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## Introduction

BNP Paribas Real Estate instructed by Council to undertake viability testing to understand the cumulative impacts of current and emerging policy requirements of:

- Core Strategy (adopted Dec 2007)
- Draft Development Management Policies DPD (emerging)
- Draft Southend Central Area Action plan (emerging)


## Timescales

May 2013 - Consultation on Proposed Submission documents
August 2013 - Documents submitted to secretary of State for examination
May 2014 - Adoption subject to Planning Inspectorate and Council approval

## Introductions

- Name
- Organisation
- Interests in the area


## Local Plan testing: Guidance

## National Planning Policy Framework

## Para 173 states that:

"Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened"
"To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable."

## Local Plan testing: Guidance

## Para 174 identifies that:

LPA's, 'should set out their policy on local standards in the Local Plan, including requirements for affordable housing.

They should assess the likely cumulative impacts on development in their area of all existing and proposed local standards, supplementary planning documents and policies that support the development plan, when added to nationally required standards.

In order to be appropriate, the cumulative impact of these standards and policies should not put implementation of the plan at serious risk, and should facilitate development throughout the economic cycle. Evidence supporting the assessment should be proportionate, using only appropriate available evidence.

## CIL: viability and values in Southend-on-Sea

## Exercise

What might the schedule of rates look like in the Southend-on-Sea area?

## CIL: viability and rate setting



## Southend-on-Sea BC - CIL Viability Testing

## 3. Proposed methodology

## Study approach: residual value methodology



## Proposed methodology



## Study approach: residual value methodology



| Number of <br> units |  | Housing type | Development <br> density | Net <br> developable <br> area (ha) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 2 | Houses | 50 | 0.04 |
| 2 | 5 | Houses | 50 | 0.10 |
| 3 | 14 | Houses | 50 | 0.28 |
| 4 | 50 | Flats | 120 | 0.42 |
| 5 | 100 | Flats | 150 | 0.67 |
| 6 | 100 | Flats | 200 | 0.50 |
| 7 | 100 | Flats | 200 | 0.50 |

## Reporting: residuals and benchmarks

## XXX Planning Authority <br> LOCAL PLAN VIABILITY TESTING $\quad$ Site typology 5 <br> Site location

| Sales value inflation | $10 \%$ |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | Build cost inflation |
|  |  |

Residual land values
NB all appraisals allowance for residual S106 items (site mitigation only)

|  | CSH level 3 | CSH level 4 | CSH4 and Lifetime Homes | CSH4, LH and CIL | CSH4, LH, CIL and Secured by Design | CSH4, LH, CIL, SbD and Renewable Energy | CSH6, $\mathrm{LH}, \mathrm{CIL}$ and SbD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0\% affordable housing | £4,249,758 | £3,788,563 | £3,711,626 | £2,931,379 | £2,914,929 | £2,591,864 | -£679,468 |
| 10\% affordable housing (80:20) | £3,670,543 | £3,208,518 | £3,130,623 | £2,430,763 | £2,414,315 | £2,086,054 | -£1,294,164 |
| 20\% affordable housing ( $80: 20$ ) | £3,090,905 | £2,626,107 | £2,548,211 | £1,926,888 | £1,909,961 | £1,576,898 | - £1,908,860 |
| 30\% affordable housing ( $80: 20$ ) | £2,511,070 | £2,041,863 | £1,962,893 | £1,418,525 | £1,401,321 | £1,064,196 | -£2,523,557 |
| 40\% affordable housing ( $50: 50$ ) | £2,323,150 | £1,857,549 | £1,778,579 | £1,312,223 | £1,295,295 | £958,973 | - £2,651,167 |
| 40\% affordable housing (80:20) | £1,928,658 | £1,453,233 | £1,372,533 | £905,823 | £888,620 | £551,432 | - £3,138,252 |
| 100\% affordable housing (80:20) | -£1,695,891 | -£2,201,988 | -£2,286,338 | -£2,286,338 | -£2,304,461 | -£2,659,597 | -£6,015,843 |

Residual Land values compared to benchmark land values
Benchmark 1 - Residnetial Land Value

|  | CSH level 3 | CSH level 4 | CSH4 and Lifetime Homes | CSH4, LH and CIL | CSH4, LH, CIL and Secured by Design | CSH4, LH, CIL, SbD and Renewable Energy | CSH6, LH, CIL and SbD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0\% affordable housing | £3,241,998 | £2,780,803 | £2,703,866 | £1,923,619 | £1,907,169 | £1,584,104 | £1,687,228 |
| 10\% affordable housing (80:20) | £2,662,783 | £2,200,758 | £2,122,863 | £1,423,003 | £1,406,555 | £1,078,294 | £ £2,301,924 |
| 20\% affordable housing (80:20) | £2,083,145 | £1,618,347 | £1,540,451 | £919,128 | £902,201 | £569,138 | £2,916,620 |
| 30\% affordable housing (80:20) | £1,503,310 | £1,034,103 | £955,133 | £410,765 | £393,561 | £56,436 | £3,531,317 |
| 40\% affordable housing ( $50: 50$ ) | £1,315,390 | £849,789 | £770,819 | £304,463 | £287,535 | - ¢48,787 | £3,658,927 |
| 40\% affordable housing (80:20) | £920,898 | £445,473 | £364,773 | -£101,937 | -£119,140 | -£456,328 | £4,146,012 |

Residual Land values compared to benchmark land values Benchmark 2 - offices (second hand)

| No Units | 100 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Site density | 4.08 dph |


|  | CSH level 3 | CSH level 4 | CSH4 and Lifetime Homes | CSH4, LH and CIL | CSH4, LH, CIL and Secured by Design | CSH4, LH, CIL, SbD and Renewable Energy | $\underset{\text { SbD }}{\text { CSH6, } \mathrm{LH}, \mathrm{CIL} \text { and }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0\% affordable housing | -£223,037 | £684,232 | £761,169 | £1,541,416 | £1,557,866 | £1,880,931 | £5,152,263 |
| 10\% affordable housing (80:20) | - £802,252 | - £1,264,276 | £1,342,172 | £2,042,032 | £2,058,480 | £2,386,741 | £5,766,959 |
| 20\% affordable housing (80:20) | - £1,381,890 | £1,846,688 | £1,924,584 | £2,545,907 | £2,562,834 | £2,895,897 | £6,381,655 |
| $30 \%$ affordable housing (80:20) | - $£ 1,961,725$ | -£2,430,932 | £2,509,902 | £3,054,270 | £3,071,474 | £3,408,599 | £6,996,352 |
| 40\% affordable housing (50:50) | - $£ 2,149,645$ | - $22,615,246$ | £2,694,216 | £3,160,572 | £3,177,500 | £3,513,822 | £7,123,962 |
| 40\% affordable housing (80:20) | -£2,544,137 | -£3,019,562 | £3,100,262 | $£ 3,566,972$ | $£ 3,584,175$ | £3,921,363 | £7,611,047 |

## Southend-on-Sea BC - CIL Viability Testing

## 4. Proposed appraisal inputs

Hypothetical Residential developments

|  | Number of <br> units | Housing type | Location | Development <br> density units per ha |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 5 | Flats | Southend central | 40 |
| 2 | 9 | Flats | Southend central | 100 |
| 3 | 35 | Flats | Southend central | 220 |
| 4 | 60 | Flats \& Retail | Southend central |  |
| (office and retail) |  |  |  |  |

## Appraisal assumptions

| Site type | 1 Bed Flat | 2 Bed Flat | 3 Bed Flat | 2 bed <br> house | 3 Bed house | 4 Bed house |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Unit size | 37.5 sqm | 57 sqm | 67 sqm | 80 sqm | 93 sqm | 108 sqm |
| 1 | $25 \%$ | $75 \%$ | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | $33 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $33 \%$ | - | - | - |
| 3 | $35 \%$ | $60 \%$ | $5 \%$ | - | - | - |
| 4 | $20 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $10 \%$ | - | - | - |
| 5 | $30 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $20 \%$ | - | $5 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| 6 | $30 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $20 \%$ | - | $5 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| 7 | - | - | - | - | $100 \%$ | - |
| 8 | $30 \%$ | $70 \%$ | - | - | - | - |
| 9 | - | - | - | $25 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| 10 | $25 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $5 \%$ | - | - | - |
| 11 | $15 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| 12 | $25 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| 13 | $30 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $5 \%$ |

## Appraisal assumptions: residential

- Density: circa 40 uph to 335 uph
- Flats: gross to net ratio $78 \%-85 \%$
- Build costs (per sq m) - BCIS (incl external works @ 15\%)
- Houses £834 per sqm
- Flats Generally $£ 982$ per sqm
- Flats Higher density £1,084 per sqm
- Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 (6\% allowance on build costs)
- Developer's profit: 20\%
- Development finance: 7\%
- Fees: $10 \%$ of build costs


## Appraisal assumptions: Affordable Housing

- Affordable housing on sites of 10-49 units ( $0.3 \mathrm{Ha}-1.99 \mathrm{Ha}$ ):
- 20\% (70\% social rent / 30\% intermediate)
- Affordable housing on sites of 50+ units (2Ha+):
- 30\% (70\% social rent / 30\% intermediate)
- Sensitivity testing $10 \%$ and $0 \%$ AH
- No grant
- Affordable rent as sensitivity
- Shared ownership: 25-30\% equity sale and $2.75 \%$ rent


## Appraisal assumptions: Residential values ( $£ \mathrm{psi}$ )



Rest of borough
£175-£225
Sutton Road, Thorpe Bay and North Shoebury £250-

## Proposed appraisal inputs: Commercial

- Retail:
- Rents:
- £25-£35 per sq ft (Prime town centre and Leigh-on-sea)
- Everywhere else £10-£12 per sq ft
- Yield:
" 7\%-7.5\% (Prime)
- 8\% (everywhere else)
- Build: £115 per sq ft
- Retail Warehouse/Retail Park/Superstore:
- Rents:
- £20-£25
- Yield
- 6\%-6.5\%
- Build: £95 per sq ft
- Offices:
- Rents:
- $£ 10-15$ per sq ft
- Yield:
- 9\%
- Build: £150 per sq ft
- Industrial/warehouse:
- Rents:
- $£ 5$ per sq ft
- Yield:
- Build: $£ 60$ per sq ft


## CIL in context

- CIL exemptions:
- Affordable housing
- Charities (providing development serves charitable objects)
- Instalments policy - set at CA's discretion
- Discount for existing floorspace



## CIL in context



## Southend-on-Sea BC - CIL Viability Testing

## 6. Other feedback or issues?



