



Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Study

Your Vale - Your Future

October 2014



Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Study

An annex to the VoWH Local Plan Viability Study (October 2014)

October 2014



Important Notice

HDH Planning & Development Ltd has prepared this report for the sole use of Vale of White Horse District Council in accordance with the instructions under which our services were performed. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report or any other services provided by us. This report may not be relied upon by any other party without the prior and express written agreement of HDH Planning & Development Ltd.

Some of the conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are based upon information provided by others (including the Council and consultees) and upon the assumption that all relevant information has been provided by those parties from whom it has been requested. Information obtained from third parties has not been independently verified by HDH Planning & Development Ltd, unless otherwise stated in the report. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this report are concerned with policy requirement, guidance and regulations which may be subject to change. They reflect a Chartered Surveyor's perspective and do not reflect or constitute legal advice and the Council should seek legal advice before implementing any of the recommendations.

No part of this report constitutes a valuation and the report should not be relied on in that regard.

Certain statements made in the report may constitute estimates, projections or other forward-looking statements and even though they are based on reasonable assumptions as of the date of the report, such forward-looking statements by their nature involve risks and uncertainties that could cause actual results to differ materially from the results predicted. HDH Planning & Development Ltd specifically does not guarantee or warrant any estimate or projections contained in this report.

RS Drummond-Hay MRICS ACIH HDH Planning & Development Ltd Clapham Woods Farm Keasden, Nr Clapham Lancaster. LA2 8ET simon@drummond-hay.co.uk 015242 51831 / 07989 975 977 Registered in England Company Number 08555548

Issued 31st October 2014

COPYRIGHT

© This report is the copyright of HDH Planning & Development Ltd. Any unauthorised reproduction or usage by any person other than the addressee is strictly prohibited.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction Scope Report Structure	 3 3 5
2.	Methodology National Policy and Guidance Setting CIL Differential Rates Viability Guidance Outline Methodology Additional Profit. The meaning of 'competitive return' Existing Available Evidence.	7 7 9 . 11 . 12 . 15 . 16 . 17
3.	Viability work to date Introduction Residential Development Additional Profit and Effect of CIL Older People's Housing Additional Profit CIL as a proportion of Land Value and Gross Development Value Non-Residential Development Additional Profit	. 19 . 20 . 27 . 30 . 32 . 32 . 32 . 37 . 39
4.	Setting Rates of CIL Regulations and Guidance CIL v s106 Infrastructure Delivery Uncertain Market Neighbouring Authorities S106 History Instalment Policy Review and Revision Viability Evidence – Rates and Zones Residential Development Non-Residential Development	. 41 . 42 . 43 . 43 . 44 . 44 . 44 . 46 . 47 . 48 . 50
5.	Conclusions	. 51



1. Introduction

Scope

- 1.1 Vale of White Horse District Council (VoWHDC) is working towards finalising their Local Plan 2031, Part 1 Strategic Sites and Policies (The Plan). The Plan was previously known as the LDF Core Strategy, and then the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2029, Part 1 Strategic Sites and Policies as published in February 2013. This Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Viability Study has been commissioned to finalise the viability aspects of the CIL setting process.
- 1.2 HDH Planning and Development Ltd has been appointed to advise the Council in three regards:
 - a. Firstly, to inform the preparation of a deliverable and viable Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, Part 1 - Strategic Sites and Policies. Assessment of the viability of the Plan as a whole including appraisal of the viability of strategic housing site allocations, and of strategic policies that potentially impact on the viability of development, for example, affordable housing requirements – as required by paragraphs 173 and 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
 - b. Secondly, to make a viability assessment of the sites identified as being potentially suitable for development through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).
 - c. Thirdly, to advise in connection with the introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) particularly in the context on viability testing as required by CIL Regulation 14.
- 1.3 This project has changed considerably since its inception. The initial remit was restricted to the viability assessment of the Local Plan. As the project progressed it became apparent that a more comprehensive study was needed to ensure a consistent evidence base and to inform the process of identifying development sites. The project now has four distinct parts:
 - a. **Local Plan Viability Study** (October 2014) to examine the cumulative impact of the policies and requirements in the Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031, Part 1.
 - b. **Strategic Sites Viability, Interim Paper** (March 2013) to make a high level assessment of the five broad locations / strategic sites initially included in the Local Plan.
 - c. SHLAA Viability Assessment (February 2014) The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) was divided into two parts. The first was based on developing and viability testing a number of site typologies that were representative of sites in the SHLAA. The second was to consider a number of new potential strategic sites / broad locations for development to ensure that the Council was able to ensure that only viable sites were taken further into the plan-making process.

- d. **The CIL Viability Assessment** (this report) this is the final element of the viability work. This present study includes much of the analysis from the Local Plan Viability Study which will be built on and used to inform the CIL setting process.
- 1.4 The Local Plan Viability Study forms the 'root' document and sets out the detailed methodology and assumptions used. The other reports (although published earlier) and this report, must each be read as an annexe to the Local Plan Viability Study, as the methodology and assumptions used are not repeated (although they are briefly summarised).
- 1.5 It is important to note the chronology of this project. Work on the project started in and was initially based on late 2012 costs and values. The Strategic Sites Viability, Interim Paper was finalised and published in March 2013. The first draft of the SHLAA Viability Assessment was completed in September 2013, before being reworked and finalised to include a number of Contingency Sites in February 2014. The Local Plan Viability Study was been finalised early in October 2014, having been prepared over the period from May 2014 to September 2014. This process was an inevitable consequence of the plan-making process and in particular the requirement to identify further development locations.
- 1.6 The Local Plan Viability Study concluded, in relation to residential development (at paragraph 12.17):

Bearing in mind the levels of infrastructure funding required we recommend that the Council moves to the lower level of affordable housing of 35% across all sites (including older peoples housing). Whilst this would not bring more sites into viability, it would increase the cushion or margin between the Viability Threshold and the Residual Value and enable developer contributions in the range £80/m² to £140/m² to be paid without threatening development.

1.7 In relation to non-residential development, the Local Plan Viability Study concluded (at paragraph 12.20):

The lack of viability is not as a result of the cumulative impact of the Council's policies rendering development unviable through imposing layers of additional costs. The Council has few policies adding to the costs of development in this area. We conclude that the cumulative impact of the Council's policies does not put employment uses at serious risk, however we also note that employment development has little capacity to bear developer contributions.

- 1.8 This present document takes this general advice forward and builds on these conclusions and the advice set out in Chapter 13 of the Local Plan Viability Study to make firm recommendations as to the rates of CIL for the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS).
- 1.9 Like the earlier work, this study will draw on the existing available evidence. CIL is set having regard to a range of factors, one of which is viability. This report only considers viability. Outside this report the Council will consider the need for infrastructure and other sources of funding. As set out at 13.4 of the Local Plan Viability Study these include the following:
 - a. Regulations and Guidance d. CIL v s106
 - b. Differential Rates e. Infrastructure Delivery
 - c. New Regulations and Guidance f. Uncertain Market

g. Neighbouring Authorities

j. Instalment Policy

- h. S106 History
- i. Costs of Infrastructure and Sources of Funding
- 1.10 As when considering the viability aspects of deliverability of the Local Plan, it is important to note at the start of a study of this type that, not all sites will be viable, even without any policy requirements or CIL imposed or sought by the Council. It is inevitable that the Council's requirements will render some sites unviable. The question for this report is not whether some development site or other would be rendered unviable, it is whether the delivery of the overall Plan is threatened and whether CIL will facilitate the delivery of the Plan.
- 1.11 The Local Plan Viability Study was prepared following a consultation process with landowners, agents and developers. An event was held, following which, both the SHLAA Viability Assessment and the Strategic Sites Viability, Interim Paper were published as part of the consultation process. Further consultation will take place as the CIL process continues. On the 25th January 2013, an initial consultation event was held to which the representatives of the main developers, development site landowners, their agents and housing providers were invited. The meeting was used to introduce the development industry to the NPPF and CIL, to set out the methodology, to test the assumptions used in the report and to put the report in context. As the Plan has passed through the stages of consultation, further representations have been made. The various comments made through the consultation process are set out through the Local Plan Viability Study, showing where changes in the methodology or assumptions have been made.
- 1.12 We acknowledge that the viability testing process has been somewhat protracted. This has been unavoidable given the iterative plan-making process that has reflected the emerging findings of this work. Further, during the project, amendments have been made to the various sources of guidance, and CIL Examiners' and Local Plan Inspectors' reports and planning appeal decisions have been published that have had to be addressed. In addition, in March 2014, Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) was published.

Report Structure

- 1.13 This report considers the viability aspects of the CIL setting process for Vale of White Horse District Council. This report follows the following format:
 - **Chapter 2** A summary of the approach taken, including a review of the requirements of the CIL Regulations, guidance and of the methodology used.
 - **Chapter 3** A recap of the findings of the main findings of the Local Plan Viability Study.
 - **Chapter 4** Setting rates of CIL by development type and area.
 - **Chapter 5** Conclusions.



2. Methodology

National Policy and Guidance

2.1 The background to viability testing is set out in Chapter 2 of the Local Plan Viability Study. In this section we have further considered the CIL Guidance that forms part of the National Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).

Setting CIL

2.2 The CIL Regulations have been subject to a number of amendments¹. CIL Regulation 14 (as amended) sets out the core principle for setting CIL:

Setting rates

- (1) In setting rates (including differential rates) in a charging schedule, a charging authority must strike an appropriate balance between—
 - (a) the desirability of funding from CIL (in whole or in part) the actual and expected estimated total cost of infrastructure required to support the development of its area, taking into account other actual and expected sources of funding; and
 - (b) the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area.
- (2) In setting rates ...
- 2.3 Viability testing in the context of CIL will assess the '*effects*' on development viability of the imposition of CIL. The financial impact of introducing CIL is an important factor, but the provision of infrastructure (or lack of it) will also have an impact on the ability of the Council to meet its objectives through development and deliver its Development Plan. The Plan may not be deliverable in the absence of CIL.
- 2.4 The test that will be applied to the proposed rates of CIL are set out in the updated CIL Guidance contained in the PPG, putting greater emphasis on demonstrating how CIL will be used to deliver the infrastructure required to support the Plan.

The levy is expected to have a positive economic effect on development across a local plan area. When deciding the levy rates, an appropriate balance must be struck between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments.

This balance is at the centre of the charge-setting process. In meeting the regulatory requirements (see Regulation 14(1)), charging authorities should be able to show and explain how their proposed levy rate



¹ SI 2010 No. 948. The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 Made 23rd March 2010, Coming into force 6th April 2010. SI 2011 No. 987. The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2011 Made 28th March 2011, Coming into force 6th April 2011. SI 2011 No. 2918. The Local Authorities (Contracting Out of Community Infrastructure Levy Functions) Order 2011. Made 6th December 2011, Coming into force 7th December 2011. SI 2012 No. 2975. The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2012. Made 28th November 2012, Coming into force 29th November 2012. SI 2013 No. 982. The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2013. Made 24th April 2013, Coming into force 25th April 2013. SI 2014 No. 385. The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2013. Made 24th April 2013. Made 24th February 2014, Coming into force 24th February 2014.

(or rates) will contribute towards the implementation of their relevant plan and support development across their area.

As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework in England (paragraphs 173 - 177), 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. The same principle applies in Wales.

PPG ID: 25-009-20140612

- 2.5 The test is whether the sites and the scale of development identified in the Plan are subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens (when considered together) that their ability to be developed viably is threatened by CIL. This is somewhat more cautious than the approach set out in earlier guidance. In the March 2010 CIL Guidance, the test was whether the Plan was put at '*serious risk*', and in the December 2012 / April 2013 CIL Guidance, the test was whether CIL 'threatened the development plan as a whole' although it is important to note that the CIL Regulation 14 is clear that the purpose of the viability testing is to establish '*the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area*' rather than specific sites.
- 2.6 On preparing the evidence base on economic viability, the Guidance says:

A charging authority must use 'appropriate available evidence' (as defined in the Planning Act 2008 section 211(7A)) to inform their draft charging schedule. The Government recognises that the available data is unlikely to be fully comprehensive. Charging authorities need to demonstrate that their proposed levy rate or rates are informed by 'appropriate available' evidence and consistent with that evidence across their area as a whole.

In addition, a charging authority should directly sample an appropriate range of types of sites across its area, in order to supplement existing data. This will require support from local developers. The exercise should focus on strategic sites on which the relevant Plan (the Local Plan in England, Local Development Plan in Wales, and the London Plan in London)] relies, and those sites where the impact of the levy on economic viability is likely to be most significant (such as brownfield sites).

The sampling should reflect a selection of the different types of sites included in the relevant Plan, and should be consistent with viability assessment undertaken as part of plan-making.

PPG ID: 25-019-20140612

- 2.7 This study has drawn on the existing available evidence where it is available. In due course this study will form one part of the evidence that the Council will use to set CIL. The Council will also consider other 'existing available evidence', the comments of stakeholders and wider priorities. The NPPF, PPG and the Harman Guidance, as referred to below, recommend that the development and consideration of a CIL rate should be undertaken as part of the same exercise, which is what VoWHDC have done. This report will form the basis of the evidence as required by the CIL Regulations (when read with the Local Plan Viability Study).
- 2.8 From April 2015, councils will be restricted in relation to pooling S106 or s278 contributions from more than five developments² (where the obligation in the s106 or s278 agreement is a reason for granting consent). This restriction will encourage councils to adopt CIL –

² CIL Regulations 123(3)

particularly where there are large items of infrastructure to be delivered that relate to multiple sites. This restriction on pooling may have the effect of bringing s106 tariff policies to an end.

- 2.9 Following the implementation of CIL a Council will still be able to raise additional s106 funds for infrastructure, provided this infrastructure can be directly linked to the site-specific needs associated with the scheme in question, and that it is not for infrastructure specifically identified to be funded by CIL, through the Regulation 123 List³. Payments requested under the s106 regime (and s278 regime) must be (as set out in CIL Regulation 122):
 - a. necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - b. directly related to the development; and
 - c. fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 2.10 As mentioned above, under CIL Regulation 123, from April 2015, there are restrictions on pooling contributions from five or more sites where the obligation is a reason for granting planning permission. It is important to note that the counting of the 'five or more sites' relates to the '*provision of that project, or type of infrastructure*' and is from the date of the CIL Regulations, being April 2010. The Council will need to consider whether the threshold has already been exceeded for some items of infrastructure.
- 2.11 Under changes to CIL Regulation 73, a local authority (at its discretion and subject to strict rules) can accept CIL 'in kind'. The changes to this Regulation have extended this provision from the payment of CIL through the transfer of land, to the payment through the transfer of infrastructure as well as land. These changes may give increased flexibility to both the Charging Authority and the developer allowing CIL to be 'paid' through the provision of infrastructure.

Differential Rates

2.12 CIL Regulation 13 (as amended) provides scope for CIL to be set at different levels by different area (zones) and type and size of developments.

Differential rates

- (1) A charging authority may set differential rates—
 - (a) for different zones in which development would be situated;
 - (b) by reference to different intended uses of development,
 - (c) by reference to the intended gross internal area of development;
 - (d) by reference to the intended number of dwellings or units to be constructed or provided under a planning permission.
- (2) In setting differential rates, a charging authority may set supplementary charges, nil rates, increased rates or reductions.
- 2.13 The PPG expands on this saying:

³ This is the list of the items that the Council will spend CIL payments on.

Charging authorities that decide to set differential rates may need to undertake more fine-grained sampling, on a higher proportion of total sites, to help them to estimate the boundaries for their differential rates. Fine-grained sampling is also likely to be necessary where they wish to differentiate between categories or scales of intended use.

The focus should be in particular on strategic sites on which the relevant Plan relies and those sites (such as brownfield sites) where the impact of the levy is likely to be most significant.

The outcome of the sampling exercise should be to provide a robust evidence base about the potential effects of the rates proposed, balanced against the need to avoid excessive detail.

A charging authority's proposed rate or rates should be reasonable, given the available evidence, but there is no requirement for a proposed rate to exactly mirror the evidence. For example, this might not be appropriate if the evidence pointed to setting a charge right at the margins of viability. There is room for some pragmatism. It would be appropriate to ensure that a 'buffer' or margin is included, so that the levy rate is able to support development when economic circumstances adjust. In all cases, the charging authority should be able to explain its approach clearly.

PPG ID: 25-019-20140612

The regulations allow charging authorities to apply differential rates in a flexible way, to help ensure the viability of development is not put at risk. Differences in rates need to be justified by reference to the economic viability of development. Differential rates should not be used as a means to deliver policy objectives.

Differential rates may be appropriate in relation to

- geographical zones within the charging authority's boundary
- types of development; and/or
- scales of development.

A charging authority that plans to set differential rates should seek to avoid undue complexity. Charging schedules with differential rates should not have a disproportionate impact on particular sectors or specialist forms of development. Charging authorities should consider the views of developers at an early stage.

If the evidence shows that the area includes a zone, which could be a strategic site, which has low, very low or zero viability, the charging authority should consider setting a low or zero levy rate in that area. The same principle should apply where the evidence shows similarly low viability for particular types and/or scales of development.

In all cases, differential rates must not be set in such a way that they constitute a notifiable state aid under European Commission regulations (see 'State aid' section for further information). One element of state aid is the conferring of a selective advantage to any 'undertaking'. A charging authority which chooses to differentiate between classes of development, or by reference to different areas, should do so only where there is consistent economic viability evidence to justify this approach. It is the responsibility of each charging authority to ensure that their charging schedules are state aid compliant.

PPG ID: 25-021-20140612

- 2.14 Any differential rates must only be set with regard to viability. It would be contrary to the guidance, for example, to set a high rate to deter a particular type of development, or to set a low rate to encourage it a consistent approach must be taken across all development types.
- 2.15 CIL, once introduced, is mandatory on all developments (with a very few exceptions) that fall within the categories and areas where the levy applies, unlike other policy requirements to provide affordable housing or to build to a particular environmental standard over which there can be negotiations. This means that CIL must not prejudice the viability of most sites.

Viability Guidance

- 2.16 As set out in the Local Plan Viability Study, there is no specific technical guidance on how to test the viability in the CIL Regulations or Guidance. Paragraph 173 of the NPPF says: '... 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...' This seems quite straightforward although 'competitive returns' is not defined.
- 2.17 There are several sources of guidance and appeal decisions⁴ that support the methodology used. In this study we have followed the *Viability Testing in Local Plans Advice for planning practitioners* (LGA/HBF Sir John Harman) June 2012⁵ (known as the **Harman Guidance**). This contains the following definition:

An individual development can be said to be viable if, after taking account of all costs, including central and local government policy and regulatory costs and the cost and availability of development finance, the scheme provides a competitive return to the developer to ensure that development takes place and generates a land value sufficient to persuade the land owner to sell the land for the development proposed. If these conditions are not met, a scheme will not be delivered.

- 2.18 The planning appeal decisions, and the HCA good practice publication suggest that the most appropriate test of viability for planning policy purposes is to consider the Residual Value of schemes compared with the Existing Use Value (EUV), plus a premium. The premium over and above the EUV being set at a level to provide the landowner with a competitive return and the inducement to sell. The Harman Guidance and *Financial viability in planning*, RICS guidance note, 1st edition (GN 94/2012) August 2012 (known as the **RICS Guidance**) set out the principles of viability testing. Additionally, the Planning Advisory Service (PAS)⁶ provide viability guidance and manuals for local authorities.
- 2.19 There is considerable common ground between the RICS and the Harman Guidance but they are not consistent. The RICS Guidance recommends against the 'current/alternative use value plus a margin' which is the methodology recommended in the Harman Guidance.

One approach has been to exclusively adopt current use value (CUV) plus a margin or a variant of this, *i.e.* existing use value (EUV) plus a premium. The problem with this singular approach is that it does



⁴ Barnet: APP/Q5300/ A/07/2043798/NWF, Bristol: APP/P0119/ A/08/2069226, Beckenham: APP/G5180/ A/08/2084559, Bishops Cleeve; APP/G1630/A/11/2146206 Burgess Farm: APP/U4230/A/11/2157433, CLAY FARM: APP/Q0505/A/09/2103599/NWF, Woodstock: APP/D3125/ A/09/2104658, Shinfield APP/X0360/ A/12/2179141, Oxenholme Road, APP/M0933/A/13/2193338 Vannes: Court of Appeal 22 April 2010, [2010] EWHC 1092 (Admin) 2010 WL 1608437

⁵ Viability Testing in Local Plans has been endorsed by the Local Government Association and forms the basis of advice given by the, CLG funded, Planning Advisory Service (PAS).

⁶ PAS is funded directly by DCLG to provide consultancy and peer support, learning events and online resources to help local authorities understand and respond to planning reform. (Note: Much of the most recent advice has been co-authored by HDH).

not reflect the workings of the market as land is not released at CUV or CUV plus a margin (EUV plus).....

Financial viability in planning, RICS guidance note, 1st edition (GN 94/2012)

2.20 The Harman Guidance advocates an approach based on Threshold Land Value. Viability Testing in Local Plans says:

Consideration of an appropriate **Threshold Land Value** needs to take account of the fact that future plan policy requirements will have an impact on land values and landowner expectations. Therefore, using a market value approach as the starting point carries the risk of building-in assumptions of current policy costs rather than helping to inform the potential for future policy. Reference to market values can still provide a useful 'sense check' on the threshold values that are being used in the model (making use of cost-effective sources of local information), but it is not recommended that these are used as the basis for the input to a model.

We recommend that the Threshold Land Value is based on a premium over current use values and credible alternative use values (noting the exceptions below).

Viability Testing in Local Plans – Advice for planning practitioners. (June 2012)

2.21 The RICS dismisses a Threshold Land Value approach as follows.

Threshold land value. A term developed by the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) being essentially a land value at or above that which it is assumed a landowner would be prepared to sell. It is not a recognised valuation definition or approach.

- 2.22 On face value these statements are contradictory. The approach taken in this study brings these two sources of guidance together. The methodology adopted is to compare the Residual Value from the viability appraisals, with the Existing Use Value (EUV) or an Alternative Use Value (AUV) plus an appropriate uplift to incentivise a landowner to sell. The amount of the uplift over and above the existing use value is central to the assessment of viability. It must be set at a level to provide 'competitive returns'⁷ to the landowner.
- 2.23 This approach is in line with that recommended in the Harman Guidance (as endorsed by LGA, HBF and PAS) and is broadly in line with the RICS Guidance. It is relevant to note that the Harman methodology was endorsed by the Planning Inspector who approved the London Mayoral CIL Charging Schedule in January 2012⁸. In his report, the Inspector dismissed the theory that using historical market value (i.e. as proposed by the RICS) to assess the value of land was a more appropriate methodology than using EUV plus a margin.

Outline Methodology

2.24 There is no statutory technical guidance on how to go about viability testing. In all the viability work for the Council we have therefore followed the Harman Guidance. The availability and cost of land are matters at the core of viability for any property development. The format of

⁷ As required by 173 of the NPPF

⁸ Paragraphs 7 to 9 of REPORT ON THE EXAMINATION OF THE DRAFT MAYORAL COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY CHARGING SCHEDULE by Keith Holland BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI ARICS an Examiner appointed by the Mayor Date: 27th January 2012

the typical valuation, which has been standard for as long as land has been traded for development is:

Gross Development Value

(The combined value of the complete development)

LESS

Cost of creating the asset, including a profit margin (Construction + fees + finance charges)

=

RESIDUAL VALUE

- 2.25 The result of the calculation indicates a land value, the Residual Value, which is the top limit of what a bidder could offer for a site and still make a satisfactory profit margin.
- 2.26 In the following graphic, the bar illustrates all the income from a scheme. This is set by the market (rather than by the developer or local authority) so is, to a large extent, fixed. The developer has relatively little control over the costs of development (construction and fees) and whilst there is scope to build to different standards and with different levels of efficiency the costs are largely out of the developer's direct control they are what they are depending on the development.



2.27 It is well recognised in viability testing that the developer should be rewarded for taking the risks of development. The NPPF terms this the 'competitive return'. The essential balance in viability testing is around the land value and whether or not land will come forward for development. The more policy requirements and developer contributions the planning authority asks for the less the developer can afford to pay for the land. The purpose of this study is to quantify the costs of the Council's various policies and CIL on development and then make a judgement as to whether or not land prices are squeezed to such an extent that, in the NPPF context that the Development Plan is put at 'serious risk', or in the context of CIL, whether development is 'threatened' to such an extent that the Plan is not delivered.

- 2.28 It is important to note that this study is not trying to exactly mirror any particular developer's business model rather it is making a broad assessment of viability in the context of planmaking and the requirements of the NPPF and CIL Regulations.
- 2.29 As evidenced through the consultation process the 'likely land value' is a difficult topic since a landowner is unlikely to be entirely frank about the price that would be acceptable, always seeking a higher one. This is one of the areas where an informed assumption has to be made about the 'uplift': the margin above the 'Existing Use Value' which would make the landowner sell.
- 2.30 The assessment of viability as required under the NPPF and the CIL Regulations is not done through a calculation or a formula. It a quantitative and qualitative assessment based on professional judgment. The NPPF requires that '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[®] and whether 'the cumulative impact of these standards and policies should not put implementation of the plan at serious risk¹⁰. The CIL Regulations require that 'councils must strike an appropriate balance between (a) the desirability of funding from CIL (in whole or in part) the actual and expected estimated total cost of infrastructure required to support the development of its area, taking into account other actual and expected sources of funding; and (b) the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability¹¹.
- 2.31 The basic viability methodology involves preparing financial development appraisals for a representative range of sites and actual sites and using these to assess whether the development anticipated over the plan-period is likely to be viable when subject to the Council's policies and the effect CIL may have. Details of the site modelling are set out in Chapter 9 of the Local Plan Viability Study.
- 2.32 The sites were modelled based on discussions with Council officers, the existing available evidence supplied to us by the Council, and on our own experience of development. In particular we drew on the sites in the emerging SHLAA and the strategic sites and broad locations for development that the Council has identified and / or is considering as part of the plan-making process. This process ensures that the appraisals are representative of typical development.
- 2.33 The appraisals are based on the policies set out in the Local Plan 2031, Part 1 Strategic Sites and Policies. This is the most recent version of the evolving Local Plan. Initially we worked from the version published for the public consultation that ran from the 21st February 2014 to 4th April 2014. In this final report we have worked from the unpublished version 5.1 of 5th September 2014 being the near final iteration of the Plan.

⁹NPPF Paragraph 173

¹⁰ NPPF Paragraph 174

¹¹ CIL Regulation 14

- 2.34 For appropriate sensitivity testing we have assessed of a range of scenarios including different levels of affordable housing provision and different levels of developer contributions.
- 2.35 We surveyed the local housing and commercial markets, in order to obtain a picture of sales values. We also assessed land values to calibrate the appraisals and to assess alternative use values. Alongside this we considered local development patterns, in order to arrive at appropriate built form assumptions for those sites where information from a current planning permission or application was not available. These in turn informed the appropriate build cost figures. A number of other technical assumptions were required before appraisals could be produced. The appraisal results were in the form of £/ha 'residual' land values, showing the maximum value a developer could pay for the site and still return a target profit level.
- 2.36 The Residual Value was compared to the Existing Use Value (EUV) for each site. Only if the Residual Value exceeded the EUV, and by a satisfactory margin, could the scheme be judged to be viable.
- 2.37 We have used a bespoke viability testing model designed and developed by us specifically for area wide viability testing as required by the NPPF and CIL Regulations¹². The purpose of the viability model and testing is not to exactly mirror any particular business model used by those companies, organisations and people involved in property development. The purpose is to capture the generality and to provide high level advice to assist the Council in assessing the deliverability of the Local Plan and to set CIL.

Additional Profit

- 2.38 In order to assess whether or not a contribution to CIL can be made, a calculation needs to be undertaken to establish the *Additional Profit*. *Additional Profit* is a concept that we developed and it is the amount of profit over and above the *normal profit* made by the developers having purchased the land (alternative land value plus uplift), developed the site and sold the units (including providing any affordable housing that is required and complied with the requirements of the Plan). The *normal profit* is the factor included within the appraisals to reflect the risk of development and to provide the developer with a competitive return as required by Paragraph 173 of the NPPF¹³.
- 2.39 In this case 'normal profit' is the 20% of Gross Development Value (GDV) we used in the appraisals as agreed through the consultation process. Our approach to calculating Additional Profit is to complete the appraisals using the same cost and price figures, and other financial assumptions, as used to establish the Residual Value but to also incorporate the cost of the land (EUV plus uplift) into the cost side of the appraisal to show the resulting profit (or loss) over and above the allowance for developers' profit (or competitive return).



¹² This Viability Model has is used as the basis for the Planning Advisory Service (PAS) viability Workshops. It is made available to Local Authorities, free of charge, by PAS.

¹³ 173 of the NPPF says: ...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.

- 2.40 The amount by which the resulting profit exceeds the target level of profit, represents the *Additional Profit* and provides a measure of the scope for contributing to CIL without impairing development viability. CIL contributions can viably be paid out of this additional profit.
- 2.41 The starting point of these calculations is to base them on the policies set out in the latest iteration of the Local Plan. The following formula was used:

Gross Development Value

(The combined value of the complete development, including affordable housing)

LESS

Cost of creating the asset, including a profit margin

(land* + construction + fees + finance charges + developers' profit)

=

Additional Profit

* Where 'land' is the EUV plus uplift

2.42 We take this opportunity to stress that the Additional Profit is not the amount of CIL – it is the amount out of which CIL could be paid and still provide the landowner and developer with a competitive return as required by paragraph 173 of the NPPF.

The meaning of 'competitive return'

2.43 The meaning of *competitive return* is at the core of a viability assessment. The RICS Guidance includes the following definition:

Competitive returns - A term used in paragraph 173 of the NPPF and applied to 'a willing land owner and willing developer to enable development to be deliverable'. A 'Competitive Return' in the context of land and/or premises equates to the Site Value as defined by this guidance, i.e. the Market Value subject to the following assumption: that the value has regard to development plan policies and all other material planning considerations and disregards that which is contrary to the development plan. A 'Competitive Return' in the context of a developer bringing forward development should be in accordance with a 'market risk adjusted return' to the developer, as defined in this guidance, in viably delivering a project.

- 2.44 Whilst this is useful it does not provide guidance as to the size of that return. To date there has been much discussion within the industry as to what may and may not be a competitive return, as yet the term has not been given a firm definition through the appeal, planning examination or legal processes.
- 2.45 Competitive return was considered at the Shinfield appeal¹⁴ (January 2013). More recently, further clarification has been added in the Oxenholme Road Appeal (October 2013)¹⁵ where

¹⁴ APP/X0360/A/12/2179141 (Land at The Manor, Shinfield, Reading RG2 9BX)

¹⁵ APP/M0933/ A/13/ 2193338 (Land to the west of Oxenholme Road, Kendal, Cumbria)

the inspector confirmed that the principle set out in Shinfield is very site specific and should only be given limited weight.

2.46 It should be noted that this study is about the economics of development. Viability brings in a wider range than just financial factors. The PPG says:

Understanding Local Plan viability is critical to the overall assessment of deliverability. Local Plans should present visions for an area in the context of an understanding of local economic conditions and market realities. This should not undermine ambition for high quality design and wider social and environmental benefit but such ambition should be tested against the realistic likelihood of delivery.

2.47 The above methodology and in particular the differences between the Harman Guidance and the RICS Guidance were presented and discussed through the consultation process. There was a universal agreement that it was appropriate to follow the Harman Guidance which is what we have done.

Existing Available Evidence

- 2.48 The NPPF, the PPG and the CIL Regulations are clear that the assessment of the potential impact of CIL should, wherever possible, be based on existing available evidence rather than new evidence. We have reviewed the evidence that is available from the Council. This falls into three broad types:
- 2.49 The first is that which has been prepared by the Council to inform its Local Development Framework (LDF).
- 2.50 Secondly, the Council holds in the form of development appraisals that have been submitted by developers in connection with specific developments – most often to support negotiations around the provision of affordable housing or s106 contributions. Our approach has been to draw on this existing evidence and to consolidate it so that it can then be used as a sound base for setting the affordable housing target and the levels of CIL.
- 2.51 Thirdly, the Council also holds evidence of what is being collected from developers under the s106 regime. We have considered the Council's policies for developer contributions (including affordable housing) and the amounts that have actually been collected from developers.



3. Viability work to date

Introduction

3.1 As set out at the start of this report, The Local Plan Viability Study concluded (at paragraph 12.17):

Bearing in mind the levels of infrastructure funding required we recommend that the Council moves to the lower level of affordable housing of 35% across all sites (including older peoples housing). Whilst this would not bring more sites into viability, it would increase the cushion or margin between the Viability Threshold and the Residual Value and enable developer contributions in the range £80/m2 to £140/m2 to be paid without threatening development.

3.2 In relation to non-residential development The Local Plan Viability Study concluded, (at paragraph 12.20):

The lack of viability is not as a result of the cumulative impact of the Council's policies rendering development unviable through imposing layers of additional costs. The Council has few policies adding to the costs of development in this area. We conclude that the cumulative impact of the Council's policies does not put employment uses at serious risk, however we also note that employment development has little capacity to bear developer contributions.

- 3.3 This present document takes this general advice forward and builds on these conclusions and the advice set out in Chapter 13 of the Local Plan Viability Study to make firm recommendations as to the rates of CIL for the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule (PDCS).
- 3.4 In large part these findings were based on the findings set out in Chapter 10 of the Local Plan Viability Study where the relationship between affordable housing and total infrastructure contributions were set out. The relevant sections are repeated below.
- 3.5 The appraisals use the residual valuation approach that is, they are designed to assess the value of the site after taking into account the costs of development, the likely income from sales and/or rents and an appropriate amount of developers' profit. The Residual Value represents the maximum bid for the site where the payment is made in a single tranche on the acquisition of a site. In order for the proposed development to be described as viable, it is necessary for this value to exceed the Existing Use Value by a satisfactory margin.
- 3.6 We ran multiple sets of appraisals. The initial appraisals were based on the full policy requirements of the emerging Plan, including the 40% affordable housing requirement. As this project progressed, a decision (informed by the evidence) was been taken by the Council to reduce the overall requirement from 40% to 35%. Development appraisals are sensitive to changes in price so appraisals have been run with various changes in the cost of construction and an increase and decrease in prices.
- 3.7 For each development type we calculated the Residual Value. In the tables we colour coded the results using a simple traffic light system:

- a) Green Viable where the Residual Value per hectare exceeds the indicative Viability Threshold Value per hectare (being the Existing Use Value (EUV) plus the appropriate uplift to provide a competitive return for the landowner).
- b) Amber Marginal where the Residual Value per hectare exceeds the EUV, but not Viability Threshold Value per hectare. These sites should not be considered as viable when measured against the test set out – however, depending on the nature of the site and the owner, they may come forward.
- c) **Red** Non-viable where the Residual Value does not exceed the EUV.
- 3.8 The results are set out and presented for each site and per gross hectare to allow comparison between sites.

Residential Development

3.9 We prepared financial appraisals for each of the modelled and strategic residential sites using a bespoke spreadsheet-based financial analysis package. These appraisals are based on the full policy requirements of the Local Plan, but with a range of affordable housing and developer contribution assumptions base options:

a)	Affordable Housing	On sites of 3 or more or over 0.1ha as 75% affordable rented housing and 25% intermediate (i.e. shared ownership) housing.
b)	Environmental Standards	Enhanced Building Regulations (Part L) (BCIS +1.5%).
c)	CIL and s106	SHLAA typologies and small sites £2,500 per unit (market and affordable) plus the amounts shown applied per meter squared on market housing.
		Strategic Sites estimated infrastructure costs as follows (from Table 7.1 in the Local Plan Viability Study) being those site specific costs that in line with the CIL Regulation 122 and CIL Regulation 123:

	Total	£/unit
Abingdon and Oxford Fringe		
North of Abingdon-on-Thames	13,566,800	16,959
North-West of Abingdon-on-Thames	3,391,200	16,956
South of East Hanney	200,000	1,000
East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor	420,000	1,500
North-West of Radley	2,147,000	8,946
South of Kennington	2,416,000	8,948
South East Vale (Science Vale West)		
Grove	12,155,500	16,207
Wantage	30,039,500	20,026
South East Vale (Science Vale East)		
Valley Park	19,796,373	7,763
North-West of Valley Park	6,210,627	7,763
East of Harwell Campus	7,130,893	8,389
North-West of Harwell Campus	4,614,107	8,389
East of Sutton Courtenay	330,000	1,500
West of Harwell	200,000	1,000
Milton Heights	600,000	1,500
Western Vale		
East of Coxwell Road Faringdon	1,690,664	8,453
Land South of Park Road	2,608,662	7,453
South-West of Faringdon	1,690,664	8,453
South of Faringdon	1,690,664	8,453
North of Shrivenham	4,188,125	8,376
West of Stanford-in-the-Vale	290,000	1,450

- d) Developers' Return 20% on GDV
- 3.10 The Residual Value is compared to the Existing Use Value and Viability Thresholds and the consequence of the findings discussed in the four following tables.

40% Affordable Nationality Value Enclass Feesidad Abingdon and Oxord Pringe Enh Enh <td< th=""><th>£160 £180 457,529 444,003 385,703 869,375 1,885,437 1,685,437 1,056,976 1,038,752 1,345,082 1,314,626 1,345,082 1,314,826 1,625,976 1,038,752 1,625,976 1,038,757 1,625,976 1,038,757 1,625,927 190,008 165,922 151,926 437,718 427,531 482,7410 409,988 1,039,397 1,066,304 1,163,416 1,193,905 1,103,416 1,193,905 1,134,479 1,115,552 618,224 591,776 303,436 291,062 472,377 452,673 905,052 27,995 455,074 479,628 1,011,106 933,303 501,996 487,343 982,021 1944,063 1,012,027 1,077,523 1,431,663 1,400,069 1,103,2377 1,104,21</th></td<> <th>80 £200 3430,476 5 75 842,927 71 1,685,437 72 1,685,437 73 1,685,437 71 1,685,437 71 1,685,437 72 1,685,437 73 1,685,437 73 1,685,437 73 1,685,437 73 1,638,453 31 417,343 21 790,251 84 457,516 91 1,315,133 52 1,392,622 276,689 226,464 28 464,183 303 975,500 80 £200 43 472,689 97 925,992 1,797,523 1,380,475 1,088,576 1,380,475 1,088,576 1,247,933 4208,609 208,609</th>	£160 £180 457,529 444,003 385,703 869,375 1,885,437 1,685,437 1,056,976 1,038,752 1,345,082 1,314,626 1,345,082 1,314,826 1,625,976 1,038,752 1,625,976 1,038,757 1,625,976 1,038,757 1,625,927 190,008 165,922 151,926 437,718 427,531 482,7410 409,988 1,039,397 1,066,304 1,163,416 1,193,905 1,103,416 1,193,905 1,134,479 1,115,552 618,224 591,776 303,436 291,062 472,377 452,673 905,052 27,995 455,074 479,628 1,011,106 933,303 501,996 487,343 982,021 1944,063 1,012,027 1,077,523 1,431,663 1,400,069 1,103,2377 1,104,21	80 £200 3430,476 5 75 842,927 71 1,685,437 72 1,685,437 73 1,685,437 71 1,685,437 71 1,685,437 72 1,685,437 73 1,685,437 73 1,685,437 73 1,685,437 73 1,638,453 31 417,343 21 790,251 84 457,516 91 1,315,133 52 1,392,622 276,689 226,464 28 464,183 303 975,500 80 £200 43 472,689 97 925,992 1,797,523 1,380,475 1,088,576 1,380,475 1,088,576 1,247,933 4208,609 208,609
Alternative Value Residual Paint	£160 £180 457,529 444,003 895,703 899,375 1,855,437 1,855,437 1,855,437 1,855,437 1,345,052 1,321,426 1,066,976 1,038,758 202,972 190,608 165,292 151,926 437,718 427,531 482,470 4429,938 1,038,987 1,066,304 1,450,549 1,142,905 1,163,416 1,139,305 1,139,479 1,115,552 618,224 591,066 2472,377 452,169 249,552 257,955 495,074 479,628 1,011,106 983,303 1,011,106 983,303 511,996 487,343 982,021 954,007 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,432,674 1,277,578 1,431,663 1,470,628 1,132,227 1,110,421 1,287,541 1,272,788 243,986 222,004	80 £200 33 430,476 75 842,927 71 1,685,437 26 1,297,801 55 1,016,534 26 1,297,801 55 1,016,534 26 138,453 31 417,343 21 790,251 1,399,262 05 05 1,101,624 565,328 26 276 565,328 69 246,464 28 464,183 03 975,500 975 21,027,523 60 £200 43 472,689 07 925,992 21,797,523 1,380,475 21,080,575 1,380,475 21,080,575 1,247,933 4,208,609 208,609
End End <th>£160 £180 457,529 444,003 885,703 889,375 1,858,437 1,865,437 1,858,437 1,865,437 1,658,437 1,836,437 1,658,976 1,033,755 1,211,643 1,188,748 202,972 190,608 165,282 151,926 437,718 427,531 423,778 427,531 423,778 427,531 1,450,549 1,424,905 1,133,416 1,139,305 1,133,416 1,139,305 1,163,416 1,139,303 1,031,949 1,115,552 495,074 479,628 1,011,106 993,303 1,011,106 993,303 511,996 487,343 982,021 954,027,945,23 1,011,106 917,97,523 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,122,778 1,237,571 1,122,754 1,237,541 1,227,788</th> <th>80 £200 03 430,476 75 842,927 71 1,685,437 28 1,297,801 13 1,685,437 26 1,297,801 14 1,165,852 03 1,484,53 14 1,165,852 04 1,038,621 05 1,715,193 52 1,091,624 52 1,091,624 56 2,78,689 69 2,43,669 80 £2,00 43 472,689 975,500 2,1,79,752 80 £200 43 472,689 97,520 1,390,475 80 £200 43 472,689 925,992 1,247,933 1,247,933 1,247,933</th>	£160 £180 457,529 444,003 885,703 889,375 1,858,437 1,865,437 1,858,437 1,865,437 1,658,437 1,836,437 1,658,976 1,033,755 1,211,643 1,188,748 202,972 190,608 165,282 151,926 437,718 427,531 423,778 427,531 423,778 427,531 1,450,549 1,424,905 1,133,416 1,139,305 1,133,416 1,139,305 1,163,416 1,139,303 1,031,949 1,115,552 495,074 479,628 1,011,106 993,303 1,011,106 993,303 511,996 487,343 982,021 954,027,945,23 1,011,106 917,97,523 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,122,778 1,237,571 1,122,754 1,237,541 1,227,788	80 £200 03 430,476 75 842,927 71 1,685,437 28 1,297,801 13 1,685,437 26 1,297,801 14 1,165,852 03 1,484,53 14 1,165,852 04 1,038,621 05 1,715,193 52 1,091,624 52 1,091,624 56 2,78,689 69 2,43,669 80 £2,00 43 472,689 975,500 2,1,79,752 80 £200 43 472,689 97,520 1,390,475 80 £200 43 472,689 925,992 1,247,933 1,247,933 1,247,933
North of Abrigdon 20,000 374,000 562,214 552,215 532,888 525,101 999,142 977,422 947,422 921,423 921,423 921,423 921,423 921,423 921,423 921,423 921,423 921,423 921,42 921,423 1868,437 1868,	457.529 444,003 885,703 889,375 1,885,437 1,885,437 1,885,437 1,885,437 1,685,437 1,835,437 1,685,437 1,321,426 1,058,976 1,036,755 1,211,643 1,188,748 202,972 190,608 165,282 151,926 437,718 427,591 437,718 427,591 437,718 427,591 433,718 424,905 1,163,416 1,139,397 1,450,549 1,424,905 1,139,479 1,115,552 618,222 557,995 495,074 479,628 1,011,106 993,303 1,011,106 993,303 501,996 487,343 982,021 954,007 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,132,327 1,101,621 1,132,327 1,102,421 1,287,541 1,227,788 235,389 222,004	03 430,476 75 842,927 1,685,437 26 1,297,801 26 1,297,801 26 1,297,801 27 1,685,437 26 1,297,801 27 1,634 48 1,165,852 20 178,243 26 138,453 21 790,251 21 790,251 21 790,251 21 790,251 21 790,251 21 790,251 23 1,091,624 25 1,091,624 26 278,689 29 246,464 28 464,183 03 975,500 244,464 28 464,183 03 975,500 22 1,097,523 20 1,207,523 21 1,208,516 21 1,088,516 21 1
2 North-West of Abingdon Abingdon 20,000 374,000 11/02,280 1/07,6720 10.008 11/02,801 1999,142 972,282 947,422 921,863,437 South of East Hanney 20,000 374,000 1583,405 1685,437	895,703 899,375 1685,437 1.885,437 1,345,052 1,321,426 1,356,052 1,321,426 1,211,643 1.885,437 1,211,643 1.188,748 202,972 190,608 165,292 151,926 437,718 427,531 482,410 409,988 1,033,987 1,066,304 1,482,410 409,988 1,033,987 1,066,304 1,163,416 1,139,305 1,138,473 1,115,542 618,224 591,796 269,525 257,995 1,011,106 983,303 1,011,106 983,303 1,011,106 983,303 1,011,106 984,307 1,132,227 1,104,211 1,295,541 1,277,775,253 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,227 1,104,211 1,297,541 1,277,78 1,323,237 1,104,211 1,295,541 1,272,788	75 842.927 75 842.927 7 1.685.437 26 1.297,801 55 1.016.534 26 1.297,801 55 1.016.532 9 178,243 26 138,453 31 417,343 21 790,251 04 1,038,621 05 1,392,623 05 1,392,624 05 1,392,624 05 1,393,621 05 1,393,624 05 1,392,623 05 1,415,193 62 278,689 63 424,464 80 £200 444,183 03 975,500 925,992 21 1,797,523 80 £200 34 472,689 07 925,992 21 1,380,475 21 1,380,475 21 1,380,475 21
3 South of East Hanney East Hanney 20.000 374,000 1.888,437	1,685,437 1,685,437 1,685,437 1,345,062 1,321,426 1,321,426 1,056,976 1,321,426 1,321,426 1,056,976 1,038,752 1,211,643 1,188,748 20,2972 190,608 165,232 151,926 437,718 427,531 827,991 809,121 482,740 469,988 1,036,934 1,424,905 1,163,416 1,139,305 1,139,305 1,139,305 1,134,479 1,115,552 257,936 495,074 479,523 209,525 257,936 495,074 479,523 1,011,106 993,303 1,011,106 993,203 1,011,106 993,203 1,011,106 993,203 501,996 487,343 982,021 1,942,027 1,97,523 1,797,523 1,122,327 1,104,221 1,104,221 1,104,221 1,297,541 1,227,388	37 1.885,437 1.297,801 1.297,801 55 1.016,534 48 1,165,852 1 1.78,243 20 138,453 31 417,343 21 790,251 88 457,516 05 1,399,262 13,47,333 1,399,262 21 1,086,621 05 1,115,193 25 1,001,624 7 565,328 62 278,689 80 £2000 43 447,2689 97 925,992 1,797,523 1,797,523 38 1,247,935 4 248,516 38 1,247,935
Number of Radiey Radiey 20000 374,000 1/218,742 1,178,300 1,137,855 1,117,838 1,097,417 1,077,197 6 Soline / Kernington Radey 20,000 374,000 1,384,864 1,371,805 1,137,855 1,117,838 1,097,417 1,077,197 6 Soline / Vale West	10:056:976 1,036.755 1,211.643 1,036.755 1,211.643 1,188.748 202.972 190.063 165.292 151.926 437.718 427.531 827.991 809.121 482.791 809.121 482.791 809.121 482.791 809.121 482.791 809.121 482.791 809.121 482.791 809.121 482.791 809.321 1,163.446 1,139.307 1,133.479 1.115.552 618.224 591.776 303.436 291.062 472.377 452.57.995 495.074 479.628 1,011.106 933.031 501.996 487.343 982.021 954.73 982.021 954.73 982.021 104.21 1,232.377 11.0421 1,232.377 11.0421 1,232.377 11.0421 1,232.373 11.0421	55 1.016.534 1.016.534 1.165.852 1.165.852 1.165.852 1.165.852 1.38.453 31 417.343 26 138.453 31 417.343 21 790.251 88 457.516 21 1.038.621 05 1.115.193 22 1.091.624 75 565.328 62 2.76.689 63 421.960 95 246.464 28 464.183 03 975.500 43 472.689 07 925.992 1.390.475 1.390.475 38 1.247.935 31 1.247.935 32 1.247.935
6 South of Kernington Redey 20,000 374,000 1,34,004 1,34,004 1,320,221 1,200,221 1,257,433 1,257,433 1,257,433 1,234,538 7 Morks Farm Grove 20,000 374,000 200,226 227,116 226,4796 225,471 200,668 227,702 215,537 9 Crab Hill South East Vale 20,000 374,000 270,236 257,118 244,000 230,482 217,764 204,646 191,528 178,460 10 Valey Park Harwell and Miton Parish 20,000 374,000 596,252 565,071 543,661 513,315 519,006 566,731 446,601 12 East Harwell Campus Harwell Campus 20,000 374,000 135,561 1,604,411 1,578,781 1,523,724 1,527,402 1,553,784 1,224,721 1,7068 1,426,003 1,426,0141 1,578,784 1,553,754 1,217,633 1,210,719 1,446,401 13 East of Scovert Harvell 20,000 374,000	1,211,643 1,188,748 202,972 190,608 165,292 151,926 437,718 427,531 427,931 809,121 482,410 469,988 1,033,967 1,065,989 1,480,548 1,424,905 1,163,416 1,139,305 1,139,479 1,115,552 1,139,479 1,115,552 1,139,479 1,115,552 618,224 591,776 303,436 291,062 472,377 452,169 287,995 495,074 479,628 1,011,106 933,303 501,996 487,343 982,021 954,744 5,219 501,996 487,343 982,021 954,747 3,219 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,122,377 1,110,421 1,277,738 1,278,78 1,277,788 1,278 1,277,788 1,277,788 1,278 1,277,788 1,278 1,277,788 1,277,788 1,278 1,2778 1,278 1,278 1,278 1,278 1,	44 1.165.852 98 1.78,243 26 1.38,453 31 4.17,343 331 4.17,343 341 4.17,343 35 4.57,516 36 4.37,516 37 5.65,328 38 2.1,091,624 39 75,500 95 2.46,464 28 464,183 303 975,500 97 925,992 31 4.72,689 07 925,922 21 1.088,516 21 1.088,517 21 1.088,516 23 1.727,523 24 1.088,516 23 1.247,935 24 208,609
Buttle Vale West Grove 20,000 374,000 301,880 289,555 277,160 284,796 282,431 240,006 227,702 215,337 9 Crab Hill Wartage 20,000 374,000 270,238 257,118 244,000 230,882 217,764 204,666 111,528 177,410 10 Valley Park Harwell and Miton Parish 20,000 374,000 519,219 500,314 488,844 488,666 478,469 468,281 458,094 447,906 11 North-Vest of Valey Park Harwell Campus 20,000 374,000 580,222 585,031 543,561 531,331 519,100 506,870 494,640 13 North-Vest of Harwell Campus 20,000 374,000 1,356,51 1,827,781 1,523,402 1,204,719 1,476,133 13 East of Sutton Courtenay 20,000 374,000 1,386,508 1,330,555 1,281,753 1,227,403 1,527,443 1,267,443 1,577,543 1,230,555 1,281,753 1,187,527	202,972 190,608 165,282 151,926 437,718 427,631 827,991 809,121 432,470 469,988 1,039,387 1,066,304 1,450,549 1,424,905 1,133,416 1,139,305 1,134,416 1,139,305 618,224 591,776 303,436 291,062 472,377 452,169 949,502 257,995 495,074 479,628 1,011,106 993,303 1,011,106 993,303 511,996 487,343 982,021 954,007 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,132,327 1,104,221 1,237,541 1,272,738 235,389 222,004	08 178,243 26 138,453 31 417,343 21 790,251 188 457,516 04 1,038,621 05 1,115,193 52 1,091,624 76 565,328 69 243,960 95 246,464 28 464,183 03 975,500 975,500 21,077,523 80 £200 43 472,689 97 925,992 1,380,475 31,247,933 31 1,247,935 31 1,247,935 31 1,247,935
9 Crab Hill Wantage 20,000 374,000 270,236 257,118 244,000 230,882 217,764 204,646 191,528 178,410 10 Valley Park Harvell and Miton Parish 20,000 374,000 519,215 508,031 498,844 488,656 478,469 468,231 458,094 447,906 11 North-West of Valley Park Harvell Campus 20,000 374,000 978,044 950,549 494,097 922,340 903,470 884,601 885,731 848,861 12 East Harvell Campus 20,000 374,000 1,345,451 1,237,788 1,230,085 1,342,145 1,237,7788 1,260,382 1,235,750 1,211,633 1,187,527 13 East of Sutton Courtenay 20,000 374,000 1,386,068 1,332,146 1,308,058 1,240,533 1,211,633 1,187,527 14 Mestor Fairingdon 20,000 374,000 1,328,055 1,240,533 1,211,633 1,187,527 1,613,406 1276,537 1,211,533 1,187,527	165,292 151,926 437,718 427,531 827,991 809,121 1,63,416 1,429,953 1,163,416 1,139,305 1,133,473 1,115,542 618,224 591,766 618,224 591,766 618,224 591,766 427,377 452,169 269,525,257,995 527,995 1,011,106 993,303 1,011,106 993,303 1,011,106 993,303 1,011,106 993,002 1,011,106 993,003 1,011,106 993,003 1,011,106 993,003 1,011,106 993,003 1,011,106 993,003 1,011,106 914,007,797,503 1,431,663 1,406,009 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,297,541 1,272,789 235,389 222,004	28 138,453 31 417,343 21 790,251 84 457,516 04 1,038,621 05 1,319,262 05 1,315,193 52 278,689 62 278,689 62 246,464 82 444,183 03 975,500 975,500 925,992 1,797,523 1,380,475 1,380,475 1,380,475 1,1088,516 1,247,933
South East Vale South East Vale South Cast Vale South Cast Vale South Cast Vale South Vale	437,718 427,531 827,931 809,121 482,410 469,988 1,039,387 1,066,304 1,450,549 1,424,905 1,163,416 1,133,305 1,139,479 1,115,552 6,18,224 591,776 303,436 291,062 472,377 452,169 269,525 257,936 456,074 479,528 1,011,106 993,303 1,011,106 993,303 501,996 487,343 982,021 954,021 951,996 487,343 982,021 954,021 951,996 487,343 982,021 954,011,042 1,129,7541 1,272,738 235,389 222,004	31 417,343 21 790,251 88 457,516 90,251 1,038,621 05 1,399,262 05 1,151,193 52 1,091,624 76 565,328 62 278,699 93 246,464 80 £200 43 464,183 03 975,500 43 472,689 07 925,992 1,380,475 1,308,516 38 1,247,935 04 208,609
In Value Yrak Harwell and Mitch Parish 20,000 374,000 395,041 495,050 496,453 496,201 496,453 496,201 496,453 496,201 496,453 496,201 496,453 496,201 496,453 496,201 496,453 496,201 496,453 496,453 496,453 496,453 496,451 522,340 903,471 884,661 446,861 12 East Harvell Campus Harvell Campus 20,000 374,000 1,325,451 1,280,085 1,240,210 1,121,670 1,121,670 13 Suthon Courtenay Suthon Courtenay 20,000 374,000 1,326,506 1,230,055 1,204,055 1,253,051 1,230,570 1,211,630 1,187,527 14 West of Harwell Harwell Harwell Parvell 20,000 374,000 1,326,506 1,230,551 1,230,531 1,205,531 1,205,531 1,201,551 1,236,551 2,210,551 2,230,501 1,216,551 2,23,750 1,211,652 1,256 1,256 52,211 530,003 552,211<	427,916 427,916 427,917 482,917 492,91	31 417,343 321 790,251 34 477,516 35 47,516 36 1,399,262 35 1,01,624 36 1,115,193 36 2,1091,624 36 2,278,689 36 2,41,960 303 975,500 375,500 443,441,83 303 975,500 43 472,689 925,982 1,797,523 32 1,727,523 33 1,247,935 42 208,609
12 East Harvell Campus 4arvell Campus 20,000 374,000 580,225 555,791 543,861 531,331 519,100 506,870 494,640 13 North-West of Harwell Campus 20,000 374,000 1,356,699 1,320,758 1,260,085 1,223,402 1,204,719 1,177,036 1,493,33 1,126,700 14 West of Harwell Harwell 20,000 374,000 1,365,698 1,330,855 1,281,055 1,225,852 1,225,750 1,211,633 1,187,527 15 Miton Heights Miton Parish west of the 4 20,000 374,000 1,328,656 1,281,055 2,281,462 1,46,72 1,411 2,24,056 2,21,956 2,21,956 2,21,944 42,586 1,302,511 <td>482.410 469.988 1,033,987 1,066,304 1,450.549 1,424,905 1,1450.549 1,424,905 1,133,479 1,115,552 6,18,224 591,776 303,436 291,062 472,377 452,169 269,525 257,995 495,074 479,628 1,011,106 993,303 6,10,202 954,007 501,996 487,343 982,021 954,007 1,737,523 1,10,421 1,123,277 1,10,421 1,297,541 1,277,788 235,389 222,004</td> <td>88 457,516 04 1,038,621 105 1,399,262 05 1,115,193 05 1,115,193 06 276,565,328 62 276,689 69 431,960 975,500 9 444,183 975,500 9 226,992 1,277,523 1,727,523 921 1,088,516 33 1,247,935 4208,609 4208,609</td>	482.410 469.988 1,033,987 1,066,304 1,450.549 1,424,905 1,1450.549 1,424,905 1,133,479 1,115,552 6,18,224 591,776 303,436 291,062 472,377 452,169 269,525 257,995 495,074 479,628 1,011,106 993,303 6,10,202 954,007 501,996 487,343 982,021 954,007 1,737,523 1,10,421 1,123,277 1,10,421 1,297,541 1,277,788 235,389 222,004	88 457,516 04 1,038,621 105 1,399,262 05 1,115,193 05 1,115,193 06 276,565,328 62 276,689 69 431,960 975,500 9 444,183 975,500 9 226,992 1,277,523 1,727,523 921 1,088,516 33 1,247,935 4208,609 4208,609
13 North-West of Harwell Campus 20,000 374,000 1,354,541 1,260,709 1,204,719 1,717,036 1,149,353 1,121,670 13 East of Sutton Courtenay Sutton Courtenay 20,000 374,000 1,586,509 1,300,655 1,828,078 1,527,861 1,527,861 1,527,861 1,527,861 1,527,861 1,527,861 1,210,553 1,187,527 15 Mitton Heights Mitton Parish west of the / 20,000 374,000 1,328,056 1,281,055 1,227,554 1,224,053 1,210,553 1,187,562 1,163,406 16 East of Coxwell Road Faringdon 20,000 374,000 828,552 390,049 377,675 356,302 352,923 340,555 328,182 3158,809 17 Land South Of Park Road Faringdon 20,000 374,000 633,117 613,338 533,269 573,420 553,211 533,003 512,794 492,586 19 South of Shrivenham 20,000 374,000 617,241 602,112 586,893 571,854 556,725 541,411 525,965 510,519 21 921,966 230,941	1,083,987 1,066,304 1,450,549 1,424,905 1,163,416 1,139,305 1,139,479 1,115,552 618,224 591,776 303,436 291,062 472,377 452,169 299,525 257,995 495,074 479,628 1,011,106 993,303 1,011,106 993,303 501,996 487,343 982,021 954,007 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,227,541 1,272,738	04 1.038,621 0.1,399,262 05 05 1.115,193 52 1.091,624 76 565,328 62 278,689 69 431,960 95 244,464 28 464,183 975,500 925,992 34 472,689 97 925,992 21 1,088,516 21 1,088,516 23 1,247,935 24 1,247,935 24 208,609
Is East Ordinatesy 20000 374,000 130,003 1,004,003 1,203,004 1,024,004 1,203,004 1,024,004 1,203,004 1,024,004 1,203,004 1,204,004 1,204,004 1,204,0	1,133,435 1,42,345 1,42,345 1,133,479 1,115,552 618,224 591,776 303,436 291,062 2472,377 452,169 269,525 257,995 495,074 479,628 1,011,106 993,303 962,021 954,003 501,996 487,343 962,021 954,003 1,797,523 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,400,603 1,297,541 1,272,738 235,398 222,004	30 1,15,193 1,115,193 1,01,624 76 565,328 80 278,689 95 246,464 95 246,464 975,500 975,500 80 £200 43 472,689 97 925,992 1,797,523 1,380,475 1,088,576 1,380,475 1,108,576 1,247,933 40 208,609
15 Milton Heights Milton Parish west of the / 20,000 374,000 1,328,056 1,304,555 1,281,055 1,234,063 1,210,553 1,187,052 1,163,406 16 East of Coxwell Road Faringdon Faringdon 20,000 374,000 828,552 802,732 776,873 750,463 724,015 697,567 671,119 644,672 17 Land South of Park Road Faringdon 20,000 374,000 402,422 800,049 377,475 365,302 352,929 340,555 328,182 315,809 18 South-West of Faringdon Great Coxwell Parish 20,000 374,000 361,239 499,965 338,691 327,177 315,647 304,117 225,865 151,519 20 North of Stariford-in-the-Vale 20,000 374,000 1153,534 1,113,5731 1,117,927 1,100,124 1,082,320 1,064,517 1,046,713 1,028,910 35% Affordable Value Value Value Value Value Value 1,00,124 1,082,320 1,064,51	1,139,479 1,115,552 618,224 591,776 303,436 291,062 472,377 452,169 269,525 257,995 495,074 479,628 1,011,106 993,303 501,996 487,343 982,021 994,002 501,996 487,343 982,021 994,002 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,297,541 1,272,738	1,091,624 1,091,624 76 565,328 62 278,689 9431,990 95 95 246,464 246,464 464,183 03 975,500 97 925,992 43 472,689 07 925,992 1,797,523 1,797,523 12 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 04 208,609
Western Vale Western Vale Paingdon	618,224 591,776 903,436 291,062 472,377 452,169 269,525 257,995 495,074 479,628 1,011,106 993,303 501,996 487,343 982,021 9954,021 994,021 9954,021 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,122,373 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,122,7541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004	76 565,328 62 278,689 63 431,960 95 246,464 80 975,500 975,500 975,500 43 472,689 973 925,982 1,797,523 1,797,523 98 1,247,935 12 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 04 208,609
Instruction Land South of Park Road Faringdon 20,000 374,000 40,0124 10,0000 01,1010 01,0010 01,1010 01,0010 01	303.436 291.062 472.377 452.163 289.525 257.995 495.074 479.628 1.011.106 993.303 £160 £180 501.996 487.343 982.021 994.021 1.011.106 1.797.523 1.431.663 1.406.069 1.122.327 1.110.421 1.297.541 1.272.738 235.398 222.004	200,040 278,689 99 431,960 95 246,464 28 464,183 303 975,500 43 472,689 07 925,992 23 1,797,523 89 1,247,935 31 1,247,935
Its South - West of Faingdon Faingdon 20,000 374,000 633,117 613,328 633,389 573,420 553,211 633,003 512,794 492,588 19 South of Faingdon Grate Covell Parish 20,000 374,000 617,241 602,112 588,691 324,017 316,487 304,117 222,586 281,066 20 North of Shrivenham Shrivenham 20,000 374,000 617,241 602,112 586,983 571,854 556,725 541,411 525,985 510,519 21 West of Stanford-in-the-Vale Stanford-in-the-Vale 20,000 374,000 1,153,534 1,117,927 1,100,124 1,082,320 1,064,517 1,046,713 1,028,910 21 West of Stanford-in-the-Vale Zuorodo 1,135,731 1,117,927 1,100,124 1,082,320 1,064,517 1,046,713 1,028,910 24 Edit Value Threshold Value Value Value Value Value Value Value Value Value	472,377 452,169 276,525 257,955 495,074 479,628 1,011,106 993,303 1,011,106 993,303 501,996 487,343 992,021 995,007 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,287,541 1,272,738 235,389 222,004	89 431,960 95 246,464 95 246,464 96 246,464 97 5500 975,500 975,500 980 £200 43 472,689 97 925,992 23 1,797,523 98 1,247,935 38 1,247,935 94 208,609
Instruction Control and any status Control any status Contro any status	zoy,zoc; Zoy,Zoc; Zoy,Zoc; Zoy,Zoc; 495,074 479,628 450,074 479,628 1,011,106 993,303 993,203 993,203 501,996 487,243 992,021 954,007 920,201 954,007 1,797,523 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,406,063 1,104,21 1,110,421 1,297,541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004	20,40,403 20,404,403 28,464,183 003 975,500 80 £200 43 472,689 07 925,992 203 1,797,523 204 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 104 208,606
21 West of Stanford-in-the-Vale Stanford-in-the-Vale 20,000 374,000 1,153,534 1,137,731 1,107,927 1,100,124 1,082,320 1,064,517 1,046,713 1,028,910 35% Affordable Alternative Value North of Abingdon 1,000,124 1,082,320 1,066,713 1,028,910 Abingdon and Oxford Fringe E <th colspan="4</td> <td>1,011,106 993,303 £160 £180 501,996 487,343 982,021 954,007 1,727,523 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,297,541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004</td> <td>80 £200 43 472,689 77 925,992 23 1,797,523 69 1,380,475 21 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 4 208,609</td>	1,011,106 993,303 £160 £180 501,996 487,343 982,021 954,007 1,727,523 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,297,541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004	80 £200 43 472,689 77 925,992 23 1,797,523 69 1,380,475 21 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 4 208,609
35% Affordable Alternative Value Residual Value End	£160 £180 501.996 487.343 982.021 994.007 1,797.523 1,797.623 1,431.663 1,406.069 1,132.327 1,110.421 1,227.541 1,272.738 235.399 222.004	80 £200 43 472,689 07 925,982 31,797,523 69 1,380,475 21 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 9 4 208,609
Alternative Use Value Valability Preshold Residual Value Residual Residual Use Value Use Value E20 £40 £60 £100 £120 £100 North of Abingdon ad Oxford Fringe E0 £20 £40 £60 £80 £100 £120 £100 North of Abingdon Abingdon 20,000 374,000 619,226 604,573 589,919 575,265 560,611 545,958 531,304 516,650 North Vest of Abingdon 20,000 374,000 1,797,523 </td <td>£160 £180 501,996 487,343 982,021 954,007 1,797,523 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,297,541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004</td> <td>80 £200 43 472,689 07 925,992 31,797,523 69 1,380,475 21 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 04 208,609</td>	£160 £180 501,996 487,343 982,021 954,007 1,797,523 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,297,541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004	80 £200 43 472,689 07 925,992 31,797,523 69 1,380,475 21 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 04 208,609
Observation Constraint Constraint <thconstraint< th=""> Constraint Constra</thconstraint<>	£160 £180 501,996 487,343 982,021 954,007 1,797,523 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,297,541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004	80 £200 43 472,689 07 925,992 23 1,797,523 69 1,380,475 21 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 04 208,609
Abingdon	501,996 487,343 982,021 954,007 1,797,523 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,297,541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004	43 472,689 07 925,992 23 1,797,523 69 1,380,475 21 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 04 208,609
North Valingdon 20/001 3/4,000 6/9,2/9 3/9,3/3 5/9,2/9 5/9,2/3 3/9,3/3 5/9,2/9 5/9,2/3 1/97,5/23 1/9	901,996 467,343 982,021 954,007 1,797,523 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,297,541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004	43 472,689 07 925,992 23 1,797,523 69 1,380,475 21 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 04 208,609
3 South of East Hanney East Hanney 20,000 374,000 1797,523 1,797,523 <th< td=""><td>1,797,523 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,297,541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004</td><td>23 1,797,523 69 1,380,475 21 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 04 208,609</td></th<>	1,797,523 1,797,523 1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,297,541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004	23 1,797,523 69 1,380,475 21 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 04 208,609
4 Kingston Bagpuze with SouthingEast of Kingston Bagpuze 20,000 374,000 1,654,471 1,548,291 1,559,634 1,534,040 1,508,446 1,452,252 1,457,257 5 North-West of Radiey Radiey 20,000 374,000 1,405,696 1,421,557 1,339,674 1,371,951 1,176,133 1,176,133 1,176,133 1,154,233 6 South of Kennington Radiey 20,000 374,000 1,495,966 1,471,163 1,446,360 1,421,557 1,339,674 1,371,951 1,347,148 1,322,344 7 Monks Farm Grove 20,000 374,000 342,395 329,164 315,769 302,374 288,979 275,584 262,189 248,794 9 Crab Hill Wantage 20,000 374,000 313,004 298,873 284,662 270,451 256,239 242,028 227,817 213,606 9 Crab Hill Wantage 20,000 374,000 559,930 548,956 537,920 526,883 515,847 504,810 <td< td=""><td>1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,297,541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004</td><td>69 1,380,475 21 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 04 208,609</td></td<>	1,431,663 1,406,069 1,132,327 1,110,421 1,297,541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004	69 1,380,475 21 1,088,516 38 1,247,935 04 208,609
6 South of Kennington Radley 20,000 374,000 1,495,966 1,471,163 1,446,360 1,421,557 1,336,754 1,371,951 1,347,148 1,322,344 7 Monks Farm Grove 20,000 374,000 342,395 329,164 315,769 302,374 288,979 275,584 262,189 248,794 9 Crab Hill Wantage 20,000 374,000 313,084 298,873 284,662 270,451 256,239 242,028 227,817 213,606 9 Crab Hill Wantage 20,000 374,000 354,093 254,865 537,920 526,883 515,847 504,810 493,774 482,737 10 Valley Park Harwell and Miton Parisht 20,000 374,000 559,930 548,966 537,920 526,883 515,847 504,810 493,774 482,737 11 North-West of Valley Park Harwell and Miton Parisht 20,000 374,000 103,3459 10,33,377 10,33,277 403,377 493,774 <t< td=""><td>1,297,541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004</td><td>38 1,247,935 04 208,609</td></t<>	1,297,541 1,272,738 235,399 222,004	38 1,247,935 04 208,609
Science Vale West Control Science Vale West Science	235,399 222,004	04 208,609
Drothes Family Diobe 200x80 374,000	200,000 222,004	200,009
South East Vale Image: Constraint of Constrain	199,395 185,183	83 170,972
ID Valley Park Harwell and Mitton Parishe 20,000 374,000 593,930 552,930 526,883 515,847 514,810 482,737 11 North-West of Valley Park Harwell and Mitton Parishe 20,000 374,000 1,053,459 1,033,377 1,013,296 993,214 973,133 952,888 932,446 912,003 12 East Harwell Campus Harwell Campus 20,000 374,000 627,853 614,604 601,354 588,105 561,606 548,356 535,107		
12 East Harwell Campus Harwell Campus 20,000 374,000 627,853 614,604 601,354 588,105 574,855 561,606 548,356 535,107	4/1,/01 460,664 891,561 871,119	64 449,628 19 850.676
	521,857 508,608	08 495,309
13 North-West of Harvell Campus Harvell Campus 20,000 374,000 1 476,322 1,393,332 1,363,343 1,333,353 1,303,353 1,273,373 1,243,383 1,213,333 1,323,353 1,213,333 1,21	1,183,403 1,153,414	14 1,123,424 66 1,488,685
Decision optimized Decisio	1,243,899 1,217,778	78 1,191,658
15 Miton Heights Miton Parish west of the 20,000 374,000 1,422,504 1,397,045 1,371,586 1,346,127 1,320,668 1,295,209 1,269,750 1,244,291	1,218,832 1,192,968	68 1,167,047
16 East of Coxwell Road Faringdon Faringdon 20,000 374,000 915,094 887,079 859,065 831,050 802,991 774,339 745,687 717,036	688,384 659,732	32 631,080
17 Land South of Park Road Faringdon 20,000 374,000 443,266 430,101 416,697 403,292 389,888 376,483 363,079 349,675	336,270 322,866	66 309,461
18 South-West of Faringdon Great Coxwell Parish 20,000 374,000 989,212 077,800 009,214 054,995 013,300 591,003 509,771 947,873	300,113 287,621	21 275,130
20 North of Shrivenham Shrivenham 20,000 374,000 672,468 656,078 639,688 623,299 606,909 590,519 574,129 557,458	540,725 523,993	93 507,260
21 West of Stantord-in-the-Vale Stantord-in-the-Vale 20,000 3/4,000 1,230,701 1,211,414 1,192,127 1,172,840 1,153,553 1,134,266 1,114,9/3 1,055,652 2,000 3/4,000 1,230,701 1,211,414 1,192,127 1,172,840 1,153,553 1,134,266 1,114,9/3 1,055,652 2,000 3/4,000 1,230,701 1,211,414 1,192,127 1,172,840 1,153,553 1,134,266 1,114,9/3 1,055,652 2,000 3/4,000 1,230,701 1,211,414 1,192,127 1,172,840 1,153,553 1,134,266 1,114,9/3 1,055,652 2,000 3/4,000 1,230,701 1,211,414 1,192,127 1,172,840 1,153,553 1,134,266 1,114,9/3 1,055,652 1,153,553 1,153,553 1,154,266 1,114,9/3 1,055,652 1,154,155 1,155 1,	1,076,405 1,057,118	18 1,037,831
S0 /o Altorudule		_
Use Value Threshold Value		
£0 £20 £40 £60 £80 £100 £120 £140	£160 £180	80 £200
1 North of Abingdon Abingdon Abingdon 20,000 374,000 672,711 656,930 641,149 625,368 609,587 593,806 578,025 562,244	546,463 530,682	82 514,901
2 North-West of Abingdon Abingdon 20,000 374,000 1309,695 1,279,526 1,249,356 1,219,187 1,189,017 1,158,484 1,128,678 1,098,509 -	1,068,339 1,038,170	70 1,008,001
3 30001 0F 243 Frailiney East Fraininey 20,000 3/4,000 1,739,700 1,309,000 1	1,518,275 1,490,712	12 1,463,149
5 North-West of Radley Radley 20,000 374,000 1,336,161 1,372,814 1,349,223 1,325,633 1,302,042 1,278,451 1,254,860 1,231,269	1,207,678 1,184,088	88 1,160,497
o Solum of Kennington [Kataley 20,000 3/4,000 1,597,128 1,570,417 1,545,706 1,516,995 1,490,284 1,465,573 1,436,662 1,410,151	1,383,440 1,356,729	29 1,330,018
7 Monks Farm Grove 20,000 342,000 382,441 388,332 354,223 339,953 325,527 311,102 296,676 282,251	267,825 253,400	00 238,975
9 Crab-Hill Wantage 20,000 374,000 355,702 340,628 325,323 310,019 294,715 279,410 264,106 248,801 South East Vale	233,497 218,193	93 202,888
10 Valley Park Harwell and Miton Parish 20,000 374,000 600,409 588,692 576,976 565,111 553,225 541,340 529,454 517,569	505,683 493,798	98 481,912
11 North-West of Valley Park Harvell and Miton Parishe 20,000 374,000 1128.877 1,107.250 1,085.624 1,063.998 1,042.371 1,020.745 999,119 977,146 12 26 24 1990 26 14 199 26 14 1	955,131 933,116	16 911,101
12 local terms desinged in the desinged and the desing of	1,272,820 1,240,523	23 1,208,226
13 [East of Sutton Courtenay 20,000] 374,000] 1877,286 1,847,388 1,817,450 1,787,533 1,757,615 1,727,697 1,697,780 1,667,852	1,637,944 1,608,027	27 1,578,109
1** yrvesi ur nei weni (Franken) 20,000 374,000 1,546,342 1,527,1292 1,493,152 1,495,052 1,456,902 1,408,772 1,380,642 1,352,512 1,55 (2010) 1,55 (201	1,324,382 1,296,252	95 1,268,122
Western Vale		
To: Least of Lowwell Koad + Faringdon 20,000 374,000 1,001,566 971,426 941,257 911,088 880,918 850,749 820,255 789,400 17. Land South of Park Road Faringdon 20,000 374,000 402,9356 971,426 941,257 911,088 880,918 850,749 820,255 789,400 17. Land South of Park Road Faringdon 20,000 374,000 482,9356 974,426 941,257 911,088 880,918 850,749 820,255 789,400	758,544 727,688	88 696,832
12 South-West of Faringdon Faringdon 20,000 374,000 765,307 742,255 719,203 666,151 673,099 650,47 626,747 633,171	579,594 556,017	17 532,441
19 South of Faringdon Great Coxwell Parish 20,000 374,000 436,663 423,510 410,357 397,204 384,051 370,809 357,605 344,152 00 Neth of Shiraphane \$20,000 374,000 370,663 423,510 410,357 397,204 384,051 370,809 357,605 344,152	330,700 317,248	48 303,796
CV Decardo Sumericanian Dimensional Control - Contro	1,141,703 1,120,932	32 1,100,162

.

Source: Table 10.10, VOWH Local Plan Viability Study. (HDH 2014)

3.11 The above appraisals include the s106 contributions set out above. These are the costs that would meet the post-April 2015 restrictions on the pooling of s106 and s278 contributions. As noted in the Local Plan Viability Study, these strategic sites put significant further pressure on the infrastructure and additional improvements will be required that will not be sufficiently site specific to pass the tests for payments to be required through the s106 and s278 regimes.

These further items will be funded through a range of other sources including CIL so it will be necessary to apply CIL to the Strategic Sites as well as to general development.

- 3.12 As would be expected, as the amount of affordable housing is reduced, the Residual Value increases. Similarly as the amount of developer contribution increases, the Residual Value is reduced.
- 3.13 The two large sites in the Science Vale West area, being the Monks Farm and Crab Hill sites, are shown as being unviable when considered on a gross area basis. Both, however, generate a Residual Value of over £600,000/ net ha. This suggests that these sites will come forward and to bear the infrastructure and mitigation costs. We understand that the ongoing discussions with the promoters of the Crab Hill site are nearing completion and consent is expected to be granted with between 30% and 40% affordable housing. With the affordable housing requirement lowered to 30%, under our modelling approach these sites would not be able to bear further developer contributions over and above the site specific contributions set out above. As noted previously our assumptions on costs and values are both generalised and err on the cautious side. Sites we find to be of marginal viability under this study approach, may well be viable based on the use of actual, site specific costs and values known to the developer. Neither of these sites have scope to bear CIL.
- 3.14 Site 19 to the South of Faringdon in Great Coxwell Parish is shown as unviable with 40% affordable housing on a gross basis. The site is viable with 35% affordable housing before developer contributions are considered, however the total site area is over 18ha but the net area is just 5.7ha or so. The Residual Value per net ha is well over £1,000,000 so this site can be considered deliverable and to bear CIL.
- 3.15 The test for the Local Plan examination is whether the cumulative impact of the policies in the Plan puts the Development Plan at serious risk. It is not a requirement that each and every policy can be delivered in full on all sites. Most sites must be able to bear the Council's policy burden so that site by site viability testing at the development management stage is the exception rather than the rule. Based on the above we confirmed in the Local Plan Viability Study that the cumulative impact of the policies, including the 40% affordable housing and the site specific s106 costs, but excluding further infrastructure contributions, does not put the strategic sites at *serious risk*. We highlighted our concern that as the level of additional contribution increases, the Residual Value falls significantly reducing the cushion or margin by which the Residual Value exceeds the Viability Threshold and recommended that, bearing in mind the levels of infrastructure funding required, we would recommend that the Council move to the lower level of affordable housing of 35%. The Council have followed this advice.
- 3.16 This change does not bring more sites into viability, but does increase the cushion or margin between the Viability Threshold and the Residual Value and allow developer contributions in the range of £80/m² to £140m² to be considered without prejudicing viability.
- 3.17 The following three tables set out similar analysis for the modelled sites (the SHLAA sites and the smaller sites), each for 30%, 35% and 40% affordable housing.

18	IDIE 3.2 RE	SIGUa	aivai s 109		ordał	red to	o viar	ollity a Cli	Inres	snola: n² to	s, fui £200/	P0 /m²	су	
	Nequire		3, 40		orual		Jusin	y, ci	L 20/1		2200	111		
SHLAA Settlem	ent - 40% Afforda	able												
		Alternative	Viability	Residual										
		Use Value	Threshold	Value										
-				£0	£20	£40	£60	£80	£100	£120	£140	£160	£180	£200
1 - Small	Higher Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	2,004,709	1,963,111	1,921,513	1,846,398	1,804,800	1,763,202	1,755,122	1,713,524	1,671,927	1,630,329	1,588,731
2 - Medium	Higher Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1,398,026	1,368,274	1,338,522	1,285,836	1,256,084	1,226,332	1,219,512	1,189,760	1,160,007	1,130,255	1,100,503
3 - Medium Flood	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1,126,285	1,100,814	1,075,344	1,030,211	1,004,741	979,270	973,462	947,991	922,520	897,050	871,579
4 - Larger	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1,285,063	1,255,602	1,226,141	1,174,164	1,144,703	1,115,242	1,108,299	1,078,838	1,049,377	1,019,917	990,456
5 - Large	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1,305,305	1,275,904	1,246,502	1,194,368	1,164,967	1,135,566	1,128,897	1,099,496	1,070,095	1,040,693	1,011,292
6 - Medium Density	Higher Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1,915,364	1,872,570	1,829,776	1,753,513	1,710,719	1,667,925	1,658,601	1,615,807	1,573,013	1,530,219	1,487,425
7 - Medium Sensitive	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1,284,691	1,255,481	1,226,271	1,174,173	1,144,963	1,115,753	1,109,432	1,080,222	1,051,012	1,021,803	992,593
8 - Part Brownfield	Higher Main Settlement	75,000	440,000	998,997	969,435	939,874	884,572	855,010	825,449	821,627	792,066	762,504	732,942	703,381
1 - Small	Lower Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1,190,381	1,153,115	1,115,849	1,047,415	1,010,148	972,882	966,784	929,518	892,251	854,985	825,470
2 - Medium	Lower Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	947,072	917,320	887,567	834,882	805,130	775,377	768,558	738,806	709,053	679,301	649,548
3 - Medium Flood	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	739,790	714,319	688,849	643,716	618,246	592,775	586,967	561,496	536,026	510,555	485,084
4 - Larger	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	843,015	813,554	784,093	732,116	702,655	673,195	666,251	636,790	607,329	577,869	548,408
5 - Large	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	858,552	829,151	799,749	747,615	718,214	688,813	682,144	652,743	623,342	593,940	564,539
6 - Medium Density	Lower Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1,256,610	1,213,816	1,171,022	1,094,759	1,051,965	1,009,171	999,846	957,052	914,258	871,464	828,670
7 - Medium Sensitive	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	834,747	805,537	776,327	724,229	695,019	665,809	659,488	630,278	601,068	571,859	542,649
8 - Part Brownfield	Lower Main Settlement	75,000	440,000	547,369	517,807	488,246	432,929	403,368	373,806	369,999	340,437	313,822	283,981	254,139
	10% Affordable													
SHLAA KUI di - 4	+0% Altoruable	Alternative	Viability											
		Lise Value	Threshold											
		ose value	meshold	f0	£20	£40	£60	f80	£100	f120	£140	£160	£180	£200
1 - Small	Higher Main Settlement	50.000	410 000	2 333 750	2 292 153	2 250 555	2 208 957	2 167 359	2 125 761	2 084 163	2 042 566	2 000 968	1 959 370	1 917 772
2 - Medium	Higher Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1 623 503	1 593 751	1 563 999	1 534 246	1 504 494	1 474 742	1 444 989	1 415 237	1 385 485	1 355 732	1 325 980
3 - Medium Flood	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374 000	1 319 532	1 294 062	1 268 591	1 243 121	1 217 650	1 192 180	1 166 709	1 141 239	1 115 768	1 090 297	1 064 827
4 - Larger	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1 506 086	1 476 626	1 447 165	1 417 704	1 388 244	1 358 783	1 329 322	1 299 862	1 270 401	1 240 941	1 211 480
5 - Large	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1 528 682	1 /100 280	1 /69 879	1 440 478	1 /11 076	1 381 675	1 352 274	1 322 873	1 203 /71	1 264 070	1 234 669
6 - Medium Density	Higher Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	2 244 742	2 201 948	2 159 154	2 116 360	2 073 566	2 030 772	1 087 078	1 9/15 18/	1,200,471	1,204,070	1,234,003
7 - Medium Sensitive	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374.000	1 509 663	1 /180 /153	1 451 243	1 422 034	1 302 824	1 363 614	1 334 404	1 305 194	1 275 984	1 246 775	1 217 565
8 - Part Brownfield	Higher Main Settlement	75,000	440.000	1 224 742	1 195 180	1 165 619	1 136 057	1 106 495	1 076 934	1 047 372	1 017 811	988 249	958 687	929 126
1 - Small	Lower Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1 675 668	1,634,070	1 592 472	1 550 874	1 509 277	1 /67 679	1 426 081	1 384 483	1 3//2 885	1 301 287	1 259 690
2 - Medium	Lower Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1 172 549	1 142 797	1 113 044	1 083 292	1 053 540	1 023 787	994 035	964 283	934 530	904 778	875.026
3 - Medium Flood	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	374.000	033 038	907 567	882.096	856 626	831 155	805 685	780 214	754 744	729 273	703 802	678 332
A - Larger	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1 064 039	1 034 578	1 005 117	975 657	946 196	916 735	887 275	857 814	828 353	708,802	769.432
5 - Large	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1 021 022	1 052 527	1,003,117	003 725	964 323	03/ 077	905 521	876 120	8/6 718	817 317	787.916
6 - Medium Density	Lower Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1 585 987	1 543 193	1 500 399	1 457 605	1 414 811	1 372 017	1 329 223	1 286 429	1 243 635	1 200 841	1 158 047
7 - Medium Sensitive	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	374.000	1 050 710	1 030 500	1 001 200	972 000	0/2 880	913 670	884.460	855 250	826.040	706 831	767 621
8 - Part Brownfield	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	440.000	773,205	743.643	714.082	684,520	654,958	625,397	595,835	566.274	536,712	507,150	477.589
-		,	,		,	,		,					,	,
Small Sites - 40	% Affordable													
		Alternative	Viability	Residual										
		Use Value	Threshold	Value										
				£0	£20	£40	£60	£80	£100	£120	£140	£160	£180	£200
Single Rural	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	2,899,119	2,842,791	2,786,463	2,730,134	2,673,806	2,617,478	2,528,394	2,504,821	2,472,616	2,415,733	2,358,849
Three Rural	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	1,851,491	1,819,572	1,787,653	1,755,733	1,723,814	1,691,895	1,631,272	1,628,056	1,596,136	1,564,217	1,532,298
Five Rural	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	2,571,649	2,524,777	2,500,000	2,454,296	2,406,975	2,359,654	2,285,686	2,265,013	2,217,692	2,170,371	2,123,050
Seven Rural	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	1,902,294	1,870,494	1,838,694	1,806,895	1,775,095	1,743,296	1,685,068	1,679,696	1,647,897	1,616,097	1,584,298
Single Rural	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	2,183,254	2,126,370	2,069,487	2,012,604	1,955,721	1,898,837	1,808,876	1,785,071	1,728,187	1,671,304	1,614,421
Three Rural	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	1,301,505	1,269,586	1,249,860	1,217,626	1,185,392	1,153,159	1,091,939	1,088,691	1,056,457	1,024,223	991,989
Five Rural	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	1,242,203	1,213,256	1,184,310	1,155,363	1,126,417	1,097,470	1,044,137	1,039,577	1,010,631	981,684	952,738
Seven Rural	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	1,386,269	1,354,470	1,322,670	1,290,871	1,259,071	1,227,271	1,169,043	1,163,672	1,131,873	1,100,073	1,068,273
Pair Urban	Higher Main Settlement	750.000	900.000	3,211.075	3,131,799	3,052.522	2,973.245	2,893.968	2,814.691	2,683.692	2,656.137	2,576.860	2,500.000	2,442.132
2 Semi Urban	Higher Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	2,022,746	1,975,180	1,927,614	1,880,048	1,832,482	1,784,915	1,689,538	1,689,783	1,642,217	1,594,651	1,547,085
Urban infill	Higher Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	1.734,949	1.694.865	1.654.782	1.614.698	1.574,615	1.534.531	1.470.588	1,470,588	1,441,876	1,401,011	1.360.145
Terraces	Higher Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	1.660,168	1.621.861	1.583.554	1.545.247	1.506,941	1,468,634	1.396.375	1.392.020	1.353.713	1.315,406	1.277.100
Pair Urban	Lower Main Settlement	750.000	900.000	2,633.218	2,540.589	2,472.078	2,378.537	2,284,995	2,191.454	2,036.884	2,004.371	1,910.830	1,817.288	1,723.747
2 Semi Urban	Lower Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	1,215,766	1.167.731	1.119.697	1.071.662	1.023,627	975,592	879,276	879,523	831,488	783,453	735,418
Urban infill	Lower Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	1.092,993	1.052,128	1.011.262	970,396	929,531	888,665	808,962	806,934	766,068	732,347	691.079
-		,500	222,000	-,,555	-,,120	2,022,202	2.2,550	020,001	222,505	000,002		,		

idu al Valı d to Viability . . ~ ~ -----. _

Source: Table 10.11, VOWH Local Plan Viability Study. (HDH 2014)

SHLAA settlement 33% AffordureInterm LevineNorm Levine	Table 3.3	Residual	Value 35%	com Affor	parec dable	l to V Hou	iabilit sing,	CIL £	resho 0/m² i	to £2	-ull P 00/m ²		Requ	irem	ents,
Alternative Use Value Value Mark	SHLAA Settlem	ent 35% Afforda	ble												
Image: Second			Alternative	Viability	Residual										
b-and page two settement 300 400 700 400 700 400 700 400 700 400 700 400 700 400 700 1000 7000 7000 7000 7000 7000 7000 7000 7000 7000 7000 7000 7000 <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>Use Value</td><td>Threshold</td><td>Value</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>			Use Value	Threshold	Value										
Lisual Physic Physical Physical <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>£0</td><td>£20</td><td>£40</td><td>£60</td><td>£80</td><td>£100</td><td>£120</td><td>£140</td><td>£160</td><td>£180</td><td>£200</td></th<>					£0	£20	£40	£60	£80	£100	£120	£140	£160	£180	£200
Deck Deck <thdeck< th=""> Deck Deck <thd< td=""><td>1 - Small</td><td>Higher Main Settlement</td><td>50,000</td><td>410,000</td><td>2,152,839</td><td>2,107,775</td><td>2,062,710</td><td>2,017,646</td><td>1,972,582</td><td>1,927,518</td><td>1,882,453</td><td>1,837,389</td><td>1,792,325</td><td>1,747,260</td><td>1,702,196</td></thd<></thdeck<>	1 - Small	Higher Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	2,152,839	2,107,775	2,062,710	2,017,646	1,972,582	1,927,518	1,882,453	1,837,389	1,792,325	1,747,260	1,702,196
Linger Might Man Settlement South 244.00 1383.00 1283.00	2 - Medium Flood	Higher Main Settlement	50,000	274 000	1,499,402	1,467,170	1,434,938	1,402,706	1,3/0,4/5	1,338,243	1,306,011	1,2/3,/80	1,241,548	1,209,316	026 021
- Logics Higher Man Settlement 20,00 24,000 1,040,00 1,052,00 1,050,00 1,052,00 1,052,00 1,252,00	4 - Larger	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1.383.002	1,351.087	1,130,700	1,129,173	1,101,380	1,073,387	1,191,508	1,018,800	1.127.677	1.095.761	1.063.845
br	5 - Large	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1,404,243	1,372,392	1,340,540	1,308,689	1,276,838	1,244,986	1,213,135	1,181,283	1,149,432	1.117.581	1,085,729
P-Method Negler Main Settlement 20.000 138.378 13.278 1.278.00 1.278.20 1.312.20 <td>6 - Medium Density</td> <td>Higher Main Settlement</td> <td>50,000</td> <td>410,000</td> <td>2,061,530</td> <td>2,015,170</td> <td>1,968,810</td> <td>1,922,450</td> <td>1,876,090</td> <td>1,829,729</td> <td>1,783,369</td> <td>1,737,009</td> <td>1,690,649</td> <td>1,644,289</td> <td>1,597,929</td>	6 - Medium Density	Higher Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	2,061,530	2,015,170	1,968,810	1,922,450	1,876,090	1,829,729	1,783,369	1,737,009	1,690,649	1,644,289	1,597,929
bit bit <td>7 - Medium Sensitive</td> <td>Higher Main Settlement</td> <td>20,000</td> <td>374,000</td> <td>1,384,378</td> <td>1,352,734</td> <td>1,321,090</td> <td>1,289,446</td> <td>1,257,802</td> <td>1,226,158</td> <td>1,194,514</td> <td>1,162,870</td> <td>1,131,226</td> <td>1,099,582</td> <td>1,067,938</td>	7 - Medium Sensitive	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1,384,378	1,352,734	1,321,090	1,289,446	1,257,802	1,226,158	1,194,514	1,162,870	1,131,226	1,099,582	1,067,938
1.5-mail Lower Main Settlement 50,00 41,00,00 1,43,16 1,26,2016 1,99,502 1,54,877 1,00,969 2Medium Frod Lower Main Settlement 20,00 74,000 81,248 72,448 1,00,269 72,448 1,00,269 72,248 1,00,269 72,248 1,00,269 72,248 1,00,269 72,248 1,00,269 72,248 1,00,269 72,248 1,00,269 72,248 1,00,269 72,248 1,00,269 72,248 1,00,269 72,248 1,00,269 72,248 1,00,269 72,249 72,00,49 72,000	8 - Part Brownfield	Higher Main Settlement	75,000	440,000	1,095,115	1,063,090	1,031,065	999,040	967,015	934,990	902,965	870,940	838,915	806,889	774,864
2:-Medium Lower Main Settlement 5000 41.020 700.460 695.71 697.640 687.640 688.647 800.645 750.640 780.640	1 - Small	Lower Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1,470,337	1,425,273	1,380,209	1,335,145	1,290,080	1,245,016	1,199,952	1,154,887	1,109,823	1,064,759	1,019,694
1: Medium Trood Lower Main Settlement 20.00 91,400 95,420 97,420 95,440 95,420 95,440 75,420 45,420 45,420 45,420 45,420 45,420 45,420 45,420 45,420 45,420 45,420 45,420 45,420 45,420 45,420 45,420 </td <td>2 - Medium</td> <td>Lower Main Settlement</td> <td>50,000</td> <td>410,000</td> <td>1,031,807</td> <td>999,576</td> <td>967,344</td> <td>935,112</td> <td>902,880</td> <td>870,649</td> <td>838,417</td> <td>806,185</td> <td>773,954</td> <td>741,722</td> <td>709,490</td>	2 - Medium	Lower Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1,031,807	999,576	967,344	935,112	902,880	870,649	838,417	806,185	773,954	741,722	709,490
Linger Diver Value Stationent 20.00 32.400	3 - Medium Flood	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	811,216	/83,623	/56,030	/28,436	700,843	6/3,250	645,657	618,064	590,471	562,878	535,285
Statum Density Door Hean Settlement 3000 410000 1278.68 1232.08	4 - Larger	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	924,659	892,743	860,828	828,912 945 514	796,996 912 662	701 012	733,105	701,249	696 257	654 406	605,502
Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""></thdescription<></thdescription<>	6 - Medium Density	Lower Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1 378 468	1 332 108	1 285 748	1 239 388	1 193 027	1 146 667	1 100 307	1 053 947	1 007 587	961 227	914 867
j. Part Brownfield werr Mein Settlement 75,000 440,000 626,885 984,293 542,783 446,728 943,793 460,278 940,278 930,651 330,678 930,593 SHLAA Rural 35% Affordable Alternative Uvalue Value Value 62,033 2,330,778 498,793 446,728 943,793 460,278 930,651 330,678 930,651 330,678 930,651 330,678 930,651 330,678 930,651 330,678 930,651 930,651 930,651 930,678 930,651 930,	7 - Medium Sensitive	Lower Main Settlement	20.000	374.000	917.865	886.221	854.577	822,933	791,289	759.645	728.001	696,357	664,713	633.069	601,425
SHLAA Rural 35% Affordable Image: Second Secon	8 - Part Brownfield	Lower Main Settlement	75,000	440,000	626,854	594,829	562,803	530,778	498,753	466,728	434,703	402,678	370,653	338,628	309,509
SHLAA Rural 35% Affordable Alternative Viability Residual Viability Residual Viability Residual (Viability) Residual (Viability) <thresidual (Viability) Residual (Viability)</thresidual 															
Alternative Use Viability Viability Residual Viability No. Field Field <td>SHLAA Rural 35</td> <td>5% Affordable</td> <td></td>	SHLAA Rural 35	5% Affordable													
Image Use Value Image Image <thimage< th=""></thimage<>			Alternative	Viability	Residual										
i col			Use Value	Threshold	Value										
1 - Small Higher Rural 50.00 410,000 2,449,000 2,449,000 2,438,687 2,318,887 2,318,887 2,318,887 2,318,887 2,318,887 2,318,887 2,318,887 2,318,887 2,318,887 2,318,887 2,318,887 2,358,84 1,440,881 3 - Medium Flood Higher Rural 20,000 374,000 1,412,320 1,384,827 1,358,485 1,446,511 445,551 442,672 1,219,169 1,491,557 1,163,582 1,383,487 1,358,484 1,321,321 1,338,476 1,356,484 1,329,017 1,338,476 1,356,484 1,323,101 1,449,418 1,323,501 1,349,485 1,323,301 1,349,485 1,323,301 1,348,485 1,345,484 1,322,381 1,339,460 1,333,481 1,356,321 1,233,111 1,306,321 1,364,482 1,332,381 1,303,481 1,339,460 1,323,381 1,303,481 1,435,471 1,440,400 1,323,311 1,306,321 1,434,414 1,427,071 1,306,321 1,434,414 1,427,071 1,306,321 1,304,341 1,400,301 1,300,391					£0	£20	£40	£60	£80	£100	£120	£140	£160	£180	£200
2- Medium Higher Rural 500.00 440,000 1,733,199 1,720,407 1,568,298 1,604,272 1,572,400 1,592,580 1,207,571 1,475,345 1,443,113 1,410,881 3- Medium Therard 20,000 374,000 1,612,174 1,580,288 1,582,581 1,485,515 1,445,555 1,445,555 1,445,555 1,445,515 1,442,671 1,810,191 1,431,313 1,327,317 6- Medium Density Higher Rural 50,000 410,000 2,430,061 2,555,001 2,308,482 2,717,621 2,142,671 1,810,195 1,838,784 1,327,317 7- Medium Sensitive Higher Rural 50,000 440,000 1,323,190 1,263,164 1,427,000 1,803,184 1,427,201 1,466,131 1,456,144 1,320,193 1- small Lower Rural 50,000 440,000 1,323,190 1,765,244 1,723,481 1,400,51 1,603,741 1,475,348 1,427,71 1,461,314 1,580,471 1,460,314 1,403,934 1,300,195 1- small Lower Rural 5	1 - Small	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	2,494,090	2,449,026	2,403,961	2,358,897	2,313,833	2,268,768	2,223,704	2,178,640	2,133,575	2,088,511	2,043,447
3- Medium Flood Higher Rural 20.000 374,000 1,412,300 1,882,721 1,382,541 1,382,541 1,382,541 1,382,541 1,382,541 1,382,541 1,382,541 1,385,361 1,383,389 5- Large Higher Rural 20,000 374,000 1,653,583 1,653,597 1,572,128 1,248,501 1,444,722 1,412,370 1,383,109 6- Medium Genetive Higher Rural 20,000 374,000 1,373,163 1,255,361 1,233,031 2,236,202 1,713,61 2,142,900 1,716,51 2,142,900 1,705,163 1,455,208 1,733,461 1,233,10	2 - Medium	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	1,733,199	1,700,967	1,668,735	1,636,504	1,604,272	1,572,040	1,539,808	1,507,577	1,475,345	1,443,113	1,410,881
- Ingler Higher Kural 20,000 34,000 1,012,174 1,500,288 1,540,239 1,420,088 1,820,598 1,420,088 1,820,593 1,520,301 6 - Medium Censity Higher Kural 50,000 410,000 2,400,081 2,555,364 1,522,128 1,500,256 1,420,580 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,420,581 1,4	3 - Medium Flood	Higher Rural	20,000	374,000	1,412,320	1,384,727	1,357,134	1,329,541	1,301,948	1,274,355	1,246,762	1,219,169	1,191,575	1,163,982	1,136,389
p- Large magner Rural 2000 374,000 L382,331 L392,121 L392,124 L396,235 L397,231 L392,121 L393,460 7 - Medium Bensity Higher Rural 20,000 374,000 L617,634 L585,956 L525,346 L237,621 L217,621 L217,621 L217,620 L276,621 L396,126 L393,460 7 - Medium Sensitive Higher Rural 20,000 440,000 L391,321 L255,164 L333,131 L366,05 L1,370,40 L1,000,464 L008,639 1 - Small Lower Rural 50,000 440,000 L381,681 L201,114 L168,905 L1,373,31 L366,251 L1,312,314 L486,275 L431,201,441 L486,205 L432,214 L039,826 L007,513 P343,287 3 - Medium Flood Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 L135,673 L044,610,253 L073,518 P432,29 P33,669 P31,845,885,939 R54,742 L394,118 L392,525 L364,625 L384,82 P30,845,885,898 R54,624 L394,118 L392,525 L364,625	4 - Larger	Higher Rural	20,000	374,000	1,612,174	1,580,258	1,548,343	1,516,427	1,484,511	1,452,595	1,420,680	1,388,764	1,355,848	1,324,933	1,293,017
7 Medium Sensitive Higher Rural 20000 374,000 1,524,324 1,522,702 1,491,058 1,429,472 1,336,126 1,342,482 1,332,283 1,301,195 8 -Bran Brownfield Higher Rural 75,000 440,000 1,229,196 1,225,104 1,332,185 1,000,005 1,137,040 1,000,014 1,000,094 1,000,954 1,000,005 1,137,040 1,000,014 1,000,004 1,300,945 1,000,954 1,000,005 1,137,040 1,000,014 1,000,005 1,137,040 1,000,014 1,000,005 1,137,040 1,000,014 1,400,000 1,300,945 1,000,005 1,137,040 1,000,014 1,400,005 1,137,040 1,000,014 1,000,937 1,300,945 1,000,937 1,300,945 1,000,937 1,300,945 1,000,937 1,300,945 1,000,937 1,301,930 911,547 940,237 1,010,919 1,673,631 1,627,272 1,580,910 1,013,393 1,017,101 1,045,256 991,597 990,616 913,457 855,936 854,122 7000 851,122 640,000	5 - Large 6 - Medium Density	Higher Rural	20,000	410,000	2 403 061	2 356 701	2 310 341	2 263 981	2 217 621	2 171 261	2 124 900	2 078 540	2 032 180	1,549,108	1,317,317
B Part Brownfield Higher Rural 75,000 440,000 1,329,190 1,297,165 1,283,115 1,201,000 1,115,014 1,105,014 1,072,289 1,040,964 1,080,939 1 - Small Lower Rural 50,000 410,000 1,815,88 1,765,524 1,721,40 1,650,954 1,023,416 1,650,954 1,023,416 1,650,954 1,023,416 1,650,954 1,023,416 1,650,954 1,023,416 1,650,954 1,023,415 1,980,954 1,022,416 1,022,416 1,023,982 1,007,248 1,993,921 1,075,328 1,022,416 1,022,447 1,993,921 1,023,939 1,023,246 723,524 723,524 723,548 846,025 1,013,339 981,547 949,966 917,845 855,993 854,142 6 - Medium Density Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,712,999 1,673,633 1,627,273 1,538,194 1,441,838 1,395,478 1,390,788 1,320,784 1,255,384 7 - Medium Bensity Lower Rural 75,000 440,000 828,992 975,797	7 - Medium Sensitive	Higher Rural	20.000	374.000	1.617.634	1,585,990	1,554,346	1.522.702	1.491.058	1.459.414	1.427.770	1.396.126	1.364.482	1,332,838	1,301,195
1met Lower Rural 50,000 410,000 1,811,88 1,721,460 1,676,395 1,731,331 1,386,267 1,411,202 1,496,138 1,410,071 1,406,000 1,800,945 2 - Medium Flood Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,136,678 1,104,446 1,072,214 1,039,982 1,007,751 975,519 943,287 3 - Medium Flood Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,138,478 1,072,121 4,152,50 1,013,998 916,538 928,857 901,212 873,616 846,025 866,589 884,674 5 - Large Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,172,656 1,140,891 1,108,558 1,488,198 1,418,28 1,395,478 1,393,978 855,246 834,674 5 - Large Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,715,299 1,673,639 1,627,279 1,580,191 1,543,58 1,448,198 1,441,818 1,395,478 1,393,478 1,393,478 1,393,478 1,393,478 1,393,478 1,393,478 1,393,416,102 1,102,778 1	8 - Part Brownfield	Higher Rural	75,000	440,000	1,329,190	1,297,165	1,265,140	1,233,115	1,201,090	1,169,065	1,137,040	1,105,014	1,072,989	1,040,964	1,008,939
2-Medium Lower Rural 50,000 41,00,000 1,285,674 1,233,373 1,233,373 1,210,446 1,072,214 1,039,882 1,077,518 975,519 943,287 3-Medium Flood Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,11,584 983,991 956,336 928,805 901,212 873,618 846,025 818,432 790,833 763,246 725,553 943,252 962,336 930,421 898,505 865,588 834,674 5-Irage Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,172,956 1,108,953 1,077,102 1,045,250 1,013,389 981,547 949,696 917,845 885,993 854,142 6-Medium Density Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,151,121 1,119,477 1,087,833 1,065,189 1,024,545 992,902 951,238 929,614 897,970 866,382 636,847 604,822 572,797 540,772 Small Sites - 355% Affordable Lower Rural 75,000 428,998 796,973 764,948 732,923 700,898 668,87	1 - Small	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	1,811,588	1,766,524	1,721,460	1,676,395	1,631,331	1,586,267	1,541,202	1,496,138	1,451,074	1,406,010	1,360,945
B-: Medium Flood Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,1538 983,991 956,388 928,805 901,212 873,618 846,625 818,422 790,389 763,246 783,651 5 - Large Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,172,656 1,440,804 1,005,953 1,071,102 1,045,250 1,013,399 981,547 940,656 917,846 885,993 854,142 6 - Medium Density Lower Rural 20,000 74,000 1,172,856 1,627,279 1,580,915 1,024,545 992,02 951,547 943,666 917,846 885,993 834,628 8 - Part Brownfield Lower Rural 75,000 440,000 861,023 828,998 796,973 764,948 732,923 700,898 668,872 636,847 604,822 572,797 540,772 Small Sites - 35% Affordable Alternative Viability Residual Lower	2 - Medium	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	1,265,604	1,233,373	1,201,141	1,168,909	1,136,678	1,104,446	1,072,214	1,039,982	1,007,751	975,519	943,287
4-Larger Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,172,563 1,142,915 1,068,084 1,026,168 994,252 992,336 930,421 888,505 866,580 834,674 5-Large Lower Rural 50,000 1172,656 1,140,804 1,108,953 1,077,199 1,534,558 1,488,198 1,441,838 1,339,478 1,349,916 1,324,588 834,574 6-Medium Density Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,715,121 1,119,477 1,087,383 1,056,188 1,024,545 992,234 992,514 897,970 866,528 584,622 8- Part Brownfield Lower Rural 75,00 440,000 861,023 828,998 765,973 764,948 732,923 700,898 668,872 636,847 604,822 572,797 540,772 Small Sites - 35% Affordable 764,948 730,394 663,847 640,852 572,797 540,772 Single Rural Higher Rural 50,000	3 - Medium Flood	Lower Rural	20,000	374,000	1,011,584	983,991	956,398	928,805	901,212	873,618	846,025	818,432	790,839	763,246	735,653
5-targe Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,712,656 1,102,801 1,077,102 1,045,250 1,013,399 981,547 949,696 917,845 885,993 885,412 6-Medium Density Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,151,121 1,119,477 1,067,833 1,055,189 1,024,545 992,902 961,258 929,614 887,970 866,326 834,682 8- Part Brownfield Lower Rural 75,000 440,000 861,023 828,998 796,973 764,948 732,923 700,888 666,872 636,847 604,822 572,797 540,7772 Small Sites - 35% Affordable	4 - Larger	Lower Rural	20,000	374,000	1,153,831	1,121,915	1,089,999	1,058,084	1,026,168	994,252	962,336	930,421	898,505	866,589	834,674
6 Medium Density Lower Rural 50,000 410,000 1,719,599 1,533,589 1,583,558 1,488,198 1,438,188 1,395,478 1,349,118 1,302,758 1,256,398 7 Medium Sensitive Lower Rural 70,000 344,0000 1,511,119,477 1,087,383 1,056,189 1,024,545 992,002 952,514 997,970 865,326 343,607 8 Part Brownfield Lower Rural 75,000 440,000 861,023 828,998 796,973 764,948 732,923 700,898 668,872 636,847 604,822 572,797 540,772 Small Sites - 35% Affordable Meternative Viability Residual	5 - Large	Lower Rural	20,000	374,000	1,172,656	1,140,804	1,108,953	1,077,102	1,045,250	1,013,399	981,547	949,696	917,845	885,993	854,142
Image numbers Lower Rural 20,000 374,000 1,151,121 1,119,47,17 1,028,285 392,902 361,258 322,514 897,900 886,225 834,682 8 - Part Brownfield Lower Rural 75,000 440,000 861,023 828,988 796,973 764,948 732,923 700,888 668,872 635,847 604,822 572,797 540,772 Small Sites - 35% Affordable Alternative Viability Residual Control East	6 - Medium Density	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	1,719,999	1,673,639	1,627,279	1,580,919	1,534,558	1,488,198	1,441,838	1,395,478	1,349,118	1,302,758	1,256,398
Be-rate trowmine Duver Rural 73,000 440,000 0.80,22 0.26,535 796,575 796,575 706,546 0.06,852 0.95,647 0.00,852 0.95,647 0.00,852 0.95,647 0.00,852 0.95,647 0.00,852 0.95,647 0.00,852 0.95,647 0.00,852 0.95,647 0.00,852 0.95,647 0.00,852 0.95,647 0.00,852 0.95,647 0.00,852 0.95,647 0.00,856 0.00,857 0.95,647 0.00,856 <th0.00< th=""></th0.00<>	7 - Medium Sensitive	Lower Rural	20,000	3/4,000	1,151,121	1,119,477	1,087,833	1,056,189	1,024,545	992,902	961,258	929,614	897,970	866,326	834,682
Small Sites - 35% Affordable Alternative Use Value Viability Threshold Residual Value Image: Construct of the construction of the const	8 - Part Brownfield	Lower Rurai	75,000	440,000	601,025	626,996	/90,9/3	/04,948	/32,923	700,898	006,672	030,647	004,822	572,797	540,772
Alternative Use Value Viability Threshold Residual Value Residual Value Residual Presidual Residual Presidual Residual Presidual Residual Presidual Residual Presidual Residual Presidual Residual Presidual Residual Presidual Residual Residual<	Small Sites - 35	% Affordable													
Increduct Use Value Threshold Value Increduct Constraint			Alternative	Viability	Residual										
find find <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>Use Value</td><td>Threshold</td><td>Value</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>			Use Value	Threshold	Value										
Single Rural Higher Rural 50,000 410,000 2,899,119 2,842,791 2,786,463 2,730,134 2,673,866 2,617,478 2,561,149 2,504,821 2,472,616 2,435,733 2,452,866 Five Rural Higher Rural 50,000 410,000 2,557,649 2,524,777 2,500,002 1,400,502 1,767,923 1,767,923 1,783,344 1,698,765 1,664,418 1,629,605 Five Rural Higher Rural 50,000 410,000 2,557,649 2,524,777 2,500,002 1,482,503 1,826,726 1,827,842 1,729,977 1,718,282 1,644,421 Three Rural Lower Rural 50,000 410,000 1,324,422 1,339,850 1,421,450 1,143,530 1,108,510 1,073,590 Five Rural Lower Rural 50,000 410,000 1,334,421 1,329,631 1,225,761 1,288,130 1,108,150 1,073,590 1,124,530 1,148,350 1,108,503 1,078,501 1,078,501 1,078,501 1,027,562 1,122,163 1,088,120 1,000,522 2,973,2					£0	£20	£40	£60	£80	£100	£120	£140	£160	£180	£200
Intree Rural Figher Rural 50,000 410,000 1,975,399 1,906,241 1,87,082 1,862,053 1,763,943 1,783,944 1,986,765 1,682,060 Five Rural Higher Rural 50,000 420,000 2,571,649 2,524,777 2,500 2,251,613 2,217,692 2,170,921 2,173,037 2,123,051 Single Rural Higher Rural 50,000 4410,000 2,009,345 1,994,124 1,959,675 1,955,721 1,886,326 1,824,195 1,785,071 1,783,971 1,783,971 1,713,344 1,644,078 Single Rural Lower Rural 50,000 4410,000 1,314,429 1,205,721 1,286,303 1,214,530 1,108,610 1,073,600 Five Rural Lower Rural 50,000 4410,000 1,314,429 1,215,744 1,484,355 1,122,663 1,090,279 1,058,920 1,027,662 2,050,712 1,225,661 1,227,662 1,212,174 1,484,355 1,122,163 1,836,173 1,764,50 1,124,533 1,106,800 1,073,5621 Five Rural <td>Single Rural</td> <td>Higher Rural</td> <td>50,000</td> <td>410,000</td> <td>2,899,119</td> <td>2,842,791</td> <td>2,786,463</td> <td>2,730,134</td> <td>2,673,806</td> <td>2,617,478</td> <td>2,561,149</td> <td>2,504,821</td> <td>2,472,616</td> <td>2,415,733</td> <td>2,358,849</td>	Single Rural	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	2,899,119	2,842,791	2,786,463	2,730,134	2,673,806	2,617,478	2,561,149	2,504,821	2,472,616	2,415,733	2,358,849
International 50,000 41,0000 2,17,163 2,14,032 2,440,253 2,440,253 2,450,253 2,211,033 2,112,033 1,614,421 Three Rural Lower Rural 50,000 410,000 1,313,431 1,320,501 1,221,631 1,213,301 1,178,450 1,413,333 1,005,231 1,433,333 1,005,231 1,433,333 1,005,271 1,221,631 1,334,531 1,409,0279 1,558,920 1,027,566 <td< td=""><td>Five Rural</td><td>Higher Rural</td><td>50,000</td><td>410,000</td><td>2 571 640</td><td>1,940,820</td><td>2,500,000</td><td>2,454,206</td><td>2,406,075</td><td>2 250 654</td><td>1,767,923</td><td>2 265 012</td><td>1,698,765</td><td>1,664,185</td><td>2,122,050</td></td<>	Five Rural	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	2 571 640	1,940,820	2,500,000	2,454,206	2,406,075	2 250 654	1,767,923	2 265 012	1,698,765	1,664,185	2,122,050
Single Rural Jobosov 42,000	Seven Rural	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	2,371,045	1 00/ 12/	2,300,000	1 025 225	2,400,373	1 856 326	1 821 876	1 787 //27	1 752 977	1 718 528	2,123,030
Three Rural Lower Rural 50,000 440,000 1,374,429 1,339,850 1,305,271 1,270,691 1,243,230 1,143,530 1,108,610 1,073,690 Five Rural Lower Rural 50,000 440,000 1,315,481 1,242,722 1,233,985 1,215,714 1,184,355 1,125,626 1,122,133 1,108,610 1,073,690 Five Rural Lower Rural 50,000 440,000 1,315,481 1,284,722 1,253,964 1,225,661 1,225,662 1,228,138 1,183,156 1,493,765 1,493,765 1,493,765 1,493,765 1,493,765 1,493,765 1,493,765 1,493,765 1,493,765 1,287,121 1,225,662 1,227,660 2,500,000 2,442,132 2 seru luban Higher Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,373,971 1,988,723 1,989,713 1,888,633 1,884,433 1,782,603 1,731,073 1,749,748 Urban infill Higher Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,778,903 1,737,971 1,666,667 1,629,292 1,588,430 1,555,841 </td <td>Single Rural</td> <td>Lower Rural</td> <td>50,000</td> <td>410,000</td> <td>2,005,545</td> <td>2,126,370</td> <td>2.069.487</td> <td>2.012.604</td> <td>1,050,773</td> <td>1,898,837</td> <td>1.841.954</td> <td>1,785,071</td> <td>1,728,187</td> <td>1,671,304</td> <td>1,614,421</td>	Single Rural	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	2,005,545	2,126,370	2.069.487	2.012.604	1,050,773	1,898,837	1.841.954	1,785,071	1,728,187	1,671,304	1,614,421
Five Rural Lower Rural 50,000 410,000 1,315,481 1,284,722 1,253,964 1,247,073 1,215,714 1,182,395 1,152,996 1,121,638 1,090,279 1,058,920 1,027,562 Seven Rural Lower Rural 50,000 440,000 1,433,809 1,493,814 1,255,611 1,287,112 1,255,661 2,586,137 2,576,860 2,500,000 2,442,132 1,143,131 1,805,651 1,881,4691 2,755,441 2,656,137 2,576,860 2,500,000 2,442,132 1,403,133 1,470,588 1,470,588 1,479,913 1,885,661 1,881,403 1,575,944 1,459,931 1,575,944 1,459,931 1,575,944 1,459,931 1,575,944 1,449,133 1,470,588 TerracesHigher Main Settlement750,000900,00	Three Rural	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	1.409.009	1.374.429	1.339.850	1.305.271	1,270,691	1,248,290	1.213.370	1,178,450	1,143,530	1,108,610	1.073.690
Seven Rural Lower Rural 50,000 440,000 1,439,360 1,424,910 1,390,461 1,356,011 1,221,561 1,287,112 1,222,662 1,218,213 1,148,363 1,149,31a Pair Urban Higher Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 2,211,075 3,113,793 3,052,522 2,973,245 2,983,968 2,814,691 2,756,860 2,500,000 2,442,132 2 Semi Urban Higher Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,879,951 1,885,651 1,979,103 1,749,680 1,706,256 1,662,832 1,619,408 1,552,961 1,489,137 1,470,588 Urban infill Higher Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,879,951 1,885,652 1,793,103 1,749,680 1,706,256 1,662,693 1,555,984 1,532,561 1,489,137 1,470,588 Pair Urban Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 2,633,218 2,540,589 2,192,454 1,555,261 1,616,403 1,555,984 1,463,933 1,424,348 1,380,353 Pair Urban Lower Main Settlement<	Five Rural	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	1,315,481	1,284,722	1,253,964	1,247,073	1,215,714	1,184,355	1,152,996	1,121,638	1,090,279	1,058,920	1,027,562
Pair Urban Higher Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 3,131,799 3,052,522 2,933,488 2,844,691 2,735,414 2,656,137 2,576,860 2,500,000 2,442,132 2 Semi Urban Higher Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,219,484 2,143,213 2,040,253 1,988,723 1,937,193 1,885,653 1,834,133 1,782,603 1,731,073 1,679,544 Urban infill Higher Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,778,903 1,737,9103 1,748,604 1,062,661 1,675,984 1,557,984 1,557,984 1,557,984 1,557,984 1,557,984 1,557,984 1,557,984 1,557,984 1,557,984 1,363,033 1,422,434 1,380,935 Pair Urban Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,238,540 2,470,78 2,378,537 2,284,995 2,191,454 2,007,913 2,004,371 1,910,803 1,817,288 1,723,747 2 Semi Urban Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,238,546 1,250,000 1,007,264 1,155,226 1,1	Seven Rural	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	1,493,809	1,459,360	1,424,910	1,390,461	1,356,011	1,321,561	1,287,112	1,252,662	1,218,213	1,183,763	1,149,314
2 Semi Urban Higher Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 2,194,843 2,143,313 2,091,783 2,040,253 1,988,723 1,937,193 1,885,663 1,834,133 1,782,603 1,731,073 1,679,544 Urban infill Higher Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,737,951 1,835,257 1,733,103 1,746,263 1,639,544 1,575,944 1,532,561 1,489,137 1,470,588 Terraces Higher Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,778,903 1,737,797 1,666,691 1,666,67 1,529,929 1,588,430 1,556,432 1,463,933 1,422,434 1,380,935 Pair Urban Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 2,633,182 2,440,588 2,241,243 1,380,935 1,421,284 1,472,88 1,472,784 1,472,784 1,247,784 1,247,748 1,737,797 1,666,667 1,529,293 1,546,931 1,506,432 1,470,838 1,422,434 1,380,935 Semi Urban Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,238,546 1,220,000 1,207,264	Pair Urban	Higher Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	3,211,075	3,131,799	3,052,522	2,973,245	2,893,968	2,814,691	2,735,414	2,656,137	2,576,860	2,500,000	2,442,132
Urban infill Higher Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,879,951 1,835,257 1,793,103 1,706,256 1,668,832 1,619,408 1,575,944 1,532,561 1,439,137 1,470,588 Terraces Higher Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,778,903 1,737,797 1,666,661 1,662,832 1,519,408 1,575,944 1,532,561 1,489,133 1,470,588 Pair Urban Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 2,633,218 2,540,589 2,472,078 2,378,537 2,849,995 2,191,464 2,093,711 1,91,288 1,237,284 <td>2 Semi Urban</td> <td>Higher Main Settlement</td> <td>750,000</td> <td>900,000</td> <td>2,194,843</td> <td>2,143,313</td> <td>2,091,783</td> <td>2,040,253</td> <td>1,988,723</td> <td>1,937,193</td> <td>1,885,663</td> <td>1,834,133</td> <td>1,782,603</td> <td>1,731,073</td> <td>1,679,544</td>	2 Semi Urban	Higher Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	2,194,843	2,143,313	2,091,783	2,040,253	1,988,723	1,937,193	1,885,663	1,834,133	1,782,603	1,731,073	1,679,544
Terraces Higher Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,778,903 1,778,797 1,696,6671 1,629,292 1,588,430 1,566,631 1,505,462 1,463,933 1,422,434 1,380,935 Pair Urban Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 2,633,218 2,540,589 2,472,078 2,378,537 2,284,995 2,191,454 2,007,913 2,004,371 1,910,830 1,817,288 1,723,747 J Semi Urban Lower Main Settlement 750,000 9,00,000 1,238,546 1,250,000 1,207,264 1,155,126 1,103,149 1,051,151 999,113 947,076 856,038 843,007 Urban infill Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,216,282 1,172,111 1,127,740 1,039,138 999,926 906,655 903,844 862,113 817,842 973,571 Terraces Jower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,216,282 1,172,710 1,039,138 999,926 906,655 903,844 862,113 817,842 773,571 Terraces	Urban infill	Higher Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	1,879,951	1,836,527	1,793,103	1,749,680	1,706,256	1,662,832	1,619,408	1,575,984	1,532,561	1,489,137	1,470,588
Pair Urban Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 2,633,218 2,540,589 2,472,078 2,378,537 2,284,995 2,191,454 2,007,913 2,004,371 1,910,830 1,817,288 1,723,747 2 Semi Urban Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,350,076 1,298,546 1,250,000 1,207,264 1,155,226 1,103,189 1,051,151 999,113 947,076 885,038 843,000 Urban infill Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,212,284 1,127,740 1,083,469 1,033,188 949,426 950,655 906,384 862,113 817,422 773,571 Terraces Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1172,2911 1,120,794 1,083,948 949,426 923,0655 906,384 862,113 817,422 773,071	Terraces	Higher Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	1,778,903	1,737,797	1,696,691	1,666,667	1,629,929	1,588,430	1,546,931	1,505,432	1,463,933	1,422,434	1,380,935
Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,235,076 1,285,656 1,250,000 1,205,226 1,105,151 999,113 947,076 885,038 843,000 Urban infill Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 1,216,282 1,172,011 1,127,740 1,083,469 1,033,188 949,926 950,655 906,384 862,113 817,442 773,571 Terraces Lower Main Settlement 750,000 900,000 112,271 1,182,924 1,724 1,063,9459 949,926 923,9655 906,384 862,113 817,842 773,571	Pair Urban	Lower Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	2,633,218	2,540,589	2,472,078	2,378,537	2,284,995	2,191,454	2,097,913	2,004,371	1,910,830	1,817,288	1,723,747
Undernimm Luwer main setuerinerin 750,000 900,000 1,210,262 1,212,7201 1,227,401 1,083,909 1,035,158 954,520 950,555 905,384 862,113 61,842 775,071 Terrares Lower Main Setuerinemt 750,000 900,000 1127,291 1130,792 1,083,903 1,0754 947 946 933,966 881,906 814,366 916 916 916 916 916 916 916 916 916 9	2 Semi Urban	Lower Main Settlement	/50,000	900,000	1,350,076	1,298,546	1,250,000	1,207,264	1,155,226	1,103,189	1,051,151	999,113	947,076	895,038	843,000
	Terraces	Lower Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	1,216,282	1,172,011	1,127,740	1,083,469	1,039,198	994,926	950,655	906,384 881,797	840,298	814,386	772.077

Table ~ ~ **D** aidu al Val d to Viability ماطم ----. . .

Source: Table 10.12, VOWH Local Plan Viability Study. (HDH 2014)

		30%	Afford	dable	Hous	sing,	ĆIL £	0/m²	to £2	00/m ²	2			,
SHI AA Settlem	ent 30% Affordal	hle												
STEAA Settlem	I Store Antonau	Altornativo	Viability	Posidual										
		Use Value	Threshold	Value										
				£0	£20	£40	£60	£80	£100	£120	£140	£160	£180	£200
1 - Small	Higher Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	2,300,969	2,252,438	2,203,907	2,120,836	2,106,846	2,058,315	2,009,784	1,961,254	1,912,723	1,864,192	1,815,661
2 - Medium	Higher Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1,600,777	1,566,066	1,531,355	1,473,023	1,461,932	1,427,221	1,392,510	1,357,799	1,323,088	1,288,377	1,253,666
3 - Medium Flood	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1,297,619	1,267,904	1,238,188	1,188,223	1,178,757	1,149,041	1,119,325	1,089,610	1,059,894	1,030,178	1,000,463
4 - Larger	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1,480,942	1,446,571	1,412,201	1,354,640	1,343,459	1,309,088	1,274,718	1,240,347	1,205,976	1,171,605	1,137,234
5 - Large	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1,503,181	1,468,880	1,434,578	1,376,871	1,365,975	1,331,674	1,297,372	1,263,071	1,228,769	1,194,468	1,160,166
6 - Medium Density	Higher Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	2,207,696	2,157,770	2,107,843	2,023,444	2,007,991	1,958,064	1,908,138	1,858,212	1,808,285	1,758,359	1,708,433
7 - Medium Sensitive	Higher Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1,484,065	1,449,987	1,415,908	1,358,259	1,347,752	1,313,674	1,279,596	1,245,518	1,211,440	1,177,361	1,143,283
8 - Part Brownfield	Higher Main Settlement	75,000	440,000	1,191,234	1,156,745	1,122,257	1,061,256	1,053,279	1,018,791	984,302	949,814	915,325	880,837	846,348
1 - Small	Lower Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1,411,762	1,368,285	1,324,807	1,249,531	1,237,853	1,194,376	1,150,899	1,107,421	1,063,944	1,020,467	976,990
2 - Medium	Lower Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1,116,543	1,081,831	1,047,120	988,789	977,698	942,987	908,276	873,565	838,854	804,143	769,432
3 - Medium Flood	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	882,642	852,926	823,210	773,245	763,779	734,063	704,348	674,632	644,916	615,201	585,485
4 - Larger	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1,006,304	971,933	937,562	880,001	868,821	834,450	800,079	765,708	731,337	696,967	662,596
5 - Large	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1,023,585	989,283	954,982	897,274	886,379	852,077	817,776	/83,4/4	/49,1/3	/14,8/1	680,570
6 - Medium Density	Lower Main Settlement	50,000	410,000	1,500,326	1,450,400	1,400,473	1,316,074	1,300,621	1,250,694	1,200,768	1,150,842	1,100,916	1,050,989	1,001,063
7 - Medium Sensitive	Lower Main Settlement	20,000	374,000	1,000,983	966,905	932,827	8/5,1/8	864,670	830,592	/96,514	/62,436	/28,358	694,280	660,202
8 - Part Brownfield	Lower Main Settlement	75,000	440,000	/06,339	671,850	637,361	576,346	568,384	533,896	499,407	464,919	430,430	395,941	361,453
SHLAA Rural 30	D% Affordable													1
		Alternative	Viability	Residual										
		Use Value	Threshold	Value										
				£0	£20	£40	£60	£80	£100	£120	£140	£160	£180	£200
1 - Small	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	2,654,429	2,605,899	2,557,368	2,508,837	2,460,306	2,411,775	2,363,245	2,314,714	2,266,183	2,217,652	2,169,122
2 - Medium	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	1,842,894	1,808,183	1,773,472	1,738,761	1,704,050	1,669,338	1,634,627	1,599,916	1,565,205	1,530,494	1,495,783
3 - Medium Flood	Higher Rural	20,000	374,000	1,505,108	1,475,392	1,445,677	1,415,961	1,386,245	1,356,530	1,326,814	1,297,099	1,267,383	1,237,667	1,207,952
4 - Larger	Higher Rural	20,000	374,000	1,718,262	1,683,891	1,649,520	1,615,149	1,580,778	1,546,408	1,512,037	1,477,666	1,443,295	1,408,925	1,374,554
5 - Large	Higher Rural	20,000	374,000	1,742,980	1,708,678	1,674,377	1,640,075	1,605,774	1,571,472	1,537,171	1,502,869	1,468,568	1,434,266	1,399,965
6 - Medium Density	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	2,561,381	2,511,455	2,461,528	2,411,602	2,361,676	2,311,749	2,261,823	É120 É140 É160 1,784 1,961,254 1,912,723 1,510 1,537,799 1,323,088 3,225 1,089,610 1,059,894 1,718 1,240,347 1,205,976 3,722 1,263,071 1,228,769 3,138 1,858,212 1,808,285 3,596 1,245,518 1,211,440 3,02 949,814 915,325 3,876 87,365 838,854 4,348 674,632 644,916 3,079 765,708 721,337 7766 783,473 749,173 3,768 1,150,842 1,100,916 5,514 7,62,436 728,358 3,407 464,919 430,430 1 1,559,426 1,205,205 3,245 2,314,714 2,266,183 4,627 1,599,916 1,555,205 3,137 1,470,596 1,452,981 1,232 2,11,879 2,161,970 1,137 1,470,591 4,4	2,112,044	2,062,118	
7 - Medium Sensitive	Higher Rural	20,000	374,000	1,725,606	1,691,527	1,657,449	1,623,371	1,589,293	1,555,215	1,521,137	1,487,059	1,452,981	1,418,902	1,384,824
8 - Part Brownfield	Higher Rural	75,000	440,000	1,433,638	1,399,150	1,364,661	1,330,173	1,295,684	1,261,195	1,226,707	1,192,218	1,157,730	1,123,241	1,088,753
1 - Small	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	1,947,509	1,898,978	1,850,447	1,801,916	1,753,386	1,704,855	1,656,324	1,607,793	1,559,262	1,510,732	1,462,201
2 - Medium	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	1,358,660	1,323,949	1,289,238	1,254,526	1,219,815	1,185,104	1,150,393	1,115,682	1,080,971	1,046,260	1,011,549
3 - Medium Flood	Lower Rural	20,000	374,000	1,090,130	1,060,415	1,030,699	1,000,983	9/1,268	941,552	911,836	882,121	852,405	822,690	/92,974
4 - Larger	Lower Rural	20,000	374,000	1,243,623	1,209,252	1,1/4,881	1,140,511	1,106,140	1,071,769	1,037,398	1,003,028	968,657	934,286	899,915
5 - Large	Lower Rural	20,000	374,000	1,263,383	1,229,082	1,194,780	1,160,479	1,126,177	1,091,876	1,057,574	1,023,273	988,971	954,670	920,368
7 Medium Censitive	Lower Rural	30,000	410,000	1,004,011	1,004,005	1,704,100	1,704,232	1,004,500	1,004,379	1,009,055	1,004,027	1,454,000	1,404,074	1,554,746
Port Prownfield	Lower Rural	20,000	374,000	1,242,524	1,206,440	070 052	945 262	010 075	1,072,155	7/1 000	707 400	909,899 672,021	620 422	901,742
8-Fait Blownineiu	Lower Kurai	73,000	440,000	540,025	514,541	0/5,032	043,303	810,875	770,380	741,050	707,405	072,921	030,432	003,543
Small Sites 30%	6 Affordable													
		Alternative	Viability	Residual										
		Use Value	Threshold	Value										
				£0	£20	£40	£60	£80	£100	£120	£140	£160	£180	£200
Single Rural	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	2,899,119	2,842,791	2,786,463	2,730,134	2,673,806	2,617,478	2,561,149	2,504,821	2,472,616	2,415,733	2,358,849
Three Rural	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	2,099,307	2,062,068	2,024,829	1,987,589	1,950,350	1,913,111	1,875,872	1,838,632	1,801,393	1,764,154	1,726,914
Five Rural	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	2,571,649	2,524,777	2,500,000	2,454,296	2,406,975	2,359,654	2,312,333	2,265,013	2,217,692	2,170,371	2,123,050
Seven Rural	Higher Rural	50,000	410,000	2,134,429	2,097,681	2,060,933	2,024,185	2,000,000	1,969,356	1,932,257	1,895,157	1,858,058	1,820,958	1,783,858
Single Rural	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	2,183,254	2,126,370	2,069,487	2,012,604	1,955,721	1,898,837	1,841,954	1,785,071	1,728,187	1,671,304	1,614,421
Three Rural	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	1,516,512	1,479,273	1,442,034	1,404,794	1,367,555	1,330,316	1,293,076	1,255,837	1,230,604	1,192,998	1,155,391
Five Rural	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	1,412,533	1,379,408	1,346,284	1,313,159	1,280,035	1,250,000	1,237,469	1,203,698	1,169,927	1,136,156	1,102,385
Seven Rural	Lower Rural	50,000	410,000	1,601,349	1,564,250	1,527,150	1,490,051	1,452,951	1,415,851	1,378,752	1,341,652	1,304,553	1,267,453	1,230,354
Pair Urban	Higher Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	3,211,075	3,131,799	3,052,522	2,973,245	2,893,968	2,814,691	2,735,414	2,656,137	2,576,860	2,500,000	2,442,132
2 Semi Urban	Higher Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	2,366,940	2,311,447	2,255,953	2,200,459	2,144,965	2,089,471	2,033,978	1,978,484	1,922,990	1,867,496	1,812,002
Urban infill	Higher Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	2,024,953	1,978,189	1,931,425	1,884,661	1,837,897	1,791,133	1,744,369	1,697,605	1,650,841	1,604,076	1,557,312
Terraces	Higher Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	1,913,374	1,869,106	1,824,838	1,780,570	1,736,303	1,692,035	1,663,535	1,618,844	1,574,153	1,529,461	1,484,770
Pair Urban	Lower Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	2,633,218	2,540,589	2,472,078	2,378,537	2,284,995	2,191,454	2,097,913	2,004,371	1,910,830	1,817,288	1,723,747
2 Semi Urban	Lower Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	1,496,247	1,440,753	1,385,259	1,329,765	1,274,271	1,230,785	1,174,745	1,118,704	1,062,663	1,006,623	950,582
Urban infill	Lower Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	1,339,571	1,291,894	1,244,217	1,196,541	1,148,864	1,101,188	1,053,511	1,005,835	958,158	910,481	862,805
Terraces	Lower Main Settlement	750,000	900,000	1,283,806	1,239,115	1,194,423	1,149,732	1,105,041	1,060,349	1,015,658	970,967	926,275	881,584	836,893

Table 3.4 Residual Value compared to Viability Thresholds, Full Policy Requirements,

Source: Table 10.13, VOWH Local Plan Viability Study. (HDH 2014)

- 3.18 In the SHLAA Viability Assessment we confirmed, based on an earlier iteration of the emerging Plan, and 2012 costs and values, that generally the sites identified through the SHLAA process were viable and could make substantial contributions to infrastructure. The above updated analysis confirms, when related to the expected pattern of development, that this remains the situation.
- 3.19 The typologies represent the residential development not on strategic sites. As with the strategic sites, the test is whether the cumulative impact of the policies in the Plan puts the Development Plan at serious risk. Based on the above we confirmed that the cumulative impact of the policies, including the 40% affordable housing, but excluding additional developer contributions, does not put the general residential development sites (i.e. not the strategic sites) at serious risk. It is however, as with the strategic sites, there is a concern that

as the level of additional contribution increases, the Residual Value falls reducing the cushion or margin by which the Residual Value exceeds the Viability Threshold.

- 3.20 As with the strategic sites we recommend that the Council moves to the lower level of affordable housing of 35% as this would increase the cushion or margin between the Viability Threshold and the Residual Value and allow developer contributions in the range of £80/m² to £140m² to be considered without prejudicing viability. Again, as with the strategic sites, this is not just a local phenomenon but one that applies to sites in in all four of the Council's planning sub-areas.
- 3.21 The Council followed the recommendation to reduce the affordable housing requirement to 35%.

Additional Profit and Effect of CIL

- 3.22 The analysis set out in the Local Plan Viability Study and the extracts above, show the ability of the residential development identified in the Plan to bear developer contributions in the context of the full requirements of the Plan.
- 3.23 We have calculated the Additional Profit as well as the Residual Value. The Additional Profit is the profit over and above the developers' and the landowners' competitive return. In the following tables we have assumed the full affordable housing requirement of 35%. In addition, on the modelled sites we have allowed for a £2,500/unit (market and affordable) payment under s106 for site specific matters. On the strategic sites we have included the site specific infrastructure costs listed at 3.9(c) above.
- 3.24 It is important to note that the additional profit is not the level of CIL it is the amount out of which CIL can be paid. The PPG is clear that CIL and other policy requirements should not be set at the limits of viability. The additional profit is shown per metre squared of market housing. In the following tables the analysis is carried out on a gross basis, where the site cost is the 'EUV plus' viability threshold.

	Table 3.5 Additional Profit. Full35% A	Policy Requirements. Strategic Si	ites (£/m²)
Abir	ngdon and Oxford Fringe		
1	North of Abingdon	Abingdon	355
2	North-West of Abingdon	Abingdon	623
3	South of East Hanney	East Hanney	1,070
4	Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor	East of Kingston Bagpuize with Southmoor	1,047
5	North-West of Radley	Radley	907
6	South of Kennington	Radley	959
Sou	th East Vale (Science Vale West)		
7	Monks Farm	Grove	-46
9	Crab Hill	Wantage	-86
Sou	th East Vale (Science Vale East)		
10	Valley Park	Harwell and Milton east of the A34 adjoining Didcot	314
11	North-West of Valley Park	Harwell and Milton east of the A34 adjoining Didcot	747
12	East Harwell Campus	Harwell Campus	401
13	North-West of Harwell Campus	Harwell Campus	750
13	East of Sutton Courtenay	Sutton Courtenay	1,088
14	West of Harwell	Harwell	869
15	Milton Heights	Milton Parish west of the A34	875
Wes	stern Vale	-	·
16	East of Coxwell Road Faringdon	Faringdon	404
17	Land South of Park Road	Faringdon	114
18	South-West of Faringdon	Faringdon	318
19	South of Faringdon	Great Coxwell Parish	43
20	North of Shrivenham	Shrivenham	373
21	West of Stanford-in-the-Vale	Stanford-in-the-Vale	983

Source: Table 13.1 VOWH Local Plan Viability Study. (HDH August 2014)

Table 3.6 Add	litional Profit. Full Policy Re SHLAA Rural	equirements (35%	Affordable)
		Units	(£/m²)
1 - Small	Higher Rural	42	1,084
2 - Medium	Higher Rural	78	1,022
3 - Medium Flood	Higher Rural	155	937
4 - Larger	Higher Rural	181	966
5 - Large	Higher Rural	308	986
6 - Medium Density	Higher Rural	76	1,039
7 - Medium Sensitive	Higher Rural	71	975
8 - Part Brownfield	Higher Rural	78	693
1 - Small	Lower Rural	42	731
2 - Medium	Lower Rural	78	663
3 - Medium Flood	Lower Rural	155	578
4 - Larger	Lower Rural	181	611
5 - Large	Lower Rural	308	626
6 - Medium Density	Lower Rural	76	685
7 - Medium Sensitive	Lower Rural	71	596
8 - Part Brownfield	Lower Rural	78	331

Source: Table 13.2 VOWH Local Plan Viability Study. (HDH August 2014)

Table 3.7 Additic	onal Profit. Full Policy Req SHLAA Settlen	uirements (35% Affe	ordable) (£/m²)
		Units	(£/m²)
1 - Small	Higher Main Settlement	42	907
2 - Medium	Higher Main Settlement	78	842
3 - Medium Flood	Higher Main Settlement	155	757
4 - Larger	Higher Main Settlement	181	789
5 - Large	Higher Main Settlement	308	806
6 - Medium Density	Higher Main Settlement	76	885
7 - Medium Sensitive	Higher Main Settlement	71	793
8 - Part Brownfield	Higher Main Settlement	78	512
1 - Small	Lower Main Settlement	42	554
2 - Medium	Lower Main Settlement	78	483
3 - Medium Flood	Lower Main Settlement	155	398
4 - Larger	Lower Main Settlement	181	433
5 - Large	Lower Main Settlement	308	447
6 - Medium Density	Lower Main Settlement	76	522
7 - Medium Sensitive	Lower Main Settlement	71	430
8 - Part Brownfield	Lower Main Settlement	78	150

Source: Table 13.3 VOWH Local Plan Viability Study. (HDH August 2014)

Г

Table 3.8	Additional Profit. Full Policy Requi Small Sites	irements (35% A	fordable) (£/m²)
		Units	35% Affordable
Single Rural	Higher Rural	1	974
Three Rural	Higher Rural	3	1,030
Five Rural	Higher Rural	5	1,048
Seven Rural	Higher Rural	7	1,067
Single Rural	Lower Rural	1	687
Three Rural	Lower Rural	3	658
Five Rural	Lower Rural	5	671
Seven Rural	Lower Rural	7	717
Pair Urban	Higher Main Settlement	2	643
2 Semi Urban	Higher Main Settlement	4	555
Urban infill	Higher Main Settlement	6	514
Terraces	Higher Main Settlement	9	503
Pair Urban	Lower Main Settlement	2	413
2 Semi Urban	Lower Main Settlement	4	194
Urban infill	Lower Main Settlement	6	165
Terraces	Lower Main Settlement	9	157

Source: Table 13.4 VOWH Local Plan Viability Study. (HDH August 2014)

3.25 When it comes to setting CIL, the 'test' is whether the Development Plan as a whole is threatened. We have discussed these results later in this report.

Older People's Housing

3.26 As well as mainstream housing, we have considered the retirement and extracare sectors separately. Appraisals were run for a range of affordable housing requirements. The results of these are summarised as follows. In each case allowance has been made for a s106 developer contribution of £200,000:

		Та	ıb	le	3	.9	C	DIc	le	r P	eo	pl	e'	S	H	ou	IS	ing	g,	A	p	pr	ai	sa	l I	Re	s	ult	s	
			40%	1,529,625	20,000	374,000	3,059,251			40%	1 102 OUE	750.000		2 007 000	2,001,003			1001	40%	-248,349	20,000	374,000	-496,697			40%	-374,069	750,000	900,000	-748,139
_		0	30%	2,105,051	20,000	374,000	4,210,102			30%	1 070 230	750.000		300,000	0,000			2000	30%	237,167	20,000	374,000	474,334			30%	111,446	750,000	900,000	222,892
_			50%	2,680,477	20,000	374,000	5,360,954			20%	2 664 766	750.000		5 100 E13	3,103,012			200	%07.	722,682	20,000	374,000	1,445,365			20%	596,962	750,000	900'006	1,193,923
_			10%	3,255,903	20,000	374,000	6,511,805			10%	3 130 102	750.000		e 260 264	0,200,004			1001	10%	1,208,198	20,000	374,000	2,416,396			10%	1,082,477	750,000	900'006	2,164,954
_		xtra Care	%0	3,831,329	20,000	374,000	7,662,657		xtra Care	%0	2 705 600	750.000		7 411 215	1,411,410			U UNIT EXTRA CARE	%0	1,693,713	20,000	374,000	3,387,427		xtra Care	0%0	1,567,993	750,000	900,000	3,135,985
			40%	2,557,946	20,000	374,000	5,115,892		Û	40%	2 460 002	750.000		200,000	4,341,300			40 100	40%	1,008,404	20,000	374,000	2,016,808		Ê	40%	911,449	750,000	900,000	1,822,899
_			30%	3,104,056	20,000	374,000	6,208,112			30%	2 007 103	750.000		5 011 202	0,014,500			à	30%	1,472,597	20,000	374,000	2,945,195			30%	1,375,643	750,000	900,000	2,751,286
_			50%	3,650,166	20,000	374,000	7,300,332			20%	3 662 242	750.000		7 106 100	1,100,445			2000	%07	1,936,791	20,000	374,000	3,873,582			20%	1,839,836	750,000	900,000	3,679,673
_			10%	4,196,276	20,000	374,000	8,392,552			10%	4 000 222	750.000		9 100 £13	0,130,043			1001	10%	2,400,984	20,000	374,000	4,801,969			10%	2,304,030	750,000	900,000	4,608,060
_		sheltered		4,742,386	20,000	374,000	9,484,772		Sheltered	%0	A 646 422	750.000		000,000	3,430,000		-	oneitered	0%0	2,865,178	20,000	374,000	5,730,356		Sheltered	%0	2,768,223	750,000	900,000	5,536,447
_			I	Site	£/ha	£/ha	£/ha		0,		Cito	f/ha	5/ha		7110			,,		Site	£/ha	£/ha	£/ha		0		Site	£/ha	£/ha	£/ha
	and Northeast		AFFORDABLE %	and Worth	se Value	reshold	/alue			AFFORDABLE %	and Morth	te Value	rachold		and	Mostorn Volo			AFFORDABLE %	and Worth.	se Value	reshold	/alue			AFFORDABLE %	and Worth	se Value	reshold	alue
	Abingdon	Greentield		Residual L	Existing Us	Viability Th	Residual V		Brownfield		Docidual	Existing Us	Viahility Th	Decidinal V		Conthood	Southeast	Greenneid		Residual L	Existing Us	Viability Th	Residual V		Brownfield		Residual La	Existing Us	Viability Thi	Residual V

Source: Table 10.16 VOWH Local Plan Viability Study. (HDH 2014)

- 3.27 In practice, extracare housing falls under the definition of residential institutions rather than dwelling houses so is not normally considered to be subject to the Council's affordable housing policies. We did not pursue this further.
- 3.28 The sheltered housing is shown as viable on both greenfield and brownfield sites and also when subject to the 40% affordable housing requirement, so we confirmed that the cumulative impact of policies does not put the development of older people's housing at serious risk.

Additional Profit

AFFORDABLE %

Site

Site

/m2

Residual Land Worth

Additional Profit

- Table 3.10 Additional Profit. Older Peoples Housing (30%, 35% & 40% affordable) Abingdon and Northeast Sheltered Greenfield Extra Care 35% AFFORDABLE % 30% 35% 40% 30% 1,529,625 Residual Land Worth 3,104,056 2,831,001 2,557,946 2.105.05 1,817,338 Site Additional Profit 2,917,056 2,644,001 2,370,946 1,918,05 1,630,338 1,342,625 Site /m2 846 766 687 500 425 Brownfield AFFORDABLE % 30% 35% 40% 30% 35% Residual Land Worth Site 3,007,102 2,734,047 2,460,992 1,979,330 1,691,618 1,403,905 Additional Profit Site 2,557,102 2,284,047 2,010,992 1,529,330 1,241,618 /m2 741 583 399 324 662 Southeast and Western Vale Greenfield AFFORDABLE % 30% 35% 40% 30% 35% Residual Land Worth 1,472,597 1,240,501 1,008,404 Site 237,167 -5.591 1,285,597 1,053,501 Additional Profit 821,404 50,167 Site -192,59⁻ /m2 373 305 238 Brownfield
- 3.29 As for mainstream, we housing have calculated the additional profit:

201 Source: VOWH CIL Viability Study. (HDH 2014)

35%

1,143,546

693,546

40%

911,449

461,449

134

30%

111,446

338,55

35%

-131,312

-581,312

-152

CIL as a proportion of Land Value and Gross Development Value

30%

1,375,643

925,643

268

- 3.30 To further inform the CIL rate setting process, we have calculated CIL as a proportion of the Residual Value and the Gross Development Value.
- 3.31 CIL as the proportion of the Residual Value, in approximate terms, represents the percentage fall in land value that a landowner may receive. As set out in the Local Plan Viability Study, it is inevitable that CIL will depress land prices. This is recognised in the RICS Guidance and

40%

350

40%

953,905

249

40%

-248.349

435,349

-114

40%

-374,069

-824,069

-215

was considered at the Greater Norwich CIL examination¹⁶. In Greater Norwich it was suggested that landowners may accept a 25% fall in land prices following the introduction of CIL saying:

22. Thirdly the work done by the Councils to demonstrate what funds are likely to be available for CIL (Appendix 1 of the Note following Day 1) relies on the full 25% of the benchmark land value being available for the CIL "pot". While this may sometimes be the case it is unlikely that it will always apply. Even if some landowners may be prepared to accept less than 75% of the benchmark value, the 25% figure should be treated as a maximum and not an average. Using 25% to try to establish what the theoretical maximum amount in a CIL "pot" may be is reasonable, but when thinking about setting a CIL charge in the real world it would be prudent to treat it as a maximum that will only apply on some occasions in some circumstances.

- 3.32 It is important to note that a wide ranging debate took place at that CIL Examination and on the specific local circumstances. It would however be prudent to set CIL at a rate that does not result in a fall in land prices of greater than 25% or so.
- 3.33 The following tables show CIL, at a range of rates, as a percentage of the Residual Value.

¹⁶ Greater Norwich Development Partnership – for Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and South Norfolk Council. by Keith Holland BA (Hons) Dip TP, MRTPI ARICS Date: 4 December 2012

Table 3.11 Strate	g	ic	S	ite	es	_	С	IL	а	s	Pe I	ero Ho	ce ou	nt si	ag ng	ge I	0	f F	Re	si	dι	la	V	'al	u	e - 35% Affordable
رین میر اوع	±U/mz		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
دس/ 1053	±zu/mz		3.12%	2.69%	1.77%	1.87%	1.95%	1.98%		5.10%	6.46%		3.26%	2.55%	2.84%	2.65%	1.82%	2.07%	2.28%		3.58%	3.71%	3.58%	3.58%	3.08%	1.80%
دسر <i>روب</i> ع	±40/mz		6.40%	5.52%	3.53%	3.79%	3.96%	4.02%		10.64%	13.56%		6.66%	5.20%	5.82%	5.41%	3.70%	4.23%	4.64%		7.39%	7.66%	7.39%	7.39%	6.31%	3.67%
دس/193 1937	±00/1112		9.85%	8.49%	5.30%	5.79%	6.05%	6.14%		16.67%	21.41%		10.20%	7.96%	8.92%	8.30%	5.64%	6.46%	7.09%		11.46%	11.87%	11.46%	11.46%	9.71%	5.59%
[E&U/ MZ		13.47%	11.60%	7.06%	7.84%	8.21%	8.33%		23.25%	30.13%		13.90%	10.83%	12.17%	11.33%	7.64%	8.78%	9.64%		15.81%	16.37%	15.81%	15.81%	13.30%	7.58%
Cm/ 0013	TTU/UTT		17.29%	14.89%	8.83%	9.97%	10.45%	10.60%		30.48%	39.87%		17.75%	13.82%	15.57%	14.49%	9.71%	11.19%	12.29%		20.50%	21.20%	20.50%	20.50%	17.09%	9.63%
(m/ 10013	E 12U/ MZ		21.32%	18.35%	10.60%	12.17%	12.77%	12.95%		38.44%	50.83%		21.78%	16.95%	19.13%	17.81%	11.86%	13.70%	15.04%		25.54%	26.37%	25.54%	25.54%	21.09%	11.76%
(cv/) (1) F3	£.14U/ MZ		25.58%	22.00%	12.36%	14.45%	15.18%	15.39%		47.26%	63.25%		25.99%	20.22%	22.87%	21.29%	14.08%	16.31%	17.90%		30.99%	31.95%	30.99%	30.99%	25.34%	13.96%
در دیار	TTPU/MZ		30.09%	25.86%	14.13%	16.81%	17.69%	17.93%		57.09%	77.44%		30.39%	23.63%	26.80%	24.95%	16.38%	19.03%	20.89%		36.89%	37.97%	36.89%	36.89%	29.86%	16.24%
[[[[[[[[[[[[[[[[[[[E 18U/ MZ		34.87%	29.94%	15.89%	19.25%	20.29%	20.56%		68.10%	93.80%		35.01%	27.21%	30.94%	28.80%	18.77%	21.87%	24.01%		43.30%	44.49%	43.30%	43.30%	34.66%	18.61%
(cv/) vuc3	±200/mz		39.94%	34.28%	17.66%	21.79%	23.00%	23.30%		80.52%	112.89%		39.86%	30.96%	35.30%	32.85%	21.24%	24.84%	27.27%		50.30%	51.57%	50.30%	50.30%	39.78%	21.06%
		xford Fringe	Abingdon	Abingdon	East Hanney	o East of Kingston Bagpuize	Radley	Radley	le West	Grove	Wantage	t Vale	Harwell and Milton Parishe	Harwell and Milton Parishe	Harwell Campus	Harwell Campus	Sutton Courtenay	Harwell	Milton Parish west of the /	Vale	n Faringdon	Faringdon	Faringdon	Great Coxwell Parish	Shrivenham	Stanford-in-the-Vale
		Abingdon and O	North of Abingdon	North-West of Abingdon	South of East Hanney	Kingston Bagpuize with Southm	North-West of Radley	South of Kennington	Science Va.	Vlonks Farm	Crab Hill	South Eas	Valley Park	Vorth-West of Valley Park	East Harwell Campus	North-West of Harwell Campus	East of Sutton Courtenay	West of Harwell	Viilton Heights	Western	East of Coxwell Road Faringdor	and South of Park Road	South-West of Faringdon	South of Faringdon	North of Shrivenham	West of Stanford-in-the-Vale

Source: Table 13.7 VOWH Local Plan Viability Study. (HDH August 2014)

Г

	Wodened S	1162 -		Ho	ousing	Jeon	resiu		aiue -	33 /0 /	Alloru	able
	CIL £/m2	200	180	160	140	120	100	80	60	40	20	0
SHLAA Rural												
1 - Small	Higher Rural	21.97%	19.34%	16.83%	14.42%	12.11%	9.89%	7.76%	5.71%	3.73%	1.83%	0.00%
2 - Medium	Higher Rural	22.76%	20.02%	17.41%	14.91%	12.51%	10.21%	8.00%	5.89%	3.85%	1.89%	0.00%
3 - Medium Flood	Higher Rural	24.19%	21.25%	18.45%	15.78%	13.23%	10.78%	8.44%	6.20%	4.05%	1.98%	0.00%
4 - Larger	Higher Rural	24.59%	21.59%	18.74%	16.02%	13.43%	10.94%	8.57%	6.29%	4.11%	2.01%	0.00%
5 - Large	Higher Rural	24.08%	21.16%	18.38%	15.72%	13.18%	10.74%	8.41%	6.18%	4.04%	1.98%	0.00%
6 - Medium Density	Higher Rural	23.81%	20.93%	18.18%	15.55%	13.04%	10.63%	8.33%	6.12%	4.00%	1.96%	0.00%
7 - Medium Sensitive	Higher Rural	24.22%	21.28%	18.48%	15.80%	13.25%	10.80%	8.46%	6.21%	4.06%	1.99%	0.00%
8 - Part Brownfield	Higher Rural	31.62%	27.58%	23.78%	20.21%	16.83%	13.64%	10.62%	7.76%	5.04%	2.46%	0.00%
1 - Small	Lower Rural	32.98%	28.73%	24.75%	21.00%	17.47%	14.15%	11.01%	8.03%	5.22%	2.54%	0.00%
2 - Medium	Lower Rural	34.04%	29.62%	25.49%	21.61%	17.97%	14.53%	11.30%	8.24%	5.35%	2.60%	0.00%
3 - Medium Flood	Lower Rural	37.36%	32.41%	27.80%	23.51%	19.49%	15.73%	12.20%	8.88%	5.75%	2.79%	0.00%
4 - Larger	Lower Rural	38.09%	33.02%	28.31%	23.92%	19.82%	15.99%	12.39%	9.01%	5.83%	2.83%	0.00%
5 - Large	Lower Rural	37.14%	32.23%	27.65%	23.38%	19.39%	15.65%	12.14%	8.84%	5.72%	2.78%	0.00%
6 - Medium Density	Lower Rural	36.75%	31.90%	27.38%	23.16%	19.22%	15.51%	12.04%	8.76%	5.68%	2.76%	0.00%
7 - Medium Sensitive	Lower Rural	37.76%	32.75%	28.08%	23.73%	19.67%	15.87%	12.31%	8.95%	5.79%	2.82%	0.00%
8 - Part Brownfield	Lower Rural	58.99%	50.12%	42.19%	35.06%	28.61%	22.76%	17.41%	12.51%	8.01%	3.85%	0.00%
SHLAA Settle	ment											
1 - Small	Higher Main Settlement	26.37%	23.12%	20.04%	17.10%	14.31%	11.64%	9.10%	6.67%	4.35%	2.13%	0.00%
2 - Medium	Higher Main Settlement	27.28%	23.89%	20.69%	17.64%	14.75%	12.00%	9.37%	6.87%	4.47%	2.19%	0.00%
3 - Medium Flood	Higher Main Settlement	29.36%	25.67%	22.18%	18.88%	15.76%	12.80%	9.98%	7.30%	4.75%	2.32%	0.00%
4 - Larger	Higher Main Settlement	29.88%	26.11%	22.55%	19.19%	16.01%	12.99%	10.13%	7.41%	4.82%	2.35%	0.00%
5 - Large	Higher Main Settlement	29.22%	25.55%	22.08%	18.80%	15.69%	12.74%	9.94%	7.27%	4.73%	2.31%	0.00%
6 - Medium Density	Higher Main Settlement	28.90%	25.28%	21.85%	18.61%	15.54%	12.62%	9.85%	7.21%	4.69%	2.29%	0.00%
7 - Medium Sensitive	Higher Main Settlement	29.51%	25.80%	22.29%	18.97%	15.83%	12.85%	10.02%	7.33%	4.77%	2.33%	0.00%
8 - Part Brownfield	Higher Main Settlement	41.17%	35.58%	30.42%	25.64%	21.20%	17.06%	13.20%	9.58%	6.19%	3.00%	0.00%
1 - Small	Lower Main Settlement	44.02%	37.94%	32.36%	27.21%	22.44%	18.03%	13.92%	10.09%	6.50%	3.15%	0.00%
2 - Medium	Lower Main Settlement	45.25%	38.96%	33.19%	27.88%	22.98%	18.44%	14.22%	10.30%	6.64%	3.21%	0.00%
3 - Medium Flood	Lower Main Settlement	51.35%	43.95%	37.24%	31.13%	25.54%	20.41%	15.69%	11.32%	7.27%	3.51%	0.00%
4 - Larger	Lower Main Settlement	52.50%	44.89%	38.00%	31.73%	26.02%	20.78%	15.96%	11.51%	7.39%	3.56%	0.00%
5 - Large	Lower Main Settlement	50.96%	43.63%	36.98%	30.93%	25.38%	20.29%	15.60%	11.26%	7.23%	3.49%	0.00%
6 - Medium Density	Lower Main Settlement	50.48%	43.24%	36.66%	30.67%	25.18%	20.14%	15.48%	11.18%	7.18%	3.47%	0.00%
7 - Medium Sensitive	Lower Main Settlement	52.41%	44.81%	37.93%	31.68%	25.98%	20.75%	15.93%	11.49%	7.38%	3.56%	0.00%
8 - Part Brownfield	Lower Main Settlement	103.06%	84.78%	68.85%	55.45%	44.03%	34.17%	25.58%	18.03%	11.34%	5.36%	0.00%
Small Sites												
Single Rural	Higher Rural	22.89%	20.12%	17.47%	15.09%	12.65%	10.32%	8.08%	5.93%	3.88%	1.90%	0.00%
Three Rural	Higher Rural	20.34%	17.93%	15.61%	13.39%	11.25%	9.20%	7.22%	5.31%	3.48%	1.71%	0.00%
Five Rural	Higher Rural	21.78%	19.18%	16.68%	14.29%	12.00%	9.80%	7.69%	5.65%	3.70%	1.83%	0.00%
Seven Rural	Higher Rural	19.99%	17.63%	15.37%	13.19%	11.09%	9.07%	7.12%	5.25%	3.44%	1.69%	0.00%
Single Rural	Lower Rural	33.45%	29.08%	25.00%	21.18%	17.59%	14.22%	11.04%	8.05%	5.22%	2.54%	0.00%
Three Rural	Lower Rural	30.87%	26.91%	23.19%	19.69%	16.39%	13.28%	10.44%	7.62%	4.95%	2.41%	0.00%
Five Rural	Lower Rural	29.26%	25.55%	22.06%	18.76%	15.64%	12.69%	9.89%	7.23%	4.79%	2.34%	0.00%
Seven Rural	Lower Rural	29.30%	25.60%	22.11%	18.82%	15.70%	12.74%	9.93%	7.26%	4.73%	2.31%	0.00%
Pair Urban	Higher Main Settlement	31.12%	27.30%	23.59%	20.03%	10.07%	13.50%	10.50%	7.67%	4.98%	2.43%	0.00%
∠ Semi Urban	Higher Main Settlement	29.41%	25.68%	22.17%	18.85%	15.72%	12.75%	9.94%	7.26%	4.72%	2.30%	0.00%
Urban Intili	Higher Main Settlement	28.86%	25.65%	22.15%	18.85%	15.72%	12.76%	9.95%	7.28%	4.73%	2.31%	0.00%
Terraces Doir Urbon	Higher Main Settlement	29.37%	25.66%	22.16%	18.86%	15.73%	12.77%	9.95%	11.00%	4.78%	2.33%	0.00%
Pair Urban	Lower Main Settlement	51.52%	43.98%	37.18%	31.01%	25.40%	20.26%	15.54%	11.20%	7.18%	3.50%	0.00%
Z Semi Urban	Lower Main Settlement	58.00%	49.07%	41.73%	34.01%	28.20%	22.39%	16.24%	14.75%	7.90%	3.80%	0.00%
Ulban Inilli Torroooo	Lower Main Settlement	54.80%	40.70%	39.38%	32.78%	20.79%	21.33%	16.120/	11.75%	7.53%	3.0∠%	0.00%
Terraces	Lower Main Settlement	5∠.53%	44.82%	38.01%	32.20%	20.30%	21.02%	10.12%	11.01%	7.45%	3.59%	0.00%

Table 3.12 Modelled Sites CII as Percentage of Residual Value - 35% Affordable

Source: Table 13.8 VOWH Local Plan Viability Study. (HDH August 2014)

- 3.34 Plan-wide viability testing is not an exact science. The process is based on high level modelling and assumptions and development costs and assumptions. The process adopted by many developers is similar, hence the use of contingency sums, the competitive return assumptions and the generally cautious approach.
- 3.35 In the following tables we have set out CIL, at a range of rates, as a proportion of the Gross Development Value.

Table 3.13 Strate	egi	С	Si	te	s -	C	IL.	a: Af	s I fo	Pe rd	erc lat	e Sle	nta e H	ag Io	e u	of sir	i G	irc	os	s I	De	eve	elo	p	ment Value - 35%
f0/m2		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
£20/m2		0.51%	0.51%	0.48%	0.48%	0.47%	0.47%		0.58%	0.58%		0.50%	0.50%	0.52%	0.52%	0.48%	0.51%	0.51%		0.58%	0.58%	0.58%	0.58%	0.54%	0.48%
£40/m2	-	1.01%	1.02%	0.96%	0.96%	0.94%	0.94%		1.16%	1.16%		1.00%	1.00%	1.03%	1.03%	0.95%	1.02%	1.02%		1.16%	1.16%	1.16%	1.16%	1.08%	0.96%
£60/m2		1.52%	1.52%	1.43%	1.43%	1.41%	1.41%		1.74%	1.74%		1.50%	1.50%	1.55%	1.55%	1.43%	1.52%	1.52%		1.74%	1.74%	1.74%	1.74%	1.62%	1.43%
£80/m2		2.03%	2.03%	1.91%	1.91%	1.88%	1.88%		2.32%	2.32%		2.00%	2.00%	2.06%	2.06%	1.91%	2.03%	2.03%		2.32%	2.32%	2.32%	2.32%	2.16%	1.91%
£100/m2		2.54%	2.54%	2.39%	2.39%	2.35%	2.35%		2.90%	2.90%		2.50%	2.50%	2.58%	2.58%	2.39%	2.54%	2.54%		2.90%	2.90%	2.90%	2.90%	2.71%	2.39%
£120/m2		3.04%	3.05%	2.87%	2.87%	2.82%	2.82%		3.48%	3.48%		3.00%	3.00%	3.09%	3.09%	2.86%	3.05%	3.05%		3.48%	3.48%	3.48%	3.48%	3.25%	2.87%
£140/m2		3.55%	3.55%	3.34%	3.34%	3.29%	3.29%		4.06%	4.06%		3.50%	3.50%	3.61%	3.61%	3.34%	3.55%	3.55%		4.06%	4.06%	4.06%	4.06%	3.79%	3.34%
£160/m2	/	4.06%	4.06%	3.82%	3.82%	3.76%	3.76%		4.64%	4.64%		4.00%	4.00%	4.12%	4.12%	3.82%	4.06%	4.06%		4.64%	4.64%	4.64%	4.64%	4.33%	3.82%
£180/m2	/222	4.57%	4.57%	4.30%	4.30%	4.23%	4.23%		5.22%	5.22%		4.50%	4.50%	4.64%	4.64%	4.30%	4.57%	4.57%		5.22%	5.22%	5.22%	5.22%	4.87%	4.30%
£200/m2		5.07%	5.08%	4.78%	4.78%	4.70%	4.71%		5.80%	5.80%		5.00%	4.99%	5.15%	5.15%	4.77%	5.08%	5.08%		5.80%	5.80%	5.80%	5.80%	5.41%	4.78%
	ford Fringe	Abingdon	Abingdon	East Hanney	East of Kingston Bagpuiz	Radley	Radley	e West	Grove	Wantage	Vale	Harwell and Milton Parish	Harwell and Milton Parish	Harwell Campus	Harwell Campus	Sutton Courtenay	Harwell	Milton Parish west of the	/ale	Faringdon	Faringdon	Faringdon	Great Coxwell Parish	Shrivenham	Stanford-in-the-Vale
	Abingdon and Ox	North of Abingdon	North-West of Abingdon	South of East Hanney	Kingston Bagpuize with South	North-West of Radley	South of Kennington	Science Vale	Monks Farm	Crab Hill	South East	Valley Park	North-West of Valley Park	East Harwell Campus	North-West of Harwell Campul	East of Sutton Courtenay	West of Harwell	Milton Heights	Western	East of Coxwell Road Faringde	Land South of Park Road	South-West of Faringdon	South of Faringdon	North of Shrivenham	West of Starford-in-the-Vale

Source: Table 13.5 VOWH Local Plan Viability Study. (HDH August 2014)

SHLAA Rural	CII £/m2											
SHLAA Rural	012 2012	200	180	160	140	120	100	80	60	40	20	0
1 - Small	Higher Rural	4.78%	4.30%	3.82%	3.35%	2.87%	2.39%	1.91%	1.43%	0.96%	0.48%	0.00%
2 - Medium	Higher Rural	4.78%	4.30%	3.82%	3.34%	2.87%	2.39%	1.91%	1.43%	0.96%	0.48%	0.00%
3 - Medium Flood	Higher Rural	4.77%	4.30%	3.82%	3.34%	2.86%	2.39%	1.91%	1.43%	0.95%	0.48%	0.00%
4 - Larger	Higher Rural	4.78%	4.30%	3.82%	3.34%	2.87%	2.39%	1.91%	1.43%	0.96%	0.48%	0.00%
5 - Large	Higher Rural	4.77%	4.30%	3.82%	3.34%	2.86%	2.39%	1.91%	1.43%	0.95%	0.48%	0.00%
6 - Medium Density	Higher Rural	4.78%	4.30%	3.82%	3.34%	2.87%	2.39%	1.91%	1.43%	0.96%	0.48%	0.00%
7 - Medium Sensitive	Higher Rural	4.77%	4.30%	3.82%	3.34%	2.86%	2.39%	1.91%	1.43%	0.95%	0.48%	0.00%
8 - Part Brownfield	Higher Rural	4.78%	4.30%	3.82%	3.34%	2.87%	2.39%	1.91%	1.43%	0.96%	0.48%	0.00%
1 - Small	Lower Rural	5.42%	4.88%	4.33%	3.79%	3.25%	2.71%	2.17%	1.63%	1.08%	0.54%	0.00%
2 - Medium	Lower Rural	5.41%	4.87%	4.33%	3.79%	3.25%	2.71%	2.17%	1.62%	1.08%	0.54%	0.00%
3 - Medium Flood	Lower Rural	5.41%	4.87%	4.33%	3.79%	3.25%	2.71%	2.16%	1.62%	1.08%	0.54%	0.00%
4 - Larger	Lower Rural	5.41%	4.87%	4.33%	3.79%	3.25%	2.71%	2.16%	1.62%	1.08%	0.54%	0.00%
5 - Large	Lower Rural	5.41%	4.87%	4.33%	3.79%	3.25%	2.70%	2.16%	1.62%	1.08%	0.54%	0.00%
6 - Medium Density	Lower Rural	5.41%	4.87%	4.33%	3.79%	3.25%	2.71%	2.17%	1.62%	1.08%	0.54%	0.00%
7 - Medium Sensitive	Lower Rural	5.41%	4.87%	4.33%	3.79%	3.25%	2.71%	2.16%	1.62%	1.08%	0.54%	0.00%
8 - Part Brownfield	Lower Rural	5.41%	4.87%	4.33%	3.79%	3.25%	2.71%	2.17%	1.62%	1.08%	0.54%	0.00%
SHI AA Settle	ment											
	Higher Main Settlement	5 08%	1 57%	4.06%	3 56%	3.05%	254%	2 03%	1 5 2%	1 0 2%	0.51%	0.00%
2 - Medium	Higher Main Settlement	5.00%	4.57%	4.06%	3.55%	3.04%	2.54%	2.03%	1.52%	1.0270	0.51%	0.00%
2 Modium Flood	Higher Main Settlement	5.07%	4.57%	4.06%	2.55%	2 0 4 %	2.54%	2.0370	1.52%	1.01%	0.51%	0.00%
	Higher Main Settlement	5.07%	4.57%	4.00%	2.55%	2.04%	2.54%	2.03%	1.52%	1.01%	0.51%	0.00%
5 - Large	Higher Main Settlement	5.07%	4.57%	4.00%	3.55%	3.04%	2.54%	2.03%	1.52%	1.01%	0.51%	0.00%
6 - Medium Density	Higher Main Settlement	5.07%	4.57%	4.06%	3 55%	3.04%	2.54%	2.00%	1.52%	1.01%	0.51%	0.00%
7 - Medium Sensitive	Higher Main Settlement	5.07%	4.57%	4.06%	3.55%	3.04%	2.54%	2.03%	1.52%	1.01%	0.51%	0.00%
8 - Part Brownfield	Higher Main Settlement	5.07%	4 57%	4.06%	3 55%	3.04%	2 54%	2.00%	1 52%	1.01%	0.51%	0.00%
1 - Small	Lower Main Settlement	5.81%	5 23%	4 64%	4 06%	3 48%	2.04%	2.32%	1.02%	1.01%	0.58%	0.00%
2 - Medium	Lower Main Settlement	5.80%	5.22%	4 64%	4 06%	3 48%	2.00%	2.32%	1 74%	1 16%	0.58%	0.00%
3 - Medium Flood	Lower Main Settlement	5.80%	5.22%	4 64%	4.06%	3.48%	2.00%	2 32%	1 74%	1 16%	0.58%	0.00%
4 - Larger	Lower Main Settlement	5.80%	5.22%	4 64%	4.06%	3 48%	2.00%	2.32%	1.74%	1.16%	0.58%	0.00%
5 - Large	Lower Main Settlement	5.80%	5.22%	4 64%	4 06%	3 48%	2.00%	2.32%	1 74%	1 16%	0.58%	0.00%
6 - Medium Density	Lower Main Settlement	5.80%	5.22%	4 64%	4 06%	3 48%	2.00%	2.32%	1 74%	1 16%	0.58%	0.00%
7 - Medium Sensitive	Lower Main Settlement	5.80%	5.22%	4 64%	4 06%	3 48%	2.00%	2.32%	1 74%	1 16%	0.58%	0.00%
8 - Part Brownfield	Lower Main Settlement	5.80%	5.22%	4.64%	4.06%	3.48%	2.90%	2.32%	1.74%	1.16%	0.58%	0.00%
Small Sites												
Single Rural	Higher Rural	5 88%	5 20%	1 71%	1 12%	3 53%	2 0/%	2 35%	1 76%	1 1 8%	0 50%	0.00%
Three Purel	Higher Rural	4.60%	1 1 49/	2.69%	2 220/	2 76%	2.04/0	1 9/10/	1 29%	0.02%	0.3370	0.00%
Five Purel	Higher Rural	5 99%	5 20%	4 71%	1 1 20/	2.70%	2.30 /0	2 25%	1.30%	1 1 90/	0.40%	0.00%
Sovon Purol	Higher Rural	4 76%	4 20%	2 010/	4.12/0	2.03%	2.34/0	2.33 /6	1.70%	0.05%	0.39%	0.00%
Seven Kural		4.70%	4.29%	5.01/0	4.670/	2.00%	2.30/0	0.670/	2.00%	1.220/	0.40/0	0.00%
Single Rural	Lower Rural	5 219/	6.00%	0.00%	4.07 %	4.00%	3.33%	2.07%	2.00%	1.03%	0.67%	0.00%
Fire Purel	Lower Rural	5.21%	4.05%	4.17 /0	3.03 /0	3.1370	2.01/0	2.00 /0	1.50%	1.04/0	0.52 /0	0.00%
Five Rural	Lower Rural	5.40%	4.86%	4.32%	3.78%	3.24%	2.70%	2.10%	1.62%	1.08%	0.54%	0.00%
Seven Kurai Pair Lirban	Lower Kural Higher Main Settlemont	5.40% 6.25%	4.80%	4.32% 5.00%	3.78%	3.24%	2.70%	2.10%	1.02%	1.08%	0.54%	0.00%
2 Somi Lirban	Higher Main Settlement	/ 0/0/	1 1/1%	3.00%	3 / 50/	2 96%	2 / 70/	1 07%	1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 /	0.00%	0.03%	0.00%
Lirban infill	Higher Main Settlemont	5.06%	4.44 /0	1 05%	3.40%	2.50%	2.4170	2 020/	1.40%	1 01%	0.49%	0.00%
Torração	Higher Main Settlemont	5 17%	4.55%	4.03 /0	3 62%	3.04%	2.53%	2.02%	1.52%	1.01%	0.51%	0.00%
Pair Urban	Lower Main Settlement	7 1/0/	6 / 20/	5 710/	5.02%	4 20%	2.50%	2.01%	2 1 /0/	1 / 20/	0.52%	0.00%
2 Somi Urbon	Lower Main Settlement	1.14% 5.649/	0.43% 5.09%	J./ 1%	2.00%	4.29%	3.31%	2.00%	∠.14% 1.60%	1.43%	0.71%	0.00%
∠ oom ondn Lirban infill	Lower Main Settlement	5 78%	5.00%	4.31%	1 05%	3.30%	2.02%	2.20%	1 73%	1.13%	0.50%	0.00%
		5.70%	5.20%	4.03/0	4.00%	3.47%	2.09%	2.31%	1.73%	1.10%	0.00%	0.00%

Table 3.14 Modelled Sites - CIL as Percentage of Gross Development Value - 35%

Source: Table 13.6 VOWH Local Plan Viability Study. (HDH August 2014)

3.36 These findings are related to the proposed rates of CIL towards the end of this report.

Non-Residential Development

- For the non-residential development we ran a set of development financial appraisals for the 3.37 development types expected to come forward over the plan period.
- 3.38 When testing the non-residential development types we did not run multiple sets of appraisals for different levels of policy requirement as the Council does not seek to impose layers of policy requirements on these types of development.

	Table 3.1	5	No	n-F	Res	sid	en	tial Develop	me	ent			
	Hotels	489,055	20,000	374,000	1,207,542			sl9t0H	355,689	750,000	900,000	878,244	
	sdoys							sdoys	22,119	750,000	900,000	1,179,674	
	Retail Warehouse	2,981,204	20,000	374,000	3,726,506			Retail Warehouse	2,787,064	750,000	900,000	3,483,830	
	Supermarket Smaller	862,584	20,000	374,000	2,156,459			Supermarket Supermarket	785,130	750,000	900,000	1,962,824	
	Supermarkets Larger	3,558,562	20,000	374,000	2,224,102			Supermarkets Larger	3,129,161	750,000	900,000	1,955,725	
	Dffices Harwell sugmeD	238,897	20,000	374,000	2,866,763			Dffices Harwell	171,066	1,000,000	1,000,000	2,052,787	
	Offices Western Vale	-124,967	20,000	374,000	-1,499,602			nətesWernOfficer	-177,210	750,000	750,000	-2,126,515	
	Offices South East Vale	-124,967	20,000	374,000	-1,499,602			Offices South East Vale	-177,210	750,000	750,000	-2,126,515	
	s95170 \ nobgnidA D1070	131,128	20,000	374,000	1,573,534			s9110 \ nobgnidA Dxford	78,885	750,000	750,000	946,621	
	lnitzubnl	16,868	20,000	374,000	111,326			leinteubnl	-47,003	750,000	750,000	-310,223	
		£/site	£/ha	£/ha	£/ha				£/site	£/ha	£/ha	£/ha	
Greenfield		Residual Land Worth	Existing Use Value	Viability Threshold	Residual Value		Brownfield		Residual Land Worth	Existing Use Value	Viability Threshold	Residual Value	

Source: Table 11.1 VOWH Local Plan Viability Study. (HDH August 2014)

- 3.39 To a large extent the above results are reflective of the current market in Vale of White Horse and more widely. Office development is shown as being on the margins of viability and industrial as being unviable, however this is not just an VoWH issue – a finding supported by the fact that such development is only being brought forward to a limited extend on a speculative basis by the development industry. Where development is coming forward it tends to be from existing businesses for operational reasons – rather than to make a return through property development.
- 3.40 It is notable that over the 18 or so months of this viability work there has been a change in sentiment and an improvement in yields and therefore values.
- 3.41 It is clear that non-residential development is challenging in the current market, but it is improving. We would urge caution in relation to setting policy requirements for employment uses that would unduly impact on viability.
- 3.42 Supermarkets and retail warehouses are both shown as viable, on greenfield sites and brownfield sites with the Residual Value exceeding the Viability Threshold by a substantial margin (indicating the ability to make substantial developer contributions). The Plan (in Core Policy 32) does not support the development of retail uses outside the town centres and there are limited opportunities within the town centres beyond those being currently pursued. Whilst the Council wishes to see a broad range of retailing in the VoWHDC area, the Plan directs this towards the town centres.
- 3.43 Other town centre retailing is shown as viable (by the shop typology that represents typical high street shops) although this is based on the assumption that land could be purchased for industrial value. This is unlikely to be the case, as town centre development is most likely to be on land that is currently in a retail use and have a very much higher costs. In the current market such development is unlikely to be viable. This is also reflective of the current market, for example within Abingdon there are multiple empty premises in prime locations, and more in the locations around the periphery of the town centre. The Council have several policies (for example Core Policy 32) seeking to further enhance the town centres.
- 3.44 The analysis showed that supermarkets, retail warehouses are shown as viable on greenfield and brownfield sites whilst hotel use is shown to be viable on greenfield land but not on brownfield land.

Additional Profit

3.45 As for residential development we have also calculated the additional profit.

Table 3.16	Additional Profit.							Non-residentia					dev	elopme	nt	
		Hotels	489,055		337,585	208			zl9toH	355,689		-8,811	ċ			
		sdoys							sdoys	22, 119		5, 244	35			
		Retail Warehouse	2,981,204		2,682,004	671			Retail Warehouse	2,787,064		2,067,064	517			
		Smaller Supermarket	862,584		712,984	594			Smaller Supermarket	785,130		425,130	354			
		Supermarkets	3,558,562		2,960,162	740			Larger Supermarkets	3,129,161		1,689,161	422			
		Offices Harwell sugmeD	238, 897		207, 730	415			Offices Harwell sugmeD	171,066		87, 732	175			
		Offices Western Vale	-124,967		-156,134	-312			nətsəW estern 9lsV	-177,210		-239,710	-479			
		Africes South 9laV tsa∃	-124,967		-156,134	-312			Affices South 9l6V 1263	-177,210		-239,710	-479			
		s91110 \ nobgnidA DrotxO	131,128		99,961	200			esoiffO \ nobgnidA DrotxO	78,885		16,385	33			
		lsinteubnl	16,868		-39, 799	-40			lsintzubnl	-47,003		-160,640	-161			
			£/site		£/site	£/m2				£/site		£/site	£/m2			
	Greenfield		Residual Land Worth		Additional Profit			Brownfield		Residual Land Worth		Additional Profit				

Source: VOWH CIL Viability Study. (HDH 2014)

4. Setting Rates of CIL

- 4.1 In Chapter 13 of the Local Plan Viability Study we set out some of the matters to be considered when setting CIL but stopped short of recommending rates of CIL. Since then the Council has continued to work on the details of infrastructure required to support the plan and the various funding options. This chapter considers the appropriate rates of CIL in the context of the CIL Regulations, the CIL Guidance that is contained within the PPG, and the Vale of White Horse Local Plan. It is important to note that the findings of this report do not determine the rates of CIL, but are one of a number of factors that the Council may consider when setting CIL. Whilst viability is an important element of the CIL Setting process it is just one of a number of elements. In setting CIL there are three main elements that need to be brought together:
 - a. Evidence of the infrastructure requirements
 - b. Viability evidence
 - c. The input of stakeholders.
- 4.2 Outside this report the Council has carried out a substantial amount of work looking at the infrastructure requirements of the area and members and senior officers have attended a number of workshops during the later stages of the plan-making process to consider the total policy burden imposed on developers and, in particular, the relationship between CIL and affordable housing.
- 4.3 Members have drawn on three principle sources of information to inform the decision making process:
 - a. The viability evidence set out in the Local Plan Viability Study principally that repeated in Chapter 3 above.
 - Information about the requirements for infrastructure and, in relation to the larger sites, what of that infrastructure can be funded under s106 and s278 bearing in mind CIL Regulations 122 and 123.
 - c. Projections of expected CIL receipts through considering the amount and types of development planned for and anticipated in different parts of the District.
- 4.4 In striking a balance between the different rates of CIL the Council has considered a range of other factors including the following:

Regulations and Guidance

4.5 CIL Regulation 14 (as amended) sets out the core principle for setting CIL:

In setting rates (including differential rates) in a charging schedule, a charging authority must strike an appropriate balance between— (a) the desirability of funding from CIL (in whole or in part) the actual and expected estimated total cost of infrastructure required to support the development of its area,

taking into account other actual and expected sources of funding; and (b) the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area.....

- 4.6 Viability testing in the context of CIL concerns the '*effects*' on development viability of the imposition of CIL. The Council have taken into account the importance of the provision of infrastructure on the ability of the Council to meet its objectives through development and deliver its Development Plan.
- 4.7 The test that will be applied to the proposed rates of CIL are set out in the updated CIL Guidance, putting greater emphasis on demonstrating how CIL will be used to deliver the infrastructure required to support the Plan.

The levy is expected to have a positive economic effect on development across a local plan area. When deciding the levy rates, an appropriate balance must be struck between additional investment to support development and the potential effect on the viability of developments.

This balance is at the centre of the charge-setting process. In meeting the regulatory requirements (see Regulation 14(1)), charging authorities should be able to show and explain how their proposed levy rate (or rates) will contribute towards the implementation of their relevant plan and support development across their area.

As set out in the National Planning Policy Framework in England (paragraphs 173 – 177), 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. The same principle applies in Wales.

PPG ID: 25-009-20140612

- 4.8 The test is whether the sites and the scale of development identified in the Plan are subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens (when considered together) that their ability to be developed viably is threatened by CIL. The viability evidence has clearly considered the full range of the Council's policy requirements, inducing the need for infrastructure funding. The test is whether CIL 'threatened the development plan as a whole' although it is important to note that the CIL Regulation 14 is clear that the purpose of the viability testing is to establish 'the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area' rather than on specific sites.
- 4.9 This report has been prepared under the CIL Regulations and CIL Guidance at the time of this report (October 2014). It will be necessary for the Council to continue to monitor any changes in the Regulations and Guidance as the CIL setting process continues.

CIL v s106

- 4.10 In Chapter 2 above we have set out the restrictions on future use of s106 and s278 agreements. Whilst preparing the information about the infrastructure requirements for the strategic sites for the modelling in the Local Plan Viability Study, the Council took this into consideration.
- 4.11 Those infrastructure costs that could be met through s106 have been included in the modelling and viability appraisals in line with the requirements of the CIL Guidance. As noted in the Local Plan Viability Study, the strategic sites do put significant further pressure on the

infrastructure and improvements will be required that will not be sufficiently site specific to pass the tests for payments to be required through s106. These items will be funded through a range of other sources including CIL, so it will be necessary to apply CIL to the Strategic Sites as well as to general development.

4.12 The viability testing has considered both the infrastructure costs met through s106/s278 and under CIL.

Infrastructure Delivery

- 4.13 Since the project started the Council has devoted a substantial resource to working with the County Council in its capacity as the Highways and Education Authority. In turn the County has been working with the Highways Agency.
- 4.14 Generally there is a preference for infrastructure to be delivered through s106 / s278 where appropriate. It is recognised that this may allow greater control over the timing of delivery and thus giving greater certainty to both the Council and the developer.

Uncertain Market

4.15 Chapter 4 of the Local Plan Viability Study included a commentary on the property markets. It was noted that the current direction and state of the housing market has improved markedly over the life of this project but the future is uncertain. The housing market peaked late in 2007 (see the following graph) and then fell considerably in the 2007/2008 recession during what became known as the 'Credit Crunch'. The figure below shows that prices in Oxfordshire have seen a recovery since the bottom of the market in mid-2009, and are on an upward trajectory.



Source: Table 4.2 VOWH LPVS (October 214) Land Registry data

4.16 Whilst the housing market has seen a full recovery and there is considerable optimism in the non-residential sectors there remain a number of uncertainties around the UK's relationship with Europe and the wider world economies. It is therefore appropriate to take a cautious approach when setting CIL and ensure that the cumulative impact policies does not result in a total policy burden that is close to the limits of viability.

Neighbouring Authorities

4.17 There is no requirement to keep CIL rates consistent across Charging Authority boundaries, however it is a relevant factor to consider. It is necessary also to consider the Councils' approach to s106 payment, infrastructure requirements and affordable housing.

Table 4.1 CIL rates of neighbouring authorities										
Charging Authority	Approach (all rates per square meter)									
Oxford City	Residential £100, Retail £100, Standard Charge for all other uses £20									
Swindon	Residential £0-55, Retail out of Town Centres £100, all other uses £0									
West Oxfordshire	Residential of more than five units £100-200									
West Berkshire	Residential £75-£125, Retail £125									
Wiltshire	Residential £55-85 (lower for strategic sites), Retail in town centres £70, Retail outside of town centre £175									
Bath & North East Somerset	Residential £100-200, Office £30. Hotel £100. Retail £150. Student Accommodation £100									
South Oxfordshire	Residential: Zones 1 and 2 at £150 psm, Zone 3 Didicot - £85 psm (strategic sites £0) Retail warehousing/supermarkets) £70 psm, Offices – £50 psm, R&D/Science parks - £50 psm									

S106 History

4.18 The Council have set out their past track record of collecting developer contributions (affordable housing and financial) under s106 separately to this report.

Instalment Policy

4.19 At the start of this process the Council organised a consultation event (January 2013) with members of the development industry. The importance of allowing CIL to be paid through the life of a project was raised.

т	able 4.2 Payment of CIL
Equal to or greater than £40,000	Four equal instalments at the end of the periods of 60, 120, 180 and 240 days from commencement
£20,000 and less than £40,000	Three equal instalments at the end of the periods of 60, 120 and 180 days from commencement
£10,000 and less than £20,000	Two equal instalments at the end of the periods of 60 and 120 days from commencement
less than £10,000	In full at the end of the period of 60 days from commencement

4.20 CIL Regulation 69 sets out when CIL is payable. This is summarised as follows:

- 4.21 The 2011 amendment to CIL Regulation 32F¹⁷ introduced CIL Regulation 69B which allows the ability for Charging Authorities to adopt an Instalment Policy. If an Instalment Policy is not adopted then payment is due as set out in the table above. To require payment, particularly on large schemes in line with the above, could have a dramatic and serious impact on the delivery of projects.
- 4.22 It is our firm recommendation that the Council introduces an Instalment Policy. Not to do so could put the Development Plan at serious risk.
- 4.23 The modelling in this study is on the basis that the Council does introduce an Instalment Policy that enables CIL to be paid, through the life of a project, in equal instalments. There are a range of alternative instalment policy structures that could be adopted such as the one set out below as an example. In any event any instalment policy should have a provision whereby, in all cases, the full balance is payable on occupation/opening of the development if this is earlier than the instalment dates set out in the table.

¹⁷ SI 2011 No. 987 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY, ENGLAND AND WALES The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2011. *Made 28th March 2011 Coming into force 6th April 2011*

Number dwellings 1Of InstalmentsTotal Timescale for InstalmentsPayment AmountsPayment Periods1000m2 non- residential developmentInstalmentsInstalmentsAmountsPayment Periods12270 days (9 months)10%60 days from commencement12270 days (9 months)10%60 days from commencement2 to 53365 days (1 year)10%60 days from commencement2 to 53548 days (18 months)10%60 days from commencement	ent. Ient. Ient. Ient. Ient. Ient.
development2270 days (9 months)10%60 days from commenceme12270 days (9 months)10%60 days from commenceme2 to 53365 days (1 year)10%60 days from commenceme2 to 53365 days (1 year)10%60 days from commenceme45%270 days from commenceme45%365 days from commenceme6 to 253548 days (18 months)10%60 days from commenceme	ent. ent. ent. ent. ent. ent. ent.
1 2 270 days (9 months) 10% 60 days from commenceme 90% 270 days from commenceme 2 to 5 3 365 days (1 year) 10% 60 days from commenceme 45% 270 days from commenceme 45% 365 days from commenceme 6 to 25 3 548 days (18 months) 10% 60 days from commenceme	ent. ient. ient. ient. ient. ient.
2 to 53365 days (1 year)10%60 days from commenceme45%270 days from commenceme45%270 days from commenceme6 to 253548 days (18 months)10%60 days from commenceme	ient. ient. ient. ient. ient. ient.
2 to 5 3 365 days (1 year) 10% 60 days from commencement 45% 270 days from commencement 45% 365 days from commencement 6 to 25 3 548 days (18 months) 10% 60 days from commencement	ent. ient. ient. ient. ient.
45% 270 days from commencent 45% 365 days from commencent 6 to 25 3 548 days (18 months) 10% 60 days from commencent	nent. ent. ent. nent.
6 to 253548 days (18 months)10%60 days from commencement	ient. ient.
6 to 25 3 548 days (18 months) 10% 60 days from commencement	ent. ient.
	ient.
45% 365 days from commencer	ont
45% 548 days from commencer	ient.
26 to 50 4 730 days (2 years) 10% 60 days from commenceme	nt.
30% 365 days from commencer	ient.
30% 548 days from commencer	ient.
30% 730 days from commencer	ient.
51 to 100 5 1095 days (3 years) 10% 60 days from commencement	ent.
23% 365 days from commencer	ient.
23% 548 days from commencer	ient.
23% 730 days from commencer	ient.
23% 1095 days from commence	ment.
101 to 200 6 1460 days (4 years) 10% 60 days from commenceme	ent.
18% 365 days from commencer	ient.
18% 548 days from commencer	ient.
18% 730 days from commencer	ient.
18% 1095 days from commence	ment.
18% 1460 days from commence	ment.
201 to 300 7 1825 days (5 years) 10% 60 days from commenceme	ent.
15% 365 days from commencer	ient.
15% 548 days from commencerr	ient.
15% 730 days from commencerr	ient.
15% 1095 days from commence	ment.
15% 1460 days from commence	ment.
15% 1825 days from commence	ment.
301+ 8 2190 days (7 years) 10% 60 days from commenceme	ent.
13% 365 days from commencer	ient.
13% 548 days from commencer	ient.
13% 730 days from commencer	ient.
13% 1095 days from commence	ment.
13% 1460 days from commence	ment.
13% 1825 days from commence	ment.
12% 1826 days from commence	

Source: HDH 2014

Review and Revision

- 4.24 In Table 10.14 and Table 10.15 of the Local Plan Viability Study the results of sensitivity to price and costs change are set out where CIL, for residential property, was set at £100/m² and affordable housing at 35% across all areas (except on the Monks Farm and Crab Hill sites where zero CIL was assumed).
- 4.25 The analysis demonstrated that a relatively small fall in prices will adversely impact on the deliverability of the smaller brownfield sites. The vast majority of land allocated for housing is greenfield land (as informed by the SHLAA process) so the impact on the delivery of the overall Plan would be minimal.

- 4.26 It is clear, across all sites, that relatively small changes in price and costs can have a significant impact on the Residual Value, and that there is sensitivity to changes in prices and costs. This is particularly important when it comes to considering larger sites that will be delivered over many years through multiple phases. In situations on larger sites, where developers make a case for a lower affordable housing requirement on the grounds of viability, we would recommend that a review mechanism is incorporated to allow the affordable housing requirements be adjusted over the life of the project.
- 4.27 We would recommend that CIL be reviewed in the event of house prices changing by 10%.

Viability Evidence – Rates and Zones

- 4.28 We have drawn on the viability evidence set out in the Local Plan Viability Study that is summarised in Chapter 3 above.
- 4.29 This evidence has been prepared in line with the viability sections of the PPG, with the Harman Guidance and the RICS Guidance and taken the comments of consultees into account. It is therefore an appropriate evidence base for the setting of CIL.
- 4.30 As set out at the start of this report, the Local Plan Viability Study concluded, in relation to residential development (at paragraph 12.17):

Bearing in mind the levels of infrastructure funding required we recommend that the Council moves to the lower level of affordable housing of 35% across all sites (including older peoples housing). Whilst this would not bring more sites into viability, it would increase the cushion or margin between the Viability Threshold and the Residual Value and enable developer contributions in the range £80/m2 to £140/m2 to be paid without threatening development.

4.31 In relation to non-residential development, the Local Plan Viability Study concluded (at paragraph 12.17):

The lack of viability is not as a result of the cumulative impact of the Council's policies rendering development unviable through imposing layers of additional costs. The Council has few policies adding to the costs of development in this area. We conclude that the cumulative impact of the Council's policies does not put employment uses at serious risk, however we also note that employment development has little capacity to bear developer contributions.

- 4.32 It was also found that supermarket and retail warehouse uses could make contributions towards infrastructure through CIL and in this report we have added to this confirming specialist distribution and logistics uses also have scope to bear CIL.
- 4.33 Through the CIL workshop process, and taking into account the all the matters set out above, it was decided that:
 - a. CIL is required to fund infrastructure. The Council has been successful in securing capital funding for infrastructure but, in part due to the challenging levels of development proposed, there remains a significant 'funding gap'.

- b. If it was absolutely necessary to reduce the 40% affordable housing requirement to ensure that CIL could be raised, it would be politically acceptable to do that. It was recognised that development would deliver affordable housing and for that development to come forward infrastructure is required. The affordable housing requirement was reduced to 35% in this context.
- c. That it would be preferable, if supported by evidence, to 'keep things simple' and not have multiple rates of CIL although it was recognised that it was appropriate to have differential rates. It was agreed that a fine grained approach was not desirable.
- d. CIL setting is a qualitative and not a quantitative process. CIL is not calculated through a predetermined formula. The Council is required to 'strike' the balance between (a) the desirability of funding from CIL ... the ... cost of infrastructure required to support the development of its area, ... and (b) the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area.

Residential Development

- 4.34 Neither the Monks Farm nor the Crab Hill site are able to bear CIL in addition to the site specific infrastructure requirements to be delivered under s106. We recommend zero rates are applied to these two sites. It is important to note that the Grove Airfield site was not assessed as part of this study as it is well advanced in the planning process. This site has very significant infrastructure requirements and it is likely that a similar recommendation would apply. If the Grove Airfield site is delayed it may be necessary to consider it specifically before CIL is finalised.
- 4.35 Across the remaining area there is a modest, but significant variance in viability. The appraisals show that development in and around the settlements of Faringdon, Grove and Wantage is less good than in the rest of the District. Based on viability evidence alone, we advised senior officers and members of the Council that CIL set at £80/m² to £100/m² in Faringdon, Grove and Wantage, and £120/m² to £140/m² elsewhere would not threaten delivery of the Plan.
- 4.36 Through considering the requirements for infrastructure, affordable housing and the Councils desire to see development coming forward, it was decided that CIL should be set at the following rates.

Table 4.4 VoWH CIL – Residential Rates										
Residential Development (including older people's housing)										
Farringdon, Grove and Wantage	£85/m ²									
Monks Farm and Crab Hill strategic sites	£0/m ²									
All other areas	£120/m ²									

Source: CIL Viability Study (October 2014)

4.37 The residential charging zones are shown on the following map:



Source: VoWHDC / HDH (October 2014)

- 4.38 The analysis in this report (and the Local Plan Viability Study) is based on the analysis of a number of strategic sites allocated through the Plan and a range of typologies developed to be representative of development expected over the plan-period.
- 4.39 Considerable thought has been given to the rates that apply to the strategic sites. In particular consideration was given to whether development coming forward in one area would have significantly different s106 infrastructure requirements to another, as this would have a direct impact on viability. The site specific costs are set out in full in table 7.1 of the Local Plan Viability Study and this was found not to be the case. This is, in part, due to the restrictions of s106/s278 agreements contained in CIL Regulation 122 and CIL Regulation 123.
- 4.40 In all cases the Residual Value, having taken into account the impact of CIL is well above the Viability Thresholds, and in most cases at least double the Viability Threshold indicating that CIL, when considered with the Local Plan full policy requirements, is not being set at the limits of viability.
- 4.41 With CIL set at these levels it would equate to no more than 25% of the Residual Value and in most cases very much less. In no case would CIL represent more than 3.5% of the Gross development value. These two indicators confirm the cautious approach taken.

Non-Residential Development

- 4.42 The evidence does not support the introduction of CIL on the principle employment uses of office and industrial uses. The same findings apply to hotel uses. It is therefore not appropriate to include these uses within CIL.
- 4.43 In the retail sector, the viability evidence does support the introduction of CIL for supermarket¹⁸ uses (including the discount format) and retail warehousing¹⁹ but not for town centre shops.
- 4.44 Through considering the requirements for infrastructure, and the Councils desire to see development coming forward it was decided that CIL should be set at the following rates.

Table 4.5 VoWH CIL – Non-Residential Rates										
Retail Development										
Supermarkets (including discount supermarkets)	£100/m ²									
Retail warehouses	£100/m ²									
All other retail development	£0/m ²									

Source: CIL Viability Study (October 2014)

¹⁸ We recommend that the definition set out the examiner at the Wycombe DC CIL Examination is used:

Superstores/supermarkets are shopping destinations in their own right where weekly food shopping needs are met and which can also include non-food floorspace as part of the overall mix of the unit.

¹⁹ We recommend that the definition set out the examiner at the Wycombe DC CIL Examination is used:

Retail warehouses are large stores specialising in the sale of household goods (such as carpets, furniture and electrical goods) DIY items and other ranges of goods catering for mainly car-borne customers.

5. Conclusions

- 5.1 As set out earlier in this report, the purpose of the viability evidence is not to set CIL, rather being to assess the *effect* of CIL on viability, so that an assessment can be made to ensure that CIL does not threaten delivery of the Local Plan 2031, Part 1 Strategic Sites and Policies as a whole.
- 5.2 In the previous chapter we have set out the proposed rates of CIL. These are brought together below:

Table 5.1 VoWH CIL – Residential Rates										
Residential Development (including older peoples housing) Farringdon, Grove and Wantage Monks Farm and Crab Hill strategic sites All other areas	£85/m² £0/m² £120/m²									
Retail Development Supermarkets (including discount supermarkets) Retail warehouses All other retail development	£100/m² £100/m² £0/m²									

Source: CIL Viability Study (October 2014)

- 5.3 Based on the viability evidence set out in the Local Plan Viability Study (October 2014) and this CIL Viability Study we confirm that CIL, when set at these rates, would not threaten delivery of the Plan as a whole.
- 5.4 Separately to this report the Council will set out how funds raised as CIL will be used to deliver the Plan, and how it will form an important source of funding for infrastructure.

HDH Planning and Development Ltd is a specialist planning consultancy providing evidence to support planning authorities, land owners and developers.

The firm is led by Simon Drummond-Hay who is a Chartered Surveyor, Associate of Chartered Institute of Housing and senior development professional with a wide experience of both development and professional practice. The firm is regulated by the RICS.

The main areas of expertise are:

- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- District wide and site specific Viability Analysis
- Local and Strategic Housing Market Assessments and Housing Needs Assessments
- Future Housing Numbers Analysis (post RSS target setting)

HDH Planning and Development have clients throughout England and Wales.

HDH Planning and Development Ltd Registered in England Company Number 08555548 Clapham Woods Farm, Keasden, Nr Clapham, Lancaster. LA2 8ET simon@drummond-hay.co.uk 015242 51831 / 07989 975 977



Alternative formats of this publication are available on request. These include large print, Braille, audio, email, easy read and alternative languages

Please contact Planning on 01235 837339