Appendix 1: Economic Viability Assessment – Baseline Assumptions – NPS 2015 Update

| S 1. 1 2. | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1. 1 2. | | DTZ Comments | DTZ Final Assumption | NPS Updated Position | |
| 1.0 | tudy Areas: . Eden Valley North . Alston Moor . Eden Valley South | All agreed as proposed | As proposed | No change | |
| 4. | . Penrith | | | | |
| Р | roposed Sites | All agreed as proposed | As proposed | | |
| | | Eden District EVA Site Identification. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Small High Density Medium Density Low Den | sity High Density Medium Density Low Density High Density Medium Density Low Density | | | |
| 1 | Penrith PSHD PSMD PSLD | PMHD PMMD PMLD PLHD PLMD PLLD | | | |
| | Alston n/a ASMD ASLD Eden Valley North n/a EVNSMD EVNSL | | | | |
| 2 | Eden Valley South n/a EVSSMD EVSSU | D n/a EVSMIND EVSMLD n/a EVSIMD EVSILD | | No change | |
| | Extra Large | Urban Extension | | | |
| 1 | Penrith PXLHD PXLHD PXLMD PXLL | Eden District EVA Site Identification | | | |
| | Alston n/a AXLMD AXLM Eden Valley North n/a n/a n/a | | | | |
| | Eden Valley South n/a EVSXLMD EVSXL | | | | |
| | Total 36 sites | · · | | | |
| Р | roposed Site Sizes | All agreed as proposed | As proposed | | |
| | Penrith Sizes A | II Other Area Sizes | | | |
| | Small 0.25ha | Small 0.25ha | | | |
| 3 | Medium 0.5 ha | Medium 0.5ha Large 1.ha | | No change | |
| | Extra Large 2 ha | Extra Large 2+ ha | | | |
| l | Urban Extension 5+ha | | | | |
| + | | | | | |
| | | Many stakeholders disagreed with site densities stating that in rural | | No evidence to support change to | |
| | | areas in particular, densities usually fall well below 30 dph. However, | | assumption | |
| | | national guidance requires local authorities to aim to deliver a minimum | | | |
| | | of 30 dph on all schemes and consultation with Eden District Council has shown the that whilst they are aware not every development | | | |
| | 5 | permitted will be over 30dph this is the starting point for negotiations in | As proposed | | |
| | 5 1 | accordance with national policy. To vary this EDC would be looking for | | | |
| | | strong justification from the applicant to permit below that the shoul, | | Story Homes Kirkby Stephen Site is 1.98ha gross = 30.3 dph | |
| | · · | such as topography, irregular shape of site and those sort of issues, | | | |
| 0 | · · | and the viability of these abnormal site conditions would be assessed by the individual site viabilities to be submitted by the developer as part | | 1.77ha net = 33.9 dph | |
| | | of Policy CS10. As we are considering hypothetical sites in this | | | |
| | | approach an removing an assumptions of a minimum 30dph is | | Clifton Hill Site is: 1.78ha gross = 27.0 dph | |
| | | justifiable. abnormal concerns we are of the opinion an assumptions of | | 1.67ha net = 28.7 dph | |
| 5 V | | a minimum 30dph is justifiable. All feedback in support | As proposed | Valuation Date - December 2015 | |
| | Il sites have full planning permission | All feedback in support | As proposed | No change | |
| | | All feedback in support | As proposed | No change | |
| _ | | | | | |
| | or developments less than 11 dwellings hin return 16% on GDV is viable | | As proposed | For developments less than 11 | |
| | | Noted that this return is net of finance and central overhead costs and | | dwellings = increase to 17% of GD | |
| + | | therefore general agreement with these figures - although many stated | | For developments of between 11 | |
| For developments more than 10 dwellings | | this would be the minimum return required. On average developers expect to see a return on 20-25% gross profit. | | and 20 dwellings = 17.5% of GDV; | |
| | nin return 18% on GDV is viable | | As proposed | For developments of more than 21 | |
| | | | | dwellings = no change (18% of GDV) | |
| + | | | | Based on current evidence a | |
| | | These figures have been revised upwards following stakeholder | Land Values = 10% of GDV for rural | benchmark land value of around | |
| | | consultation. Whilst stakeholders responded providing range of | | £325,000/net developable acre | |
| | | between 10% to 30% of GDV, the upper of these figures reflects the level of land value which would have typically been paid in the height of | | appropriate for sites in Penrith and Eden Valley North and South. We | |
| | | the market. For rural (originally the DTZ study referred to 'greenfield') | | have taken the view that willing land | |
| 101 | | sites the impact of reality that schemes often provide less than 30 dph | | owner will require a land value of at | |
| | and values = 5-10% of GDV | drives land value proportion of GDV higher than what would be | (greenfield) land and 20% of GDV for urban | least 90% of this figure to reach | |
| | | calculated if schemes comprised 30 dph as a minimum. Likely | (brownfield) land. | decision to sell (i.e. £292,500/net | |
| | | brownfield sites will provide at least 30 dph hence higher land to GDV ratio is achieved. For both rural and brownfield consideration also given | . , | developable acre or circa £725,000/net developable hectare). | |
| | | for deferred / staged land payments making the actual land price | | Land values in Alston Moor taken to | |
| | | | | be 80% of this figure (i.e. | |
| | | payable to the land owner less valuable than if payments were made up | | | |
| | | payable to the land owner less valuable than if payments were made up front. | | £234,000/net developable acre) | |
| | | | | Assume two sales per month for | |
| | | front. | | Assume two sales per month for all sites. Assume Affordable/Social | |
| 11 Si tw | | | As proposed | Assume two sales per month for | |
| 11 Si tw | ales Rates – one per month (small sites) | front. | | Assume two sales per month for all sites. Assume Affordable/Social rent properties transferred to | |
| 11 Si tw | ales Rates – one per month (small sites) | front. No change - feedback broadly in agreement | | Assume two sales per month for all sites. Assume Affordable/Social rent properties transferred to Registered Provider upon | |
| | ales Rates – one per month (small sites) vo per month (large sites) | front. No change - feedback broadly in agreement This assumptions has been increased following stakeholder | As proposed | Assume two sales per month for all sites. Assume Affordable/Social rent properties transferred to Registered Provider upon completion of construction | |
| 12 In | ales Rates – one per month (small sites) vo per month (large sites) nterest Rates – as at June 2009 (2% | front. No change - feedback broadly in agreement | As proposed | Assume two sales per month for all sites. Assume Affordable/Social rent properties transferred to Registered Provider upon | |

| | | Data for Eden District (Houses - 'Estate Housing Generally' - £93 96% = £896 per m ² ; Flats 'one to two storey - £1,047 x 96% = £1, | | | |
|----|--|---|---|--|--|
| | Flats = £80 psf (£89 psf NSA including prof fees and contingency) Houses = £70 psf (£78 psf NSA including prof fee and contingency) | Due to lower required spec, costs unchanged for Penrith. However due to likely high build standards outside Penrith have been increased to £94 psf for apartments and £83 psf NSA for houses (which include contingency and professional fees). | As explained | per m²) / Infrastructure Allowand (10% to 15% dependent on size development) / Fees (6 to 7 % o Build Costs) / Contingency (2.5% build costs for Greenfield Sites; s for Brownfield Sites) | |
| 14 | Local Occupancy | No firm opinion from stakeholders as to how it impacts sales values (suggested range 5-40% most between 10-20%). However general consensus that it does have impact. As such DTZ will model viability scenarios based on 15% fall in sales values for units to reflect the fall back in sales revenue for local occupancy restriction. | As explained | No change - we concur with DT. view that a 15% reduction in val generally appropriate for local occupancy housing. Whist we h not been commissioned to test to viability of local occupancy hous we can confirm that in our professional opinion the propose 'cascade' framework set out in Appendix 6 of the emerging Loc Plan document is likely to be acceptable to lenders. We wou also expect landowners of affect sites to typically adjust land valu expectations to enable the viabil development of the limited nume of small-scale schemes we wou expect to come forward under the relevant proposed policy. | |
| 15 | Unit Values - see below Private Revenue Assumptions | General Agreement with these figures. Some feedback felt figures in Penrith are too high, however as a scenario testing will be undertaken to vary revenues most stakeholders agreed with this as a starting point | As proposed | Following a comprehensive revi of the housing market in Eden a the following average unit prices unit sizes are put forward as be appropriate at the date of valua PENRITH / EDEN VALLEY NO / EDEN VALLEY SOUTH (Hou *2 Bed - 70m2 (753ft2) - £2,260 m2 (£210 per ft2) = £158,172 *3 Bed - 92.5m2 (995ft2) - £2,2 per m2 (£205 per ft2) = £204,0 *4 Bed - 130m2 (1399ft2) - £2,1 per m2 (£200 per ft2) = £279,7 | |
| | Unit Type Value 2 Bed House High 2 Bed House Mid Low High 3 Bed House Mid 4 Bed House High 4 Bed House High 5 Bed House Mid Low High | | | ALSTON (Houses) Sames sizes as above, values a 90% of above | |
| | Unit Type Value 2 Bed Flat High 2 Bed Flat Mid 2 Bed House High 2 Bed House Mid 3 Bed House Mid 4 Bed House Mid Low High | Penrith Area sq ft Values £ psf £130,000 £200 650 £115,000 £177 £97,000 £149 £130,000 £200 750 £130,000 £173 £115,000 £153 950 £180,000 £220 £180,000 £173 £180,000 £174 £180,000 £218 1100 £220,000 £218 £180,000 £164 | | | |
| 16 | Affordable Housing intermediate 65% MV Social Rented 45% MV | Most feedback suggested that these figures are too high. Indeed some feedback points to the fact that affordable housing value is normally calculated as a multiple of lower quartile income and does not reflect changes in market values. | Revised to 50% MV for Intermediate and 35% MV for Social Rented | Change to current policy of 60% for Intermediate. Affordable ren properies typically in region of 4 to 50% of MV (this reflects analy work carried out in recent SLDC Viability Study) - use figure of 50 | |

| | | | Viability Study) - use figure of 50% |
|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | 7 Other Contributions including s106, 278 and EM18 | Idefermine the impact of this on Vianility. In the market circumstances | No change (see NOTE 1 below) |

18 Housing Mix - see below

Following stakeholder feedback the number of larger units has been reduced and 5 bedroom dwellings scaled back to 10% of the housing

Housing Mix - see below

Original Proposal

| Site Description | Unit Type | Percentage |
|------------------|-----------------|------------|
| Penrith | 2 Bed Apartment | 10% |
| High Density | 2 Bed House | 50% |
| 45dph | 3 Bed House | 40% |
| | | 100% |
| Penrith | 2 Bed House | 25% |
| Medium Density | 3 Bed House | 40% |
| 35dph | 4 Bed House | 35% |
| | 5 Bed House | 0% |
| | | 100% |
| Penrith | 2 Bed House | 25% |
| low Density | 3 Bed House | 40% |
| 30dph | 4 Bed House | 35% |
| | 5 Bed House | 0% |
| | | 100% |

mix.

| Site Description | Unit Type | Percentage | Site Description | Unit Type | Percentage |
|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|
| Alston | 2 Bed House | 25% | Eden Valley North | 2 Bed House | 25% |
| Medium Density | 3 Bed House | 35% | Medium Density | 3 Bed House | 35% |
| 35 dph 4 Bed House | | 20% | 35 dph 4 Bed House | | 20% |
| | 5 Bed House | 20% | | 5 Bed House | 20% |
| | | 100% | | | 100% |
| | | | | | |
| Alston | 2 Bed House | 20% | Eden Valley North | 2 Bed House | 20% |
| Low Density | 3 Bed House | 35% | Low Density | 3 Bed House | 35% |
| 30 dph | 4 Bed House | 25% | 30 dph | 4 Bed House | 25% |
| | 5 Bed House | 20% | | 5 Bed House | 20% |
| | | 100% | | | 100% |

| Site Description | Unit Type | Percentage |
|-------------------|-------------|------------|
| Eden Valley South | 2 Bed House | 25% |
| Medium Density | 3 Bed House | 35% |
| 35 dph | 4 Bed House | 20% |
| | 5 Bed House | 20% |
| - | | 100% |
| | | |
| Eden Valley South | 2 Bed House | 20% |
| Low Density | 3 Bed House | 35% |
| 30 dph | 4 Bed House | 25% |
| | 5 Bed House | 20% |
| | | 100% |

| | No evidence to support significantly |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| , | changing any assumptions. Note |
| | that DTZ assumption was arrived at |
| | following industry consultation in |
| | 2009. Two recent developments |
| | analysed below within the District |
| | don't feature any 5 bed houses, |
| | although some developers may well |
| | chose to include such products in |
| | proposals. For the purpose of |
| | 'Refresh' Exercise assume Housing |
| | Market Areas outside Penrith follow |
| | DTZ Revised Housing Mix |
| | Assumptions for Penrith (at 30dph |
| | and 35dph, but also apply this |
| | assumption to 40dph). |
| | |

Story - Kirkby Stephen Site is: 2 bed 27% - 3 bed 53% - 4 bed 20%

Story - Clifton Hill Site is: 2 bed 25% - 3 bed 35% - 4 bed 40%

Revised Proposal

| Site Description | Unit Type | Percentage | Site Description | Unit Type | Percentage | Site Description | Unit Type | Percentage |
|------------------|---|------------|-------------------|-------------|------------|-------------------|-------------|------------|
| Penrith | 2 Bed Apartment | 10% | Alston | 2 Bed House | 25% | Eden Valley North | 2 Bed House | 25% |
| High Density | 2 Bed House | 50% | Medium Density | 3 Bed House | 40% | Medium Density | 3 Bed House | 40% |
| 40ph | 3 Bed House | 40% | 35 dph | 4 Bed House | 25% | 35 dph | 4 Bed House | 25% |
| | 9 - Carlo | 100% | | 5 Bed House | 10% | and a second | 5 Bed House | 10% |
| | | 8 | 20 | | 100% | 108 | | 100% |
| Penrith | 2 Bed House | 25% | | | 237 | | | 18 |
| Medium Density | 3 Bed House | 40% | Alston | 2 Bed House | 25% | Eden Valley North | 2 Bed House | 25% |
| 35dph | 4 Bed House | 35% | Low Density | 3 Bed House | 40% | Low Density | 3 Bed House | 40% |
| | 5 Bed House | 0% | 30 dph | 4 Bed House | 25% | 30 dph | 4 Bed House | 25% |
| | | 100% | | 5 Bed House | 10% | | 5 Bed House | 10% |
| | c | 10 | | | 100% | | | 100% |
| Penrith | 2 Bed House | 25% | | | 10 | | | |
| Low Density | 3 Bed House | 40% | Site Description | Unit Type | Percentage | | | |
| 30dph | 4 Bed House | 35% | Eden Valley South | 2 Bed House | 25% | | | |
| | 5 Bed House | 0% | Medium Density | 3 Bed House | 40% | | | |
| | с. | 100% | 35 dph | 4 Bed House | 25% | | | |
| | | | | 5 Bed House | 10% | | | |
| | | | | | 100% | | | |
| | | | 3 | | | | | |
| | | | Eden Valley South | 2 Bed House | 25% | | | |
| | | | Low Density | 3 Bed House | 40% | | | |
| | | | 30 dph | 4 Bed House | 25% | | | |
| | | | 8. | 5 Bed House | 10% | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

Note 1 (S106 Contributions)

The Council seeks payments from developers to mitigate the impact of each development, as appropriate, through improvements to the local infrastructure. In December 2012 Cumbria County Council published its Draft Planning Obligation Policy setting out in detail the contributions that developers may be asked to provide. We are aware that a number of aspects of the Cumbria County Council document (such as education and highways contribution) remain 'under discussion' between relevant stakeholders and are likely to vary ir different parts of the District dependent on local circumstances. At this point in time it is difficult to sensibly come up with a 'one size fits all' per unit contribution allowance applicable across the District, or even a specific Housing Market Area within the District. Past trends in neighbouring South Lakeland District show that around £1,500 residential unit is ar approximate average amount that has been collected. The future adoption and application of the Cumbria County Council Planning Obligation Policy and the 2014 proposed restriction to the ability of local authorities to pool s106 payments will undoubtedly lead to changes to typical levels of s106 contributions. Against

this context we believe it would be appropriate to continue with the DTZ approach of testing the viability effect of a range of s106 contributions. We therefore propose no change to the four figures (£1,000; £2,500; £5,000 and £7,500 per unit) put forward by DTZ in 2009