should be recognised that many sites will have residential alternative values, as has been explored in this report. Due to their very specific nature, however, it is difficult to produce a single viability threshold to satisfy all residential scenarios. Instead, we have tried to avoid taking land values down to the limit of viability, particularly where we are considering infrastructure/CIL charges that might form a basis for a future CIL charging schedule.

We have carried out the study on the basis that the Council would be seeking to achieve a full affordable housing provision, in accordance with policy. Whilst we have sought to demonstrate the cumulative affect of different affordable housing tenures and infrastructure costs, it is inevitable that viability negotiations will be necessary in specific cases. In such instances, the Council will need to consider the extent to which affordable housing requirements might be relaxed in favour of infrastructure provision, and vice versa.

We believe that the Council can afford to consider a single affordable housing proportion across the plan area. Whilst the appendices show that this is likely to produce viability issues in some scenarios, we believe that it is mainly the low density locations that would be most affected. In response to this, we have stated our belief that most new development is likely to be at the medium and higher densities, where viability is improved. We find that the most common viable scenario is a 40% affordable housing proportion, assuming affordable rent in medium to high density locations and with an infrastructure payment of up to £10,000 per unit.

With regard to financial contributions/commuted sums, we can support a position whereby these are sought from developments of four units and below. In our experience, the provision of a single affordable unit on very small sites acts as a significant disincentive towards development, due to the value impact on other properties, while also being less efficient for registered providers to manage.

In this context, we believe that the simplest methodology for commuted payments is based upon the use of a percentage of development value to represent the land value, to which the policy proportion of affordable housing is applied. We believe that it would be appropriate to set a target percentage of

23%, although this might generate some viability issues in such locations such as Tidworth.

To the extent that the purpose of both financial contributions and commuted sums is to generate affordable housing revenue, we believe that it is reasonable to adopt the same methodology for calculating them both, as described in the report.

We can support a level of infrastructure payment/CIL in all locations although, as mentioned above, there will be viability issues in lower density locations, particularly in the context of social rent, as opposed to affordable rent. With this proviso, we would conclude that the Council can consider a charge of up to £10,000 per unit, especially where the rented tenure of affordable housing can be affordable rent.

We have tested social rented housing at both 60% and 75% of the affordable proportion. In practice, this is best considered in the context of the 50 unit sites. It can be seen that 75% social rent is producing viability problems in the lower value locations, even without any infrastructure cost. This is exacerbated when the infrastructure cost is imposed, even at a reduced rate of £5,000 per unit.

With regard to the cumulative impact of core policies, we believe that most scenarios will bear a code 4 level of cost, where affordable rent is the rented tenure of affordable housing. Where social rent is the rented tenure, then we believe that most scenarios will see viability issues at code 4. In these situations the Council might wish to consider a reduction in the infrastructure requirement to resume viability. It is possible, however, that sales values will have increased by the time that the extra code levels are being introduced, thereby restoring viability.

Recommendations

1. We would recommend that regular viability reviews are undertaken of the specific strategic sites as and when fresh information is available in respect of the major off-site infrastructure requirements.
2. We can support an affordable housing proportion of 40% for the strategic sites with affordable rent as the affordable tenure.
3. In the event that social rent is sought from the strategic sites, the Council is likely to need to be flexible around infrastructure requirements in some instances.
4. In connection with the notional sites, recommendations will vary, according to whether an infrastructure charge is also sought. Assuming a zero level of infrastructure, we would recommend that the Council can consider the adoption of a single affordable housing target of 40% for all sites of 5 units and above, on the assumption of either affordable rent, or social rent at higher densities. With the imposition of an infrastructure charge of up to £10,000 per unit, we would recommend that the Council can consider an affordable housing requirement of 40%, assuming affordable rent.
5. If a social rented tenure is sought, along with an infrastructure payment, we would recommend that the infrastructure payment be reduced to around £5,000 per unit, in order to minimise viability problems in the lower value locations.
6. We would recommend, therefore, that the Council can consider an infrastructure charge of up to £10,000 per unit, whilst recognising the possible need to be flexible on affordable housing rented tenures to maintain viability.
7. We would recommend that the Council can consider a requirement that new housing should meet code 4 from 2013, but only in the context of affordable rent.
8. In the context of a requirement for code 5 from 2016, we recommend that this would need to be supported by a proportionate increase in sales values between now and its introduction and that potential viability impact should be kept under review.
9. We would recommend that the Council can continue to seek financial contributions from sites of four units or less, based upon the methodology described in this report. In addition, we would recommend that the same

methodology be used where there is a policy position of on-site provision, but where a commuted payment in lieu is agreed.

10. We would recommend that, in connection with financial contributions and commuted payments, a land value: GDP percentage of around 23% should be considered. This can be in addition to an infrastructure charge of £10,000 per unit for the number of units to be built on the site.
11. In certain scenarios, particularly in lower value locations, there will need to be some flexibility around affordable housing tenures and infrastructure payments.
12. We would recommend that regular reviews are undertaken of market conditions, so that viability can be monitored on an ongoing basis.

End of Report
Adams Integra
December 2011

Appendix 1

Appendix 1

New Builds Sales Research

Address	Description	Price	Size (m2)	Price per m2	Less 20%	Less 10%	Plus 10%	Developer/ Agent	Incentives
Marlborough									
Flats									
School Walk, Marlborough, Wiltshire	2 bed apartment	£159,000						Strakers/Crest Nicholson	
	2 bed apartment	£144,000							
Average		£151,500							
Houses									
St John's Park, Chopping Knife Lane, Marlborough, SN8	5 bed detached (from)	£559,950						Crest Nicholson	Part exchange on selected plots
	5 bed detached (from)	£555,000							
	5 bed detached (from)	£539,950						Strakers	
	5 bed detached (Guide Price)	£535,000	234.0	£2,286	£1,829	£2,058	£2,515	Hamptons	
	5 bed detached (Guide Price)	£529,995	196.0	£2,704	£2,163	£2,434	£2,974		
	4 bed detached (from)	£465,000						Crest Nicholson	Part exchange on selected plots.
	4 bed detached	£399,000	124.4	£3,207	£2,566	£2,887	£3,528	Strakers	
	4 bed detached	£399,000	124.4	£3,207	£2,566	£2,887	£3,528		
	4 bed detached (from)	£399,000	124.4	£3,207	£2,566	£2,887	£3,528	Crest Nicholson	Part exchange on selected plots.
	4 bed semi detached (Guide Price)	£300,000	126.0	£2,381	£1,905	£2,143	£2,619	Hamptons	
	4 bed semi detached (From)	£299,999	97.0	£3,093	£2,474	£2,783	£3,402	Crest Nicholson	Part exchange on selected plots.
	4 bed semi detached (From)	£299,000	102.9	£2,907	£2,326	£2,616	£3,198		
	4 bed semi detached (From)	£299,999	102.9	£2,917	£2,333	£2,625	£3,208		
School Walk, Orchard Road, Marlborough, SN8 4AX	4 bed end terrace	£305,000	145.5	£2,096	£1,677	£1,887	£2,306	Crest Nicholson	Part exchange on selected plots. Easy buy available on selected plots.
	4 bed terrace (3 storey)	£295,000	145.5	£2,027	£1,622	£1,825	£2,230		
	4 bed terrace (3 storey)	£300,000	145.5	£2,062	£1,649	£1,856	£2,268		
	3 bed end terrace (from)	£240,000	55.9	£4,293	£3,435	£3,864	£4,723		
	3 bed end terrace (from)	£250,000	55.9	£4,475	£3,580	£4,027	£4,922		
	2 bed house	£165,000						Strakers	
Average		£375,573	127.2	£2,919	£2,335	£2,627	£3,211		
Pewsey									
Houses									
Swan Road, Pewsey, Wiltshire, SN9	5 bed detached (Guide Price)	£499,950	151.9	£3,292	£2,634	£2,963	£3,621	Carter Jonas	
	4 bed detached (Guide Price)	£425,000							
	4 bed detached (Guide Price)	£425,000							

	3 bed semi detached (Guide Price)	£330,000	105.4	£3,131	£2,505	£2,818	£3,444			
	3 bed semi detached (Guide Price)	£320,000	84.5	£3,788	£3,031	£3,410	£4,167			
Average		£399,990	113.9	£3,404	£2,723	£3,064	£3,744			
Devizes										
Flats										
Wilkinson Court, Naughton Avenue, Devizes, SN10	2 bed apartment (from)	£129,995	62.2	£2,090	£1,672	£1,881	£2,299	Taylor Wimpey		
	2 bed apartment (from)	£115,522								
Average		£122,759								
Houses										
Willowbrook, Horton Road, Devizes, SN10 2JJ	5 bed detached	£393,995						Redrow Homes		
	6 bed detached	£370,995	171.4	£2,164	£1,732	£1,948	£2,381			
	4 bed detached	£312,995	130.1	£2,406	£1,925	£2,166	£2,647			
	4 bed detached (from)	£259,995	103.3	£2,517	£2,013	£2,265	£2,768			
	4 bed detached	£299,995	117.2	£2,561	£2,049	£2,305	£2,817			
	4 bed detached	£299,995	117.2	£2,561	£2,049	£2,305	£2,817			
	3 bed detached	£239,995	94.1	£2,550	£2,040	£2,295	£2,805			
Keepers Road, Devizes, Wiltshire	5 bed detached	£384,995						Strakers		
	4 bed house	£279,995								
Quakers Walk, London Road, Devizes, SN10	5 bed detached (from)	£384,995						Persimmon		
	4 bed detached (Guide Price)	£349,995						Atwell Martin		
	4 bed detached (Guide Price)	£344,995	154.3	£2,236	£1,789	£2,012	£2,459			
	4 bed detached	£344,995						Strakers		
	5 bed detached (3 storey) (from)	£329,995						Taylor Wimpey	Part exchange available. Subsidised mortgage. Armed forces discount available.	
	4 bed detached (3 storey) (from)	£279,995	88.3	£3,169	£2,536	£2,853	£3,486			
	4 bed detached (3 storey) (from)	£274,995	110.4	£2,491	£1,993	£2,242	£2,741			
	3 bed town house (3 storey) (from)	£200,000								
	3 bed detached (from)	£239,995								
	4 bed detached (from)	£299,995	111.8	£2,684	£2,147	£2,416	£2,952	Persimmon		
	4 bed detached (from)	£299,995	119.4	£2,513	£2,010	£2,262	£2,764			
	4 bed house (from)	£279,995								
	4 bed detached (3 storey) (from)	£274,995	111.5	£2,466	£1,973	£2,220	£2,713			
	4 bed detached (from)	£299,995	119.4	£2,513	£2,010	£2,262	£2,764			
	4 bed detached (from)	£259,995	93.0	£2,797	£2,238	£2,517	£3,077			
	4 bed detached (from)	£279,995						Taylor Wimpey		

Nursted Meadows, Devizes, Wiltshire	3 bed house	£314,995	99.1	£3,178	£2,542	£2,860	£3,495	Strakers	
	3 bed house	£309,995	98.6	£3,143	£2,515	£2,829	£3,457		
	3 house	£277,500	56.7	£4,893	£3,915	£4,404	£5,383		
Wilkinson Court, Naughton Avenue, Devizes, SN10	5 bed detached (from)	£294,995	157.9	£1,868	£1,494	£1,681	£2,055	Taylor Wimpey	
	4 bed detached (from)	£289,995	134.5	£2,157	£1,725	£1,941	£2,372		
	4 bed town house (3 storey) (from)	£194,995	102.1	£1,909	£1,527	£1,718	£2,100		
Draymans Lock, Spitalcroft Road, Devizes, Wiltshire, SN10 3FJ	4 bed semi detached (from)	£199,950						Crest Nicholson	Part exchange and smooth move available on selected plots.
	4 bed semi detached (from)	£199,950							
Average		£293,038	114.5	£2,639	£2,111	£2,375	£2,903		
Amesbury									
Houses									
Archers Gate, Beyer Road, Amesbury, SP4	5 bed detached	£324,950						Bloor Homes	
	4 bed detached (from)	£309,950							
	5 bed detached (from)	£299,950	140.2	£2,140	£1,712	£1,926	£2,354		
	4 bed detached (from)	£299,950							
	4 bed detached (from)	£289,950	85.2	£3,403	£2,723	£3,063	£3,744		
	4 bed detached (from)	£284,950	85.2	£3,345	£2,676	£3,010	£3,679		
	4 bed detached (from)	£284,950	85.2	£3,345	£2,676	£3,010	£3,679		
	3 bed semi detached (from)	£229,950	81.4	£2,826	£2,261	£2,544	£3,109		
	3 bed semi detached (from)	£219,950							
	3 bed semi detached (from)	£224,950	88.0	£2,557	£2,045	£2,301	£2,812		
	3 bed house	£214,950							Austin Wyatt
2 bed semi detached	£173,950								
Margaret's Close, Amesbury, Salisbury	4 bed detached	£309,950						Fox & Sons	
Average		£266,796	94.2	£2,936	£2,349	£2,642	£3,230		
Durrington									
Flats									
Avon Fields, Netheravon Road, Durrington, SP7	1 bed apartment	£134,950						Persimmon	
Houses									
Avon Fields, Netheravon Road, Durrington, SP7	4 bed terrace (3 storey)	£229,950						Persimmon	
	4 bed terrace (3 storey)	£234,950							
	4 bed terrace (3 storey)	£234,950							
	4 bed terrace (3 storey)	£234,950							
Average		£233,700							
Larkhill									
Flats									
The Packway, Larkhill,	1 bed flat (from)	£120,000						Connells	

Salisbury									
Ludgershall									
Houses									
St James Street, Ludgershall	3 bed terrace	£220,000						Fox & Sons	
	3 bed end terrace	£185,000							
	3 bed terrace	£180,000							
	2 bed end terrace	£170,000							
	2 bed end terrace	£170,000							
Average		£185,000							
Trowbridge									
Flats									
Waterside Mews, Cockhill, Trowbridge	2 bed flat	£159,950	67.0	£2,388	£1,910	£2,149	£2,627	Kavanaghs	
The Hopstore, Ushers Apartments, Trowbridge	2 bed apartment	£139,950						Kavanaghs	
	2 bed apartment	£139,950							
	2 bed apartment	£138,950							5% Deposit Paid
	2 bed apartment	£129,950							5% Deposit paid or 5% discount
	2 bed apartment	£128,950							
	2 bed apartment	£127,950							
	2 bed apartment	£127,950							
	2 bed apartment	£126,950							5% Deposit paid or 5% discount
	2 bed apartment	£125,950							
	1 bed apartment	£80,950							5% Deposit paid or discount and flooring package
1 bed ground floor apartment	£79,950						5% Deposit paid or 5% discount		
Bythesea Road, Trowbridge	2 bed apartment	£129,950						Connells	
	2 bed apartment	£129,950							
	1 bed apartment	£99,950							
	1 bed apartment	£99,950							
	1 bed apartment	£99,950							
	1 bed apartment	£99,950							
	1 bed apartment	£89,950							
	1 bed apartment	£89,950							
	1 bed apartment	£89,950							
	1 bed apartment	£89,950							
Bradford Road, Trowbridge BA14	1 bed flat	£84,950						YOUR Move	
Average		£113,559							
Houses									
Hilperton, Trowbridge, Wiltshire	5 bed detached	£595,000						Davies and Davies	
Southview Park, Trowbridge	5 bed detached	£315,000						Kavanaghs	
	5 bed detached (3 storey)	£285,000	140.2	£2,033	£1,626	£1,830	£2,236		
	4 bed detached	£265,000	115.3	£2,297	£1,838	£2,068	£2,527		
	3 bed detached	£205,000	98.3	£2,085	£1,668	£1,876	£2,293		Part exchange available
	3 bed semi	£199,000							

	detached									
	3 bed terrace	£195,000						Davies & Davies		
Waterside Mews, Cockhill, Trowbridge	4 bed terrace	£249,950	111.7	£2,238	£1,791	£2,014	£2,462	Cobb Farr		
	4 bed terrace	£239,950	111.7	£2,149	£1,719	£1,934	£2,364			
	3 bed terrace	£219,950	107.2	£2,052	£1,641	£1,846	£2,257			
	3 bed terrace	£209,950	107.2	£1,958	£1,567	£1,762	£2,154			
	3 bed terrace	£199,950	107.2	£1,865	£1,492	£1,679	£2,052			
Trowbridge, Wiltshire	4 bed detached	£227,500	104.4	£2,179	£1,743	£1,961	£2,397	Kingstons		
Hawkescroft, Hackett Place, Trowbridge, Wiltshire, BA14 7GW	3 bed town house (3 store) (from)	£189,995	112.5	£1,688	£1,351	£1,520	£1,857	Taylor Wimpey		
	3 bed terrace (from)	£179,995	86.6	£2,079	£1,663	£1,871	£2,287			
	3 bed semi detached (from)	£177,995								
	2 bed terrace (from)	£151,995	52.2	£2,911	£2,329	£2,620	£3,202			
Average		£241,543	104.5	£2,128	£1,702	£1,915	£2,341			
Melksham										
Flats										
The Gateway, Snowberry Lane, Melksham, SN12	2 bed flat	£155,995	79.7	£1,956	£1,565	£1,760	£2,152	Barratt Homes		
	1 bed flat	£129,995	38.7	£3,360	£2,688	£3,024	£3,696			
Average		£142,995	59.2	£2,658	£2,127	£2,392	£2,924			
Houses										
Dauncey Gardens, Off Snarlton Lane, Melksham, SN12	4 bed detached	£339,950						Kingstons		
	4 bed detached (from)	£329,995	147.2	£2,242	£1,794	£2,018	£2,467	Persimmon		
	4 bed detached (from)	£324,995	147.2	£2,208	£1,767	£1,988	£2,429			
	5 bed detached (3 storey) (from)	£284,995	151.3	£1,883	£1,507	£1,695	£2,072			
	4 bed detached (from)	£279,995								
	4 bed detached (from)	£274,995								
	4 bed detached (from)	£249,995								
	4 bed semi detached (from)	£224,995								
	3 bed semi detached (from)	£209,995								
	4 bed semi detached (from)	£157,496								
	5 bed detached (3 storey)	£294,995	151.3	£1,949	£1,559	£1,754	£2,144		Kingstons	
	4 bed detached	£289,995								
	4 bed detached	£269,995								
	4 bed detached	£239,995								
	4 bed end terrace	£200,000								
3 bed semi detached	£189,995									
The Gateway, Snowberry Lane, Melksham, SN12	4 bed detached (from)	£329,950	143.7	£2,297	£1,837	£2,067	£2,526	Bloor Homes		
	5 bed detached (from)	£324,950								
	4 bed detached	£332,950	130.9	£2,543	£2,035	£2,289	£2,798			

	(from)								
	4 bed detached (3 storey) (from)	£264,950	135.6	£1,954	£1,563	£1,759	£2,150		
	4 bed detached (from)	£249,950	91.3	£2,737	£2,189	£2,463	£3,010		
	4 bed detached (from)	£280,000	103.5	£2,705	£2,164	£2,435	£2,976		
	4 bed terrace (from)	£249,950							
	4 bed terrace (from)	£249,950							
	4 bed detached (from)	£242,950	92.9	£2,615	£2,092	£2,353	£2,876		
	4 bed terrace (from)	£219,950							
	3 bed detached (from)	£199,950	81.3	£2,459	£1,967	£2,213	£2,705		
	3 bed semi detached (3 storey) (from)	£189,950	102.2	£1,859	£1,487	£1,673	£2,045		
	3 bed semi detached (3 storey) (from)	£187,950	102.2	£1,839	£1,471	£1,655	£2,023		
	3 bed semi detached (from)	£180,000	75.7	£2,378	£1,902	£2,140	£2,616		
	3 bed terrace (from)	£178,950	72.8	£2,457	£1,966	£2,211	£2,703		
	3 bed semi detached (from)	£173,950							
	3 bed semi detached (from)	£169,950	72.8	£2,333	£1,867	£2,100	£2,567		
	4 bed detached	£273,995	120.9	£2,267	£1,814	£2,040	£2,494		
	4 bed detached	£249,995	98.3	£2,543	£2,034	£2,289	£2,797		
	3 bed semi detached	£199,995						Barratt Homes	
	3 bed semi detached	£194,995							
	3 bed semi detached	£174,995	72.7	£2,406	£1,925	£2,166	£2,647		
	4 bed detached (from)	£324,995							
	4 bed detached (from)	£279,995							
	4 bed detached (from)	£239,995	111.4	£2,153	£1,723	£1,938	£2,369		
	4 bed detached (from)	£237,995	111.4	£2,136	£1,708	£1,922	£2,349		
	3 bed detached (from)	£179,995						Charles Church	
	3 bed semi detached (from)	£192,995	71.0	£2,719	£2,175	£2,447	£2,991		
	3 bed semi detached (from)	£194,995	71.0	£2,747	£2,198	£2,472	£3,022		
	3 bed end terrace (from)	£189,995	71.0	£2,677	£2,141	£2,409	£2,944		
	Wilkinson Close, Melksham, Wiltshire	2 bed semi detached	£139,950					Strakers	
	Union Street, Melksham, SN12	2 bed terrace	£129,995						
		2 bed end terrace	£129,995	45.6	£2,851	£2,281	£2,566	£3,136	Kingstons
		2 bed terrace	£129,995	51.2	£2,539	£2,031	£2,285	£2,793	
		2 bed terrace	£129,995	45.6	£2,851	£2,281	£2,566	£3,136	

Average		£231,049	99.0	£2,383	£1,907	£2,145	£2,622			
Corsham										
Houses										
Field House, Pickwick, Corsham, SN13	4 bed end terrace	£475,000							Hunter French	
	4 bed terrace	£465,000								
Bath Road, Corsham, SN13 OPR	4 bed detached	£360,000							Hunter French	
The Coppins, Broadstone, Corsham, SN13	4 bed detached	£339,995							Linden Homes	
	3 bed terrace	£229,950								
	3 bed terrace	£229,950								
Charles Street, Corsham	2 bed detached (Guide Price)	£160,000							Allen & Harris	
Average		£322,842								
Warminster										
Flats										
Victoria Road, Warminster	2 bed apartment	£126,995							Allen & Harris	
Houses										
Westbury Road, Warminster	5 bed detached	£515,000							Cooper and Tanner	
	5 bed detached	£485,000	243.6	£1,991	£1,593	£1,792	£2,191			
Sambourne Place, Warminster BA12	3 bed terrace	£179,950	72.5	£2,483	£1,987	£2,235	£2,732		YOUR Move	
	3 bed terrace	£169,950	85.2	£1,995	£1,596	£1,795	£2,194		Cooper and Tanner	
	3 bed terrace	£169,950	85.2	£1,995	£1,596	£1,795	£2,194			
	3 bed terrace	£169,950	85.2	£1,995	£1,596	£1,795	£2,194			
	3 bed terrace	£169,950	85.2	£1,995	£1,596	£1,795	£2,194			
	3 bed terrace	£164,950	85.2	£1,936	£1,549	£1,743	£2,130			
	3 bed terrace	£159,950	85.2	£1,878	£1,502	£1,690	£2,065			
Average		£242,739	103.4	£2,034	£1,627	£1,830	£2,237			
Bradford on Avon										
Houses										
Manor Gardens, Bradford on Avon	4 bed terrace	£585,000							Cobb Farr	
	3 bed end terrace	£395,000	114.9	£3,438	£2,750	£3,094	£3,782			
	3 bed terrace	£370,000	114.9	£3,220	£2,576	£2,898	£3,542			
Woolley Street, Bradford-On-Avon	4 bed detached	£425,000	138.8	£3,062	£2,450	£2,756	£3,368		Kingstons	
Kingston Mills, Kingston Road Bradford-On-Avon, BA15 1AB	4 bed town house (3 storey)	£380,000							Linden Homes	
	4 bed town house (3 storey)	£390,000								
Average		£424,167	122.9	£3,240	£2,592	£2,916	£3,564			
Tisbury										
Houses										
Ladydown View, Tisbury	5 bed detached (Guide Price)	£949,000							Arundell James	
Chippenham										
Flats										
Chippenham, Wiltshire	2 bed duplex apartment (Guide Price)	£129,995							Strakers	
Great Mead, Chippenham	1 bed apartment	£89,995							Connells	
Average		£109,995								
Houses										
Ladds Lane, Chippenham	3 bed terrace	£194,950							Allen & Harris	£1,000 Buyers

	2 bed end terrace	£174,950							Incentive
Average		£184,950							
Salisbury									
Flats									
Fisherton Street, Salisbury, Wiltshire	2 bed flat (Guide Price)	£164,950	49.6	£3,325	£2,660	£2,992	£3,657	Myddleton & Major	
Houses									
Old Sarum, Salisbury, Wiltshire	5 bed detached	£795,000	424.5	£1,873	£1,498	£1,686	£2,060	Chesteron Humberts	
Princes Walk, Sherbourne Drive, Old Sarum, Salisbury	4 bed detached (Guide Price)	£314,995						Woolley & Wallis	
Royal Gardens, Old Sarum, Salisbury	5 bed detached	£369,995						Charles Church	
	4 bed detached	£309,995	134.5	£2,305	£1,844	£2,075	£2,536		
	4 bed detached	£309,995	134.5	£2,305	£1,844	£2,075	£2,536		
	4 bed detached	£309,995	134.5	£2,305	£1,844	£2,075	£2,536		
	4 bed detached (3 storey)	£304,995	123.8	£2,463	£1,970	£2,217	£2,709		
	4 bed town house (from)	£269,995	109.9	£2,457	£1,965	£2,211	£2,702		
	4 bed town house (from)	£269,995	109.9	£2,457	£1,965	£2,211	£2,702		
	4 bed town house (from)	£269,995	109.9	£2,457	£1,965	£2,211	£2,702		
	4 bed town house (from)	£269,995	109.9	£2,457	£1,965	£2,211	£2,702		
	4 bed semi detached (3 storey) (Guide Price)	£264,995	101.7	£2,605	£2,084	£2,344	£2,865		
	3 bed detached (from)	£264,995	84.4	£3,141	£2,513	£2,827	£3,455		
	3 bed end terrace (from)	£259,995	97.7	£2,661	£2,129	£2,395	£2,927		
	3 bed semi detached (from)	£259,995	97.7	£2,661	£2,129	£2,395	£2,927		
	3 bed mid terrace (from)	£254,995	97.7	£2,610	£2,088	£2,349	£2,871		
	3 bed mid terrace (from)	£254,995	97.7	£2,610	£2,088	£2,349	£2,871		
2 bed coach house (from)	£184,995								
2 bed coach house (from)	£147,996								
Osmund Fields, Rowbarrow, Downton Road, Salisbury	4 bed detached (Guide Price)	£349,950	120.9	£2,894	£2,316	£2,605	£3,184	Persimmon	Part exchange
Saxon Gate, Ramsbury Drive, SP5	4 bed detached	£274,995						Persimmon	
	4 bed detached	£269,995							
	4 bed semi detached (from)	£249,995							
	3 bed detached	£249,995	81.0	£3,085	£2,468	£2,777	£3,394		
	3 bed detached	£249,995	81.0	£3,085	£2,468	£2,777	£3,394		
	3 bed detached	£249,995	81.0	£3,085	£2,468	£2,777	£3,394		
	3 bed detached (from)	£244,995							

	3 bed semi detached	£242,995							
	3 bed semi detached (from)	£239,995							
	3 bed detached (from)	£249,995							
Average		£285,360	122.7	£2,606	£2,085	£2,346	£2,867		
Wilton									
Flats									
Victoria Road, Wilton	4 bed detached (Guide Price)	£350,000						McKillop & Gregory	
Downton									
Houses									
The Glades, Wick Lane, Downton, SP5	5 bed detached	£475,995						Redrow Homes	
	5 bed detached (from)	£430,995	143.7	£2,999	£2,399	£2,699	£3,299		
	4 bed detached (from)	£390,995	116.3	£3,363	£2,690	£3,026	£3,699		
	4 bed detached	£390,995							
Wick Lane, Downton, Salisbury	5 bed detached (from)	£435,995						Connells	
Average		£424,995	130.0	£3,181	£2,545	£2,863	£3,499		
Malmesbury									
Flats									
Old Station Mews, Malmesbury	2 bed flat	£147,500	65.8	£2,242	£1,793	£2,017	£2,466	Elliotts	
Houses									
Cowbridge Mill, Swindon Road, Malmesbury, SN16	4 bed detached	£385,995						Redrow Homes	
	4 bed terrace (3 storey)	£266,995	138.3	£1,931	£1,544	£1,737	£2,124		
	4 bed semi detached (3 storey)	£265,995	138.3	£1,923	£1,539	£1,731	£2,116		
	3 bed terrace (3 storey)	£230,995							
	2 bed terrace	£150,995	52.0	£2,905	£2,324	£2,615	£3,196		
Average		£260,195	109.5	£2,253	£1,802	£2,028	£2,478		

Source: www.rightmove.co.uk, September 2011

Resales Research

Marlborough

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed
Detached		£199,950	£296,975	£377,500
Semi-Detached		£260,000	-	-
Terraced		-	-	£295,000
Flats	-	£210,000		

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-Bed Flats	£210,000	£175,000	£192,500	£210,000	£227,500	£245,000
2-Bed Houses	£239,983	£199,950	£222,475	£245,000	£260,000	£275,000
3-Bed Houses	£296,975	£295,000	£295,988	£296,975	£297,963	£298,950
4-Bed Houses	£361,000	£295,000	£315,000	£325,000	£395,000	£475,000

Pewsey

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		-	£281,667	£306,667	-
Semi-Detached		-	£199,950	-	-
Terraced		-	£237,500	-	-
Flats	-	£120,000			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-Bed Flats	£120,000	£120,000	£120,000	£120,000	£120,000	£120,000
2-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-
3-Bed Houses	£253,325	£199,950	£231,500	£257,250	£280,000	£295,000
4-Bed Houses	£306,667	£275,000	£295,000	£315,000	£322,500	£330,000
5-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-

Devizes

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		-	£244,975	£310,825	£406,224
Semi-Detached		£148,500	-	-	-
Terraced		£147,114	£178,315	£212,475	£219,950
Flats	£88,283	£121,207			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	£88,283	£82,950	£86,450	£89,950	£90,950	£91,950
2-Bed Flats	£121,207	£105,000	£115,000	£122,500	£126,875	£132,500
2-Bed Houses	£147,287	£138,000	£145,200	£149,225	£149,961	£155,000
3-Bed Houses	£204,979	£155,000	£179,995	£189,950	£199,950	£300,000
4-Bed Houses	£286,238	£179,950	£260,000	£283,750	£338,113	£355,000
5-Bed Houses	£368,969	£219,950	£359,995	£399,950	£429,950	£435,000

Amesbury

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		-	£219,764	£261,970	£319,950
Semi-Detached		£169,950	£209,350	£239,950	-
Terraced		£151,700	£187,150	£255,980	-
Flats	-	£139,967			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-Bed Flats	£139,967	£134,950	£137,450	£139,950	£142,475	£145,000
2-Bed Houses	£155,350	£139,950	£151,950	£154,950	£159,950	£169,950
3-Bed Houses	£205,803	£162,950	£185,000	£210,000	£222,500	£249,950
4-Bed Houses	£257,245	£205,000	£234,950	£244,950	£279,950	£315,000
5-Bed Houses	£319,950	£299,950	£309,950	£319,950	£329,950	£339,950

Durrington

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		-	£197,500	-	-
Semi-Detached		-	-	-	-
Terraced		-	-	-	-
Flats	-	-			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-Bed Flats	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-
3-Bed Houses	£197,500	£197,500	£197,500	£197,500	£197,500	£197,500
4-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-
5-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-

Trowbridge

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		-	£181,999	£248,827	£282,475
Semi-Detached		£134,725	£162,542	£229,995	-
Terraced		£131,049	£169,058	£187,250	-
Flats	£92,500	£121,788			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	£92,500	£92,500	£92,500	£92,500	£92,500	£92,500
2-Bed Flats	£121,788	£106,950	£113,588	£120,475	£127,713	£145,000
2-Bed Houses	£132,520	£109,950	£131,750	£133,725	£138,700	£148,950
3-Bed Houses	£168,472	£149,950	£158,450	£166,950	£176,475	£195,000
4-Bed Houses	£244,651	£185,000	£222,613	£235,000	£249,950	£369,950
5-Bed Houses	£282,475	£279,950	£281,213	£282,475	£283,738	£285,000

Melksham

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		-	£184,950	£208,332	£297,488
Semi-Detached		-	£159,173	-	-
Terraced		£132,617	£158,749	£159,960	£225,000
Flats	-	£119,264			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-Bed Flats	£119,264	£108,995	£115,500	£119,950	£124,950	£125,000
2-Bed Houses	£132,617	£129,950	£131,450	£132,950	£133,950	£134,950
3-Bed Houses	£161,025	£132,996	£139,995	£149,950	£172,500	£249,950
4-Bed Houses	£178,099	£139,950	£143,713	£179,973	£201,213	£225,000
5-Bed Houses	£282,990	£225,000	£285,000	£289,950	£305,000	£310,000

Corsham

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		£157,617	-	£307,474	-
Semi-Detached		-	£219,950	£237,500	-
Terraced		-	£214,642	-	-
Flats	£95,817	£139,333			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	£95,817	£79,950	£86,225	£92,500	£103,750	£115,000
2-Bed Flats	£139,333	£105,000	£138,500	£141,748	£144,249	£165,000
2-Bed Houses	£157,617	£149,950	£154,950	£159,950	£161,450	£162,950
3-Bed Houses	£215,400	£195,000	£213,975	£219,950	£219,975	£224,950
4-Bed Houses	£284,149	£230,000	£256,249	£294,998	£314,963	£319,950
5-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-

Warminster

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		-	£219,998	£247,474	-
Semi-Detached		-	£174,995	£214,995	-
Terraced		£129,963	£159,967	-	-
Flats	£139,995	£106,225			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	£139,995	£139,995	£139,995	£139,995	£139,995	£139,995
2-Bed Flats	£106,225	£92,500	£99,363	£106,225	£113,088	£119,950
2-Bed Houses	£129,963	£124,950	£128,700	£129,950	£131,213	£135,000
3-Bed Houses	£182,482	£139,950	£163,711	£177,498	£198,746	£235,000
4-Bed Houses	£240,978	£214,995	£219,950	£235,000	£264,995	£269,950
5-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-

Bradford on Avon

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		-	£259,950	£459,950	-
Semi-Detached		-	-	-	-
Terraced		-	£250,000	£389,950	-
Flats	-	£162,950			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-Bed Flats	£162,950	£162,950	£162,950	£162,950	£162,950	£162,950
2-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-
3-Bed Houses	£256,633	£249,950	£249,975	£250,000	£259,975	£269,950
4-Bed Houses	£436,617	£379,950	£384,950	£389,950	£464,950	£539,950
5-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-

Tisbury

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		-	-	-	-
Semi-Detached		-	-	-	-
Terraced		-	-	-	-
Flats	-	£178,300			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	-	-	-	-!	-	-
2-Bed Flats	£178,300	£169,950	£169,950	£169,950	£182,475	£195,000
2-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-
3-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-
4-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-
5-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-

Westbury

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		-	£179,950	£212,475	£298,333
Semi-Detached		-	£158,316	£184,225	-
Terraced		£119,989	£164,316	£189,950	-
Flats	£85,000	£114,000			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	£85,000	£85,000	£85,000	£85,000	£85,000	£85,000
2-Bed Flats	£114,000	£112,000	£113,000	£114,000	£115,000	£116,000
2-Bed Houses	£119,989	£109,950	£117,500	£120,000	£122,500	£129,995
3-Bed Houses	£164,134	£136,500	£155,000	£159,999	£169,995	£199,950
4-Bed Houses	£203,694	£182,500	£189,950	£194,950	£205,000	£275,000
5-Bed Houses	£298,333	£245,000	£247,500	£250,000	£325,000	£400,000

Chippenham

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		-	£219,167	£335,329	£325,000
Semi-Detached		£149,950	£172,475	£259,950	-
Terraced		£144,585	£193,642	£179,950	-
Flats	£103,260	£121,668			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	£103,260	£91,500	£99,950	£99,950	£109,950	£114,950
2-Bed Flats	£121,668	£109,995	£117,623	£121,995	£124,975	£135,000
2-Bed Houses	£145,072	£125,000	£133,750	£149,950	£154,998	£155,950
3-Bed Houses	£196,755	£155,000	£178,750	£209,950	£215,475	£225,000
4-Bed Houses	£304,715	£179,950	£273,700	£306,250	£337,450	£440,000
5-Bed Houses	£325,000	£325,000	£325,000	£325,000	£325,000	£325,000

Salisbury

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		-	-	£359,142	£622,500
Semi-Detached		£184,950	£219,133	-	-
Terraced		£169,500	£210,000	-	-
Flats	£130,588	£173,356			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	£130,588	£127,500	£129,338	£129,950	£131,200	£134,950
2-Bed Flats	£173,356	£162,500	£162,875	£166,975	£174,950	£215,000
2-Bed Houses	£174,650	£169,500	£169,500	£169,500	£177,225	£184,950
3-Bed Houses	£215,480	£192,500	£205,000	£215,000	£224,950	£239,950
4-Bed Houses	£359,142	£285,000	£334,950	£349,950	£368,738	£465,000
5-Bed Houses	£622,500	£595,000	£608,750	£622,500	£636,250	£650,000

Wilton

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		-	-	-	-
Semi-Detached		-	-	-	-
Terraced		-	-	£279,950	-
Flats	-	-			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-Bed Flats	-	-	-	-	-	-
2-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-
3-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-
4-Bed Houses	£279,950	£279,950	£279,950	£279,950	£279,950	£279,950
5-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-

Malmesbury

	1 Bed	2 Bed	3 Bed	4 Bed	5 Bed
Detached		-	£239,500	£269,667	-
Semi-Detached		-	£229,998	£225,000	-
Terraced		£162,473	£208,300	£229,950	-
Flats	£112,467	£164,869			

	Overall Average	Minimum	1st Quartile	Median	3rd Quartile	Maximum
1-Bed Flat	£112,467	£97,500	£98,725	£99,950	£119,950	£139,950
2-Bed Flats	£164,869	£119,500	£154,950	£154,995	£189,950	£204,950
2-Bed Houses	£162,473	£144,950	£153,711	£162,473	£171,234	£179,995
3-Bed Houses	£222,056	£199,950	£212,475	£215,000	£234,748	£245,000
4-Bed Houses	£252,790	£225,000	£229,950	£259,000	£275,000	£275,000
5-Bed Houses	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: www.rightmove.co.uk, September 2011

Appendix 2

Appendix 2

Table of assumed land uses and areas

Strategic Sites

	NE Chippenham	E Chippenham	SW Chippenham	Ludgershall	Bradford	Trowbridge	Warminster	Westbury	Marlborough
	750	700	800	475	150	2600	900	250	220
Residential (hectares)	16.00	18.20	21.60	9.90	4.00	71.00	32.00	13.25	6.70
Employment (hectares)	2.50	6.00	18.00	0.00	3.00	15.00	6.00	0.00	0.00
POS (hectares)	17.00	15.00	25.00	10.00	1.25	70.00	25.00	0.00	0.00
Neighbourhood hub (ha)	0.15	1.75	2.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	2.65	0.00	0.00
Totals (hectares)	35.65	40.95	66.60	21.90	9.25	159.00	65.65	13.25	6.70
Residential density/ha	47	38	37	48	38	37	28	19	33

Appendix 3

Appendix 3

Wiltshire Strategic Sites

Accommodation Schedules

	Floor	NE	E	SW						
	Area sq m	Chippenham 750	Chippenham 700	Chippenham 800	Ludgershall 475	Bradford 150	Trowbridge 2600	Warminster 900	Westbury 250	Marlborough 220
Affordable										
1 bed flat	46	36	34	38	23	6	125	43	9	8
2 bed flat	61				29	9	156	54	15	13
2 bed house	76	120	113	127	76	25	416	144	43	37
3 bed house	86	93	87	99	53	17	291	101	29	26
4 bed house	101	51	46	56	9	3	52	18	4	4
5 bed house										
Total affordable		300	280	320	190	60	1040	360	100	88
Market										
1 bed flat	47	54	50	58	34	11	187	65	18	16
2 bed flat	61	45	42	48	33	9	156	54	15	13
2 bed house	76	135	126	144	81	27	468	162	45	39
3 bed house	86	207	193	221	131	41	718	248	69	61
4 bed house	111	9	9	9	6	2	31	11	3	3
5 bed house										
Total market		450	420	480	285	90	1560	540	150	132
Total no. of units		750	700	800	475	150	2600	900	250	220
% affordable		60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%

Appendix 4

Appendix 4

Table of identified infrastructure contributions

Figures and headings are taken from the infrastructure delivery tables and other information provided by Wiltshire Council.

Heading	NE Chippenham	E Chippenham	S Chippenham	Ludgershall	Bradford	Trowbridge	Warminster	Westbury	Marlborough
	750	700	800	475	150	2600	900	250	220
Electricity reinforcement									
Public transport improvement									
Gas improvement									
Water supply									
Sewer improvement					£400,000		£750,000		
GP surgery	£315,000	£293,000	£334,000	£35,000	£430,000	£1,385,000	£700,000		
Ambulance/fire facilities				£350,000					
Primary Schools	£3,110,000		£3,110,000	£500,000	£300,000		£2,000,000	£1,172,000	£794,000
Secondary schools	£1,660,000	£1,500,000	£1,700,000	£2,675,000	£315,000	£6,000,000	£2,000,000	£1,329,000	£835,000
Cemeteries	£26,250	£24,500	£28,000		£5,250	£91,000	£31,500		
Rights of way/footpaths		£40,000	£12,500	£716,000					
Sustainable energy									
Bus stops and shelters					£100,000				
Off site road improvements*	£6,000,000	£6,000,000	£8,000,000	£250,000		£11,000,000			
Total	£11,111,250	£7,857,500	£13,184,500	£4,526,000	£1,550,250	£18,476,000	£5,481,500	£2,501,000	£1,629,000
Assume for appraisals**	£14,861,250	£11,357,500	£17,184,500	£6,901,000	£2,300,250	£26,276,000	£9,981,500	£2,501,000	£1,629,000

*Taken at a total of £22million for the Chippenham sites only,
from Colin Buchanan

Assumes that new roads will not be dual carriageway.

**To allow for infrastructure headings that are not costed, these figures add £3,000 per unit for sites of more than 1,000 units and £5,000 per unit for sites of less than 1,000 units.

Appendix 5

Appendix 5

Summary of Strategic Site Valuations

Assume affordable rent

Assume code 3

Viability threshold is £450,000 per hectare

Headings	Westbury	Warminster	Trowbridge	Bradford on Avon	Ludgershall	E Chippenham	SW Chippenham	NE Chippenham	Marlborough
Resi Site area ha	13.25	32.00	71.00	4.00	9.90	18.20	21.60	16.00	6.70
Employment area ha	0.00	6.00	15.00	3.00	0.00	6.00	18.00	2.50	0.00
Total area ha	13.25	38.00	86.00	7.00	9.90	24.20	39.60	18.50	6.70
Number market units	150	540	1560	90	285	420	480	450	132
Number affordable units	100	360	1040	60	190	280	320	300	88
Total number of units	250	900	2600	150	475	700	800	750	220
Total floor area	18783	67876	194611	11347	35808	53888	61630	58224	16750
Total capital value	£38,000,000	£136,310,000	£383,000,000	£28,316,000	£72,806,000	£109,000,000	£125,000,000	£117,248,000	£37,500,000
Total base build cost	£20,817,000	£75,226,000	£216,000,000	£13,744,000	£39,685,000	£60,000,000	£68,000,000	£64,528,000	£20,300,000
Build Cost per sq m	£1,108	£1,108	£1,110	£1,211	£1,108	£1,113	£1,103	£1,108	£1,212
Abnormals	£1,150,000	£12,600,000	£24,750,000	£725,000	£8,400,000	£7,000,000	£8,940,000	£7,000,000	£1,350,000
S106 Off site costs	£2,500,402	£9,981,500	£26,277,750	£2,300,250	£6,901,000	£11,358,000	£17,185,000	£14,861,250	£1,629,000
Total Build fees	£416,000	£489,000	£647,000	£412,000	£396,000	£448,000	£410,000	£484,000	£406,000
Marketing fees	£1,027,000	£3,461,000	£4,725,000	£844,000	£1,834,165	£1,910,000	£2,156,000	£2,033,000	£1,071,000
Finance and purchase	£959,000	£3,847,000	£13,300,000	£1,062,000	£1,366,000	£3,846,000	£3,295,000	£1,812,000	£1,046,000
Total profit	£5,453,000	£19,469,000	£54,481,000	£4,248,000	£10,432,000	£15,500,000	£17,669,000	£16,607,000	£5,657,000
Residential land value	£5,679,000	£11,237,000	£43,210,000	£4,825,000	£3,793,000	£9,741,000	£6,591,000	£9,923,000	£6,036,000
Employment LV @ £865,000 per ha	£0	£5,190,000	£12,975,000	£2,595,000	£0	£5,190,000	£15,570,000	£2,162,500	£0
Total Land Value	£5,679,000	£16,427,000	£56,185,000	£7,420,000	£3,793,000	£14,931,000	£22,161,000	£12,085,500	£6,036,000
Land value per ha	£428,604	£432,289	£653,314	£1,060,000	£383,131	£616,983	£559,621	£653,270	£900,896

Appendix 5A

Appendix 5A

Summary of Strategic Site valuations with cumulative additions of code 4 and code 5 costs.
Assume affordable rent

Viability threshold is £450,000 per hectare

Headings	Westbury	Warminster	Trowbridge	Bradford on Avon	Ludgershall	E Chippenham	SW Chippenham	NE Chippenham	Marlborough
Resi Site area ha	13.25	32.00	71.00	4.00	9.90	18.20	21.60	16.00	6.70
Employment area ha	0.00	6.00	15.00	3.00	0.00	6.00	18.00	2.50	0.00
Total area ha	13.25	38.00	86.00	7.00	9.90	24.20	39.60	18.50	6.70
Number market units	150	540	1560	90	285	420	480	450	132
Number affordable units	100	360	1040	60	190	280	320	300	88
Total number of units	250	900	2600	150	475	700	800	750	220
Residential land value code 3	£5,679,000	£11,237,000	£43,210,000	£4,825,000	£3,793,000	£9,741,000	£6,591,000	£9,923,000	£6,036,000
Employment LV @ £865,000 per ha £865,000	£0	£5,190,000	£12,975,000	£2,595,000	£0	£5,190,000	£15,570,000	£2,162,500	£0
Total Land Value	£5,679,000	£16,427,000	£56,185,000	£7,420,000	£3,793,000	£14,931,000	£22,161,000	£12,085,500	£6,036,000
Land value per ha	£428,604	£432,289	£653,314	£1,060,000	£383,131	£616,983	£559,621	£653,270	£900,896
Land value at policy code 4	£4,988,000	£8,819,000	£36,227,000	£4,411,000	£2,517,000	£7,812,000	£4,508,000	£7,856,000	£5,427,000
Employment LV @ £865,000 per ha £865,000	£0	£5,190,000	£12,975,000	£2,595,000	£0	£5,190,000	£15,570,000	£2,162,500	£0
Total Land Value	£4,988,000	£14,009,000	£49,202,000	£7,006,000	£2,517,000	£13,002,000	£20,078,000	£10,018,500	£5,427,000
Land value per ha	£376,453	£368,658	£572,116	£1,000,857	£254,242	£537,273	£507,020	£541,541	£810,000
Land value at policy code 5	£1,655,000	-£2,831,000	£2,569,000	£2,416,000	-£3,632,000	-£1,274,000	-£6,000,000	-£1,877,000	£2,490,000
Employment LV @ £865,000 per ha	£0	£5,190,000	£12,975,000	£2,595,000	£0	£5,190,000	£15,570,000	£2,162,500	£0
Total Land Value	£1,655,000	£2,359,000	£15,544,000	£5,011,000	-£3,632,000	£3,916,000	£9,570,000	£285,500	£2,490,000
Land value per ha	£124,906	£62,079	£180,744	£715,857	-£366,869	£161,818	£241,667	£15,432	£371,642

Appendix 6

Appendix 6

Summary of Strategic Site valuations

Assume social rent

Assume code 3

Headings	Westbury	Warminster	Trowbridge	Bradford on Avon	Ludgershall	E Chippenham	SW Chippenham	NE Chippenham	Marlborough
Resi Site area ha	13.25	32.00	71.00	4.00	9.90	18.20	21.60	16.00	6.70
Employment area ha	0.00	6.00	15.00	3.00	0.00	6.00	18.00	2.50	0.00
Total area ha	13.25	38.00	86.00	7.00	9.90	24.20	39.60	18.50	6.70
Number market units	150	540	1560	90	285	420	480	450	132
Number affordable units	100	360	1040	60	190	280	320	300	88
Total number of units	250	900	2600	150	475	700	800	750	220
Total floor area	18783	67876	194611	11347	35808	53888	61630	58224	16750
Total capital value	£36,126,000	£129,460,000	£363,000,000	£27,187,000	£69,157,000	£103,000,000	£118,000,000	£111,198,000	£36,719,000
Total base build cost	£20,817,000	£75,226,000	£216,000,000	£13,744,000	£39,685,000	£59,740,000	£68,303,000	£64,528,000	£20,300,000
Build Cost per sq m	£1,108	£1,108	£1,110	£1,211	£1,108	£1,109	£1,108	£1,108	£1,212
Abnormals	£1,150,000	£12,600,000	£24,750,000	£725,000	£8,400,000	£7,000,000	£8,940,000	£7,000,000	£1,350,000
S106 Off site costs	£2,500,402	£9,981,500	£26,277,750	£2,300,250	£6,901,000	£11,357,500	£17,184,000	£14,861,250	£1,629,000
Total Build fees	£416,000	£564,000	£647,000	£412,000	£397,000	£448,000	£410,000	£484,000	£406,000
Marketing fees	£1,027,000	£3,461,000	£4,245,000	£844,000	£1,834,000	£1,910,000	£2,196,000	£2,033,000	£1,071,000
Finance and purchase	£727,000	£3,153,000	£11,260,000	£963,000	£1,000,000	£2,902,000	£2,635,000	£1,210,000	£1,034,000
Total profit	£5,347,000	£19,082,000	£53,324,000	£4,184,000	£10,226,000	£15,162,000	£17,292,000	£16,264,000	£5,608,000
Residential land value	£4,097,000	£5,392,000	£25,950,000	£3,926,000	£714,000	£4,758,000	£934,000	£4,817,000	£5,332,000
Employment LV @ £865,000 per ha	£0	£5,190,000	£12,975,000	£2,595,000	£0	£5,190,000	£15,570,000	£2,162,500	£0
Total Land Value	£4,097,000	£10,582,000	£38,925,000	£6,521,000	£714,000	£9,948,000	£16,504,000	£6,979,500	£5,332,000
Land value per ha	£309,208	£278,474	£452,616	£931,571	£72,121	£411,074	£416,768	£377,270	£795,821

Appendix 6A

Appendix 6A

Summary of Strategic Site valuations with cumulative additions of code 4 and code 5 costs.
Assume social rent

Viability threshold is £450,000 per hectare

Headings	Westbury	Warminster	Trowbridge	Bradford on Avon	Ludgershall	E Chippenham	SW Chippenham	NE Chippenham	Marlborough
Resi Site area ha	13.25	32.00	71.00	4.00	9.90	18.20	21.60	16.00	6.70
Employment area ha	0.00	6.00	15.00	3.00	0.00	6.00	18.00	2.50	0.00
Total area ha	13.25	38.00	86.00	7.00	9.90	24.20	39.60	18.50	6.70
Number market units	150	540	1560	90	285	420	480	450	132
Number affordable units	100	360	1040	60	190	280	320	300	88
Total number of units	250	900	2600	150	475	700	800	750	220
Residential land value code 3	£4,097,000	£5,392,000	£25,950,000	£3,926,000	£714,000	£4,758,000	£934,000	£4,817,000	£5,332,000
Employment LV @ £865,000 per ha £865,000	£0	£5,190,000	£12,975,000	£2,595,000	£0	£5,190,000	£15,570,000	£2,162,500	£0
Total Land Value	£4,097,000	£10,582,000	£38,925,000	£6,521,000	£714,000	£9,948,000	£16,504,000	£6,979,500	£5,332,000
Land value per ha	£309,208	£278,474	£452,616	£931,571	£72,121	£411,074	£416,768	£377,270	£795,821
Land value at policy code 4	£3,406,000	£2,974,000	£18,966,000	£3,512,000	£-561,000	£2,830,000	£-1,271,000	£2,751,000	£4,717,000
Employment LV @ £865,000 per ha £865,000	£0	£5,190,000	£12,975,000	£2,595,000	£0	£5,190,000	£15,570,000	£2,162,500	£0
Total Land Value	£3,406,000	£8,164,000	£31,941,000	£6,107,000	£-561,000	£8,020,000	£14,299,000	£4,913,500	£4,717,000
Land value per ha	£257,057	£214,842	£371,407	£872,429	£-56,667	£331,405	£361,086	£265,595	£704,030
Land value at policy code 5	£73,000	£-8,676,000	£-14,691,000	£1,517,000	£-6,710,000	£-6,256,000	£-11,650,000	£-6,982,000	£1,747,000
Employment LV @ £865,000 per ha	£0	£5,190,000	£12,975,000	£2,595,000	£0	£5,190,000	£15,570,000	£2,162,500	£0
Total Land Value	£73,000	£-3,486,000	£-1,716,000	£4,112,000	£-6,710,000	£-1,066,000	£3,920,000	£-4,819,500	£1,747,000
Land value per ha	£5,509	£-91,737	£-19,953	£587,429	£-677,778	£-44,050	£98,990	£-260,514	£260,746

Appendix 7

Appendix 7

5 units

Land values at varying densities and affordable housing tenures

**NB: the affordable provision on 5 unit sites is rented, not intermediate.
Zero CIL/Infrastructure**

Location	Density per ha		No affordable	25% affordable with aff. rent	40% affordable with aff. rent	25% affordable with social rent	40% affordable with social rent
Marlborough	20	Land value	£551,000	£444,000	£331,000	£358,000	£236,000
		As % GDV	25	24	21	20	17
		Land value per ha	£2,205,000	£1,775,000	£1,324,000	£1,431,000	£943,000
	30	Land value	£430,000	£343,000	£308,000	£284,000	£178,000
		As % GDV	28	25	26	22	17
		Land value per ha	£2,534,000	£2,019,000	£1,814,000	£1,673,000	£1,047,000
	40	Land value	£368,000	£294,000	£222,000	£263,000	£167,000
		As % GDV	29	26	23	24	18
		Land value per ha	£2,945,000	£2,349,000	£1,780,000	£2,105,000	£1,334,000
Devizes	20	Land value	£278,000	£247,000	£173,000	£221,000	£110,000
		As % GDV	19	19	15	18	10
		Land value per ha	£1,111,000	£988,000	£693,000	£884,000	£442,000
	30	Land value	£391,000	£301,000	£228,000	£271,000	£167,000
		As % GDV	27	23	22	21	17
		Land value per ha	£2,300,000	£1,771,000	£1,339,000	£1,594,000	£984,000
	40	Land value	£304,000	£256,000	£201,000	£228,000	£146,000
		As % GDV	28	26	22	24	18
		Land value per ha	£2,435,000	£2,045,000	£1,607,000	£1,826,000	£1,168,000
Tidworth	20	Land value	£350,000	£268,000	£210,000	£258,000	£101,000
		As % GDV	25	22	20	22	10
		Land value per ha	£1,399,000	£1,071,000	£840,000	£1,031,000	£406,000
	30	Land value	£350,000	£291,000	£217,000	£258,000	£169,000
		As % GDV	27	24	21	22	17
		Land value per ha	£2,061,000	£1,714,000	£1,277,000	£1,516,000	£996,000
	40	Land value	£279,000	£248,000	£195,000	£225,000	£140,000
		As % GDV	28	25	22	23	17
		Land value per ha	£2,235,000	£1,986,000	£1,560,000	£1,802,000	£1,121,000

Appendix 7A

Appendix 7A

5 units

Land values at varying densities and affordable housing tenures, with differing levels of CIL/Infrastructure

NB: the affordable provision on 5 unit sites is rented, not intermediate.

Location	Density per ha	Infrastructure/CIL per unit:	No affordable	25% affordable with aff. rent	40% affordable with aff. rent	25% affordable with social rent	40% affordable with social rent
			£30,000	£20,000	£10,000	£10,000	£0
Marlborough	20	Land value	£416,000	£352,000	£285,000	£312,000	£236,000
		As % GDV	19	19	18	18	17
		Land value per ha	£1,663,000	£1,410,000	£1,141,000	£1,248,000	£943,000
	30	Land value	£294,000	£252,000	£263,000	£239,000	£178,000
		As % GDV	19	19	22	19	17
		Land value per ha	£1,729,000	£1,481,000	£1,545,000	£1,404,000	£1,047,000
	40	Land value	£231,000	£202,000	£176,000	£217,000	£167,000
		As % GDV	19	18	18	20	18
		Land value per ha	£1,849,000	£1,618,000	£1,407,000	£1,739,000	£1,334,000

Table 7A

5 units

Land values at varying densities and affordable housing tenures, with differing levels of CIL/Infrastructure

NB: the affordable provision on 5 unit sites is rented, not intermediate.

Location	Density per ha	Infrastructure/CIL per unit:	No affordable	25% affordable with aff. rent	40% affordable with aff. rent	25% affordable with social rent	40% affordable with social rent
			20dph: £5,000	20dph: £0	20dph: £0	20dph: £0	
			30/40dph: £20,000	30/40dph: £10,000	30/40dph: £10,000	30/40dph: £10,000	£0
Devizes	20	Land value	£255,000	£247,000	£173,000	£221,000	£110,000
		As % GDV	17	19	15	18	10
		Land value per ha	£1,019,000	£988,000	£693,000	£884,000	£442,000
	30	Land value	£301,000	£256,000	£183,000	£226,000	£167,000
		As % GDV	21	19	17	18	17
		Land value per ha	£1,773,000	£1,508,000	£1,076,000	£1,330,000	£984,000
	40	Land value	£213,000	£209,000	£154,000	£182,000	£146,000
		As % GDV	19	21	17	19	18
		Land value per ha	£1,705,000	£1,672,000	£1,234,000	£1,453,000	£1,168,000

Table 7A

5 units

Land values at varying densities and affordable housing tenures, with differing levels of CIL/Infrastructure

NB: the affordable provision on 5 unit sites is rented, not intermediate.

Location	Density per ha	Infrastructure/CIL per unit:	No affordable	25% affordable with aff. rent	40% affordable with aff. rent	25% affordable with social rent	40% affordable with social rent
			20dph: £5,000	20dph: £0	20dph: £0	20dph: £0	
			30/40dph: £20,000	30/40dph: £10,000	30/40dph: £10,000	30/40dph: £10,000	£0
Tidworth	20	Land value	£327,000	£268,000	£210,000	£258,000	£101,000
		As % GDV	24	22	20	22	10
		Land value per ha	£1,307,000	£1,071,000	£840,000	£1,031,000	£406,000
	30	Land value	£259,000	£247,000	£172,000	£211,000	£169,000
		As % GDV	20	20	17	18	17
		Land value per ha	£1,524,000	£1,451,000	£1,013,000	£1,242,000	£996,000
	40	Land value	£188,000	£203,000	£150,000	£178,000	£140,000
		As % GDV	19	20	17	19	17
		Land value per ha	£1,504,000	£1,624,000	£1,200,000	£1,430,000	£1,121,000

Appendix 8

Appendix 8

15 units

Land values at varying densities and affordable housing tenures

NB: we have assumed 4 units of social rent for both 60:40 and 75:25 scenarios, due to the rounding of the calculated proportion. Infrastructure/CIL is zero

Location	Density per ha		No affordable	40% affordable with aff. rent	40% affordable 60:40 social rent to intermediate	40% affordable 75:25 social rent to intermediate
Marlborough	20	Land value	£1,273,000	£932,000	£824,000	£824,000
		As % GDV	26	22	20	20
		Land value per ha	£1,698,000	£1,243,000	£1,098,000	£1,098,000
	30	Land value	£1,252,000	£862,000	£753,000	£753,000
		As % GDV	26	22	20	20
		Land value per ha	£2,504,000	£1,725,000	£1,507,000	£1,507,000
	40	Land value	£1,091,000	£802,000	£503,000	£503,000
		As % GDV	26	22	18	18
		Land value per ha	£2,909,000	£2,139,000	£1,342,000	£1,342,000
Devizes	20	Land value	£849,000	£632,000	£463,000	£463,000
		As % GDV	19	19	14	14
		Land value per ha	£1,129,000	£843,000	£617,000	£617,000
	30	Land value	£1,028,000	£756,000	£680,000	£680,000
		As % GDV	26	23	22	22
		Land value per ha	£2,056,000	£1,512,000	£1,360,000	£1,360,000
	40	Land value	£867,000	£594,000	£504,000	£504,000
		As % GDV	27	22	20	20
		Land value per ha	£2,313,000	£1,584,000	£1,345,000	£1,345,000
Tidworth	20	Land value	£818,000	£569,000	£459,000	£459,000
		As % GDV	20	18	15	15
		Land value per ha	£1,090,000	£758,000	£612,000	£612,000
	30	Land value	£886,000	£661,000	£551,000	£551,000
		As % GDV	24	21	18	18
		Land value per ha	£1,771,000	£1,322,000	£1,103,000	£1,103,000
	40	Land value	£727,000	£498,000	£388,000	£388,000
		As % GDV	24	21	17	17
		Land value per ha	£1,940,000	£1,327,000	£1,036,000	£1,036,000

Appendix 8A

Table 8A

15 units

Land values at varying densities and affordable housing tenures, with differing levels of CIL/Infrastructure

NB: we have assumed 4 units of social rent for both 60:40 and 75:25 scenarios, due to the rounding of the calculated proportion.

Location	Density per ha	Infrastructure/CIL per unit:	No affordable	40% affordable with aff. rent	40% affordable 60:40 social rent to intermediate	40% affordable 75:25 social rent to intermediate
			20dph: £25,000/unit	All at £10,000/unit	20dph:£0	
			30/40dph: £30,000/unit		30/40dph: £10,000/unit	
Marlborough	20	Land value	£947,000	£801,000	£824,000	£824,000
		As % GDV	19	19	20	20
		Land value per ha	£1,262,000	£1,068,000	£1,098,000	£1,098,000
	30	Land value	£856,000	£730,000	£622,000	£622,000
		As % GDV	18	19	16	16
		Land value per ha	£1,712,000	£1,461,000	£1,243,000	£1,243,000
	40	Land value	£695,000	£670,000	£372,000	£372,000
		As % GDV	16	18	13	13
		Land value per ha	£1,854,000	£1,788,000	£991,000	£991,000

Table 8A

15 units

Land values at varying densities and affordable housing tenures, with differing levels of CIL/Infrastructure

NB: we have assumed 4 units of social rent for both 60:40 and 75:25 scenarios, due to the rounding of the calculated proportion.

Location	Density per ha		No affordable	40% affordable with aff. rent	40% affordable 60:40 social rent to intermediate	40% affordable 75:25 social rent to intermediate
			20dph: £5,000/unit	20dph:£0	20dph:£0	20dph:£0
			30/40dph: £20,000/unit	30/40dph: £10,000/unit	30/40dph: £10,000/unit	30/40dph: £10,000/unit
Devizes	20	Land value	£781,000	£632,000	£463,000	£463,000
		As % GDV	18	19	14	14
		Land value per ha	£1,041,000	£843,000	£617,000	£617,000
	30	Land value	£764,000	£625,000	£546,000	£546,000
		As % GDV	20	19	17	17
		Land value per ha	£1,528,000	£1,250,000	£1,094,000	£1,094,000
	40	Land value	£603,000	£463,000	£368,000	£368,000
		As % GDV	19	17	14	14
		Land value per ha	£1,609,000	£1,236,000	£983,000	£983,000

Appendix 8A

15 units

Land values at varying densities and affordable housing tenures, with differing levels of CIL/Infrastructure

NB: we have assumed 4 units of social rent for both 60:40 and 75:25 scenarios, due to the rounding of the calculated proportion.

Location	Density per ha	Infrastructure/CIL per unit:	No affordable	40% affordable with aff. rent	40% affordable 60:40 social rent	40% affordable 75:25 social rent
			20dph: £0	20dph:£0	20/30/40dph:£0	20/30/40dph:£0
			30/40dph: £20,000/unit	30/40dph: £10,000/unit		
Tidworth	20	Land value	£818,000	£569,000	£459,000	£459,000
		As % GDV	20	18	15	15
		Land value per ha	£1,090,000	£758,000	£612,000	£612,000
	30	Land value	£624,000	£530,000	£551,000	£551,000
		As % GDV	17	17	18	18
		Land value per ha	£1,249,000	£1,060,000	£1,103,000	£1,103,000
	40	Land value	£466,000	£367,000	£388,000	£388,000
		As % GDV	15	15	17	17
		Land value per ha	£1,243,000	£979,000	£1,036,000	£1,036,000

Appendix 9

Appendix 9

50 units

Land values at varying densities and affordable housing tenures

Zero CIL/Infrastructure

Location	Density per ha		No affordable	40% affordable with aff. rent	40% affordable 60:40 social rent to intermediate	40% affordable 75:25 social rent to intermediate
Marlborough	20	Land value	£5,109,000	£2,930,000	£2,597,000	£2,483,000
		As % GDV	28	22	20	20
		Land value per ha	£2,044,000	£1,172,000	£1,039,000	£993,000
	30	Land value	£4,039,000	£2,875,000	£2,542,000	£2,428,000
		As % GDV	28	22	21	20
		Land value per ha	£2,419,000	£1,722,000	£1,522,000	£1,454,000
	40	Land value	£3,402,000	£2,212,000	£1,879,000	£1,765,000
		As % GDV	29	22	19	18
		Land value per ha	£2,722,000	£1,769,000	£1,503,000	£1,412,000
Devizes	20	Land value	£3,499,000	£2,577,000	£1,943,000	£1,828,000
		As % GDV	25	24	19	18
		Land value per ha	£1,400,000	£1,030,000	£777,000	£731,000
	30	Land value	£3,302,000	£2,482,000	£1,856,000	£1,742,000
		As % GDV	27	24	19	18
		Land value per ha	£1,977,000	£1,489,000	£1,112,000	£1,043,000
	40	Land value	£2,609,000	£2,451,000	£1,861,000	£1,746,000
		As % GDV	26	26	21	20
		Land value per ha	£2,087,000	£1,961,000	£1,489,000	£1,397,000
Tidworth	20	Land value	£2,991,000	£2,037,000	£1,836,000	£1,590,000
		As % GDV	22	20	21	16
		Land value per ha	£1,197,000	£815,000	£735,000	£636,000
	30	Land value	£3,052,000	£1,968,000	£1,635,000	£1,520,000
		As % GDV	25	20	17	16
		Land value per ha	£1,827,000	£1,178,000	£979,000	£911,000
	40	Land value	£2,601,000	£1,922,000	£1,606,000	£1,491,000
		As % GDV	26	21	19	17
		Land value per ha	£2,080,000	£1,538,000	£1,285,000	£1,193,000

Appendix 9A

Appendix 9A

50 units

Land values at varying densities and affordable housing tenures, with differing levels of CIL/Infrastructure

Location	Density per ha	Infrastructure/CIL per unit:	No affordable	40% affordable with aff. rent	40% affordable 60:40 social rent to intermediate	40% affordable 75:25 social rent to intermediate
			20/30/40dph	20/30/40dph	20dph: £0	20dph: £0
			£30,000 per unit	£10,000 per unit	30/40dph: £10,000/unit	30/40dph: £10,000/unit
Marlborough	20	Land value	£3,839,000	£2,506,000	£2,597,000	£2,483,000
		As % GDV	21	19	20	20
		Land value per ha	£1,536,000	£1,002,000	£1,039,000	£993,000
	30	Land value	£2,768,000	£2,452,000	£2,131,000	£2,016,000
		As % GDV	19	19	17	16
		Land value per ha	£1,658,000	£1,468,000	£1,276,000	£1,208,000
	40	Land value	£2,132,000	£1,788,000	£1,467,000	£1,353,000
		As % GDV	18	18	15	14
		Land value per ha	£1,705,000	£1,431,000	£1,174,000	£1,083,000

Table 9A

50 units

Land values at varying densities and affordable housing tenures, with differing levels of CIL/Infrastructure

Location	Density	Infrastructure/CIL per unit:	No affordable	40% affordable with aff. rent	40% affordable 60:40 social rent to intermediate	40% affordable 75:25 social rent to intermediate
			20dph: £10,000/unit	20dph:£0	20dph:£0	20dph:£0
			30/40dph: £20,000/unit	30/40dph: £10,000/unit	30dph: £5,000/unit	30dph: £5,000/unit
					40dph: £10,000/unit	40dph: £10,000/unit
Devizes	20	Land value	£3,087,000	£2,577,000	£1,943,000	£1,828,000
		As % GDV	22	24	19	18
		Land value per ha	£1,235,000	£1,030,000	£777,000	£731,000
	30	Land value	£2,479,000	£2,071,000	£1,650,000	£1,536,000
		As % GDV	20	20	16	15
		Land value per ha	£1,484,000	£1,240,000	£988,000	£920,000
	40	Land value	£1,786,000	£2,040,000	£1,449,000	£1,334,000
		As % GDV	17	22	16	15
		Land value per ha	£1,429,000	£1,632,000	£1,159,000	£1,068,000

Table 9A

50 units

Land values at varying densities and affordable housing tenures, with differing levels of CIL/Infrastructure

Location	Density per ha	Infrastructure/CIL per unit:	No affordable	40% affordable with aff. rent	40% affordable 60:40 social rent to intermediate	40% affordable 75:25 social rent to intermediate
			20dph: £10,000/unit	20dph:£0	20/30dph:£0	20/30dph:£0
			30/40dph: £20,000/unit	30/40dph: £10,000/unit	40dph: £5,000/unit	40dph: £5,000/unit
Tidworth	20	Land value	£2,579,000	£2,037,000	£1,836,000	£1,590,000
		As % GDV	19	20	21	16
		Land value per ha	£1,031,000	£815,000	£735,000	£636,000
	30	Land value	£2,228,000	£1,556,000	£1,635,000	£1,520,000
		As % GDV	18	15	17	16
		Land value per ha	£1,334,000	£931,000	£979,000	£911,000
	40	Land value	£1,777,000	£1,510,000	£1,400,000	£1,286,000
		As % GDV	18	17	16	15
		Land value per ha	£1,422,000	£1,208,000	£1,120,000	£1,028,000

Appendix 10

Appendix 10

Calculation of land values

Commutated payments/Financial contributions

All scenarios include an infrastructure cost of £10,000 per unit

Commutated sums are calculated from the methodology set out below

Valuations done on the basis of 30 dwellings per hectare

	Number of commuted affordable units		Marlborough	Devizes	Tidworth
%land:GDV			25%	23%	23%
3 units	1.2	Commutated sum	£106,950	£90,459	£81,466
		Commutated sum/unit	£89,125	£75,383	£67,888
		Land value	£132,000	£125,000	£102,000
		%GDV	14	15	13
		Land value/hectare	£1,315,000	£1,247,000	£1,019,000
5 units	2.0	Commutated sum	£178,250	£150,765	£139,656
		Commutated sum/unit	£89,125	£75,383	£69,828
		Land value	£222,000	£211,000	£177,000
		%GDV	14	15	13
		Land value/hectare	£1,308,000	£1,242,000	£1,042,000
15 units	6.0	Commutated sum	£545,100	£411,033	£390,402
		Commutated sum/unit	£90,850	£68,506	£65,067
		Land value	£641,000	£535,000	£415,000
		%GDV	14	14	11
		Land value/hectare	£1,281,000	£1,069,000	£830,000

Methodology:

1. Take the relevant GDV and multiply it by the land percentage.
2. Add 15% land acquisition and servicing costs.
3. Multiply the result by the affordable housing proportion.
4. The result is the commuted sum shown in the table.

Appendix 11

Appendix 11

Summary of notional site valuations with cumulative additions of code 4 and code 5 costs.

Initial valuation at zero affordable, then assume affordable rent

Based on 15 units and 50 units, at 30 dph and 40dph

15 units

Headings	Marlborough		Devizes		Tidworth	
	30dph	40dph	30dph	40dph	30dph	40dph
Land value code 3/CIL £0/No affordable	£1,252,000	£1,091,000	£1,028,000	£867,000	£886,000	£727,000
% land value to GDP	26	26	26	27	24	24
Land value per hectare	£2,504,000	£2,909,000	£2,056,000	£2,313,000	£1,771,000	£1,940,000
Land value code 3/CIL £0/ aff rent	£862,000	£802,000	£756,000	£594,000	£661,000	£498,000
% land value to GDP	22	22	23	22	21	21
Land value per hectare	£1,725,000	£2,139,000	£1,512,000	£1,584,000	£1,322,000	£1,327,000
Land value code 3 CIL £10,000 / unit	£730,000	£670,000	£625,000	£463,000	£530,000	£367,000
% land value to GDP	19	18	19	17	17	15
Land value per hectare	£1,461,000	£1,788,000	£1,251,000	£1,236,000	£1,060,000	£979,000
Add code 4 rem categories CIL £10000	£672,000	£615,000	£573,000	£416,000	£478,000	£323,000
% land value to GDP	17	17	18	15	15	13
Land value per hectare	£1,344,000	£1,641,000	£1,146,000	£1,110,000	£956,000	£860,000
Add code 5 rem categories CIL £10,000	£434,000	£390,000	£359,000	£204,000	£264,000	£107,000
% land value to GDP	11	11	11	7	8	4
Land value per hectare	£868,000	£1,041,000	£719,000	£544,000	£529,000	£287,000

Appendix 11

Summary of notional site valuations with cumulative additions of code 4 and code 5 costs.

Initial valuation at zero affordable, then assume social rent

Based on 15 units and 50 units, at 30 dph and 40dph

15 units

Headings	Marlborough		Devizes		Tidworth	
	30dph	40dph	30dph	40dph	30dph	40dph
Land value code 3/CIL £0/No affordable	£1,252,000	£1,091,000	£1,028,000	£867,000	£886,000	£727,000
% land value to GDP	26	26	26	27	24	24
Land value per hectare	£2,504,000	£2,909,000	£2,056,000	£2,313,000	£1,771,000	£1,940,000
Land value code 3/CIL £0/ aff rent	£753,000	£503,000	£680,000	£504,000	£551,000	£388,000
% land value to GDP	20	18	22	20	18	17
Land value per hectare	£1,507,000	£1,342,000	£1,360,000	£1,345,000	£1,103,000	£1,036,000
Land value code 3 CIL £10,000 / unit	£621,000	£372,000	£547,000	£369,000	£420,000	£257,000
% land value to GDP	16	13	17	14	14	11
Land value per hectare	£1,243,000	£991,000	£1,094,000	£983,000	£842,000	£686,000
Add code 4 rem categories CIL £10000	£563,000	£316,000	£494,000	£319,000	£369,000	£213,000
% land value to GDP	15	11	16	12	12	9
Land value per hectare	£1,126,000	£844,000	£988,000	£852,000	£738,000	£567,000
Add code 5 rem categories CIL £10,000	£325,000	£91,000	£276,000	£99,000	£155,000	£-2,250
% land value to GDP	9	2	9	4	5	0
Land value per hectare	£650,000	£243,000	£552,000	£263,000	£310,000	£-5,999

Appendix 11

Summary of notional site valuations with cumulative additions of code 4 and code 5 costs.

Initial valuation at zero affordable, then assume affordable rent

Based on 15 units and 50 units, at 30 dph and 40dph

50 units

Headings	Marlborough		Devizes		Tidworth	
	30dph	40dph	30dph	40dph	30dph	40dph
Land value code 3/CIL £0/No affordable	£4,039,000	£3,402,000	£3,302,000	£2,609,000	£3,052,000	£2,601,000
% land value to GDP	28	29	27	26	25	26
Land value per hectare	£2,419,000	£2,722,000	£1,977,000	£2,087,000	£1,827,000	£2,080,000
Land value code 3/CIL £0/ aff rent	£2,875,000	£2,212,000	£2,482,000	£2,451,000	£1,968,000	£1,922,000
% land value to GDP	22	22	24	26	20	21
Land value per hectare	£1,722,000	£1,769,000	£1,489,000	£1,961,000	£1,178,000	£1,538,000
Land value code 3 CIL £10,000 / unit	£2,451,000	£1,788,000	£2,071,000	£2,040,000	£1,556,000	£1,511,000
% land value to GDP	19	18	20	22	16	17
Land value per hectare	£1,468,000	£1,431,000	£1,240,000	£1,632,000	£932,000	£1,208,000
Add code 4 rem categories CIL £10000	£2,268,000	£1,627,000	£1,901,000	£1,886,000	£1,388,000	£1,356,000
% land value to GDP	18	16	18	20	14	15
Land value per hectare	£1,358,000	£1,302,000	£1,139,000	£1,509,000	£831,000	£1,085,000
Add code 5 rem categories CIL £10,000	£1,490,000	£924,000	£1,212,000	£1,206,000	£697,000	£676,000
% land value to GDP	12	9	12	13	7	8
Land value per hectare	£892,000	£740,000	£726,000	£965,000	£418,000	£541,000

Appendix 11

Summary of notional site valuations with cumulative additions of code 4 and code 5 costs.

Initial valuation at zero affordable, then assume social rent

Based on 15 units and 50 units, at 30 dph and 40dph

50 units

Headings	Marlborough		Devizes		Tidworth	CIL at £5,000 per unit
	30dph	40dph	30dph	40dph	30dph	40dph
Land value code 3/CIL £0/No affordable	£4,039,000	£3,402,000	£3,302,000	£2,609,000	£3,052,000	£2,601,000
% land value to GDP	28	29	27	26	25	26
Land value per hectare	£2,419,000	£2,722,000	£1,977,000	£2,087,000	£1,827,000	£2,080,000
Land value code 3/CIL £0/ aff rent	£2,542,000	£1,879,000	£1,856,000	£1,861,000	£1,635,000	£1,606,000
% land value to GDP	21	19	19	21	17	19
Land value per hectare	£1,522,000	£1,503,000	£1,112,000	£1,489,000	£979,000	£1,285,000
Land value code 3 CIL £10,000 / unit	£2,131,000	£1,467,000	£1,651,000	£1,449,000	£1,416,000	£1,400,000
% land value to GDP	17	15	17	16	15	16
Land value per hectare	£1,276,000	£1,174,000	£988,000	£1,159,000	£848,000	£1,120,000
Add code 4 rem categories CIL £10000	£1,947,000	£1,306,000	£1,482,000	£1,295,000	£1,248,000	£1,246,000
% land value to GDP	16	14	15	14	13	14
Land value per hectare	£1,166,000	£1,045,000	£888,000	£1,036,000	£747,000	£997,000
Add code 5 rem categories CIL £10,000*	£1,169,000	£603,000	£792,000	£615,000	£557,000	£566,000
% land value to GDP	9	6	10	7	6	7
Land value per hectare	£699,000	£483,000	£474,000	£492,000	£333,000	£453,000

*Note that the CIL level applied to Tidworth is £5,000 per unit



Adams Integra
55 West Street
Chichester
West Sussex
PO19 1RP

T: 01243 771304

F: 01243 779951

E: enquiries@adamsintegra.co.uk

W: www.adamsintegra.co.uk